<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>A Survey of the New Manuscripts of the Vādhūla School -- MSS. of K1 and K4--</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>IKARI, Yasuke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation</td>
<td>ZINBUN (1999), 33: 1-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Date</td>
<td>1999-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URL</td>
<td><a href="https://doi.org/10.14989/48754">https://doi.org/10.14989/48754</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights</td>
<td>© Copyright March 1999, Institute for Research in Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Departmental Bulletin Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textversion</td>
<td>publisher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kyoto University
A Survey of the New Manuscripts of the Vādhūla School—MSS. of $K_1$ and $K_4$—*

Yasuke Ikari

The New Manuscripts of the Vādhūla School
General Account of the Manuscripts
Some Notes on the Vādhūla Śrutasūtra
Some Notes on the Vādhūla Anvākhyaṇa
Some Notes on the Vādhūla Grhyasūtra
Appendix: Excerpts from the Āgnyādheya Anvākhyaṇa

The New Manuscripts of the Vādhūla School

The set of manuscripts in Malayālam script that are the main subject of this article were taken photograph by me during a series of field researches between 1992 and 1997 in central Kerala, the southernmost state of India.

As a result of my field survey, almost all of the new Vādhūla manuscripts were found among the private collections of the Nambudiri brahmin families who belong to the gotra of Vadhūla. As I see it, all of the important Vādhūla manuscripts which have been preserved in the Manuscript Libraries in various districts of India, for instance, Madras, Trivandrum, Baroda, Poona and Hoshiarpur have been identified either as the direct or indirect copies of the manuscripts of these two collections. They are the Neḷumpillī Mana(House) and the Kitaṇṇaśṣeri Mana. Both of them are located at the outskirt area of Iriṇiṇjālakkuṭa, which is an old town of historical importance and was once the centre of the ancient Kerala culture.

These two houses have been regarded as the ācārya families among the Vādhūla Nambudiris, and this tradition can be traced back to as early as

* This article is a revised version of the lecture given at Harvard University, Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, March 1998.
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twelfth century as the inscription of the Padmanabha Temple of Trivandrum seems to testify. Since that period, ācāryas of these families have been highly respected by the kings of Travancore and they have been continuously appointed as the leading priests of the Padmanabha temple. Even now, the head of the family is invited to preside at the yearly festival of the Padmanabha temple of Trivandrum.

Present distribution of the surviving schools of Veda in India shows that all of the Vedic schools surviving in Kerala belong to the oldest schools in historical perspective: Śaṅkhāyana school of the Rīgveda, Jaiminīya of the Sāmaveda and the Baudhāyana and Vādhūla of the Yajurveda. Among the Yajurvedins of Kerala Nambudiri, most of them belong to the school of Baudhāyana and the Vādhūlas are minor in numbers.¹

Nowadays, only fifteen Vādhūla families have been living in Kerala and their distribution is confined to the central part of Kerala.²

According to the information given by Śrī Vasudevan Nambudiri, the author of the Vādhūlaka-Caṭañṇu, which is a practical manual of the Gṛhya rituals of the Vādhūla tradition, the last performance of the Somayāga among the Vādhūlakas was held by his father Somayajipad Nambudiri during 1920’s. Since then, the tradition of the Śrauta ritual among the Vādhūlakas have been obsolete, and to this day, none of the Vādhūlakas seem to keep the practical knowledge of the Śrauta ritual of this school. I may reluctantly say that the living Śrauta tradition of the Vādhūla school has already died out, while some of the Gṛhya rituals (especially life-rituals or the rite of passage like initiation, marriage, rites for the dead) have been kept alive.

Except for occasional references in the commentaries or in the lists of Vedic schools, like Caranāvṛtyahās, the actual text of the Vādhūla school had been little known to the Vedic scholars. It was the effort of Prof. Willem Caland who came to notice the existence of manuscripts belonging to the long forgotten school and he immediately started to study them in early 1920’s. Caland published in the same decade excerpts of the Śrautasūtra and Anvākhyaṇa. But he could not publish the edition of the entire manuscript which he could obtain. The MS. was a copy of the Madras Manuscript, abbreviated as M in my description of the MSS.

² See A.Parpola, On the Jaiminīya and Vādhūla Traditions of South India and the Pāṇḍu/Pāṇḍava Problem, Studia Orientalia 55 (1984), p.10. I was informed during my stay in Iriñjālakkutā that one house among them had been abolished since 1996.
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Fifty years after this discovery, it is Professor Michael Witzel who revived the interest into this archaic and important school of Yajurveda by exploring further materials of the school in his extensive field research of Vedic manuscripts among the important manuscript libraries of India. Being instigated by his excellent article of 1975\(^3\), two editions of the Vadhula Šrautasūtra finally came out within these ten years. One is the edition of the first prapāṭhaka by Dr. M. Sparreboom and Prof. J.C. Heesterman\(^4\), and the other is that of Prof. B.B. Chaubey of Hoshiarpur\(^5\).

In spite of the recent studies and editions of the Vadhula sūtra, there still has remained much to be done for the textual studies of this school. The first reason is the quality of the available manuscripts. Including Caland’s publications, all of the previous editions could utilize only one single manuscript \(M\), that is, the Madras manuscript and its secondary copies.

As will be shown in the diagram of stemma given below, all the manuscripts previously known(\(M, C, H\)) belong to the same single recension. And \(M\) was the only extensive manuscript in this recension. However, what has put the scholars most trouble with the manuscripts of this recension is the fatal defect of lacunae caused by the broken state of the original manuscript, which are to be observed in almost all of the leaves. The corrupt readings and the fragmented state of leaves do not allow researchers to reconstruct the original readings. In another words, the defective state of the text may lead even the expert researcher to misunderstand the true intention of the original text.

This had been the situation before I started to search the present state of the Vadhula tradition and tried to look for the possibility of finding out new manuscripts which would enable us to drastically change the situation of source materials.

Being fortunate enough, I could find, after a series of trial and error, the new Vadhula manuscripts, which are listed below under the title of New Manuscripts. Here are listed only those of three classes of basic texts of the

\(^4\) M. Sparreboom and J.C. Heesterman with assistance of A. DeLeeuw van Weenen, The ritual of setting up the sacrificial fires according to the Vadhula school (Vadhulaśrutasūtra 1.1–1.4), Wien 1989 (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil-Hist. Klasse, Sitzungsbericht 539 Band, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens NR.22)
\(^5\) B.B. Chaubey, Vadhula Śrutasūtram, Hoshiarpur 1993.
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Vādhūla school, that is, the Brāhmaṇa, or Anvākhyaṇa, and sūtra texts both of Śrauta and Grhya. In addition to these, I have taken films of some twenty manuscripts of the commentaries and the prayogas, the practical manuals for the ritual performance.

It is difficult to fix the dates of these Malayālam manuscripts, mainly for lack of firmly datable materials. All of the manuscripts do not give any date at all nor any historical references which would provide good dating criteria.\(^6\)

General Account of the Vādhūla Manuscripts

a. MSS. utilized by scholars since W. Caland (\(M, H\): Devanāgarī script; \(C\): Roman script)

Composite MS. of Grhyaśūtra(=GS) fragments, Śrutasūtra(=ŚS) and Brāhmaṇa[=Anvākhyaṇa] (=Br.) (from leaf nos. 4–123 of the original \(K[=K_1]\)).
Title on MS.: Vādhūlaśrautakalpavyākhyā (revised from “Vādhūla-grhyakalpavyākhyā”); Title by catalogue (Triennial Catalogue, p.6425): Vādhūla-parakalpavyākhyā.

\(H\): No.5657, Vishveshvaranand Vishva Bandhu Institute, Hoshiarpur. Copied during 1926–27. 40 pages.
Composite MS. of GS fragments and SS fragment(1.1–1.3 only). Title: Vādhūla-grhyakalpavyākhyā.

\(C\): Caland’s handwritten copy (Indirect copy of \(M\)), Utrecht Univ. Library. Copied ca.1923.
ŚS fragment(1.1–7.3). 105 pages. Title: Vādhūlaśrautasūtra.

b. New MSS. (Here only of ŚS, GS and Br. All in Malayālam (=Mal.) script, except the last one; ([Old]= written in older type of Mal. script. [Mod]= in

---

\(^6\) We may distinguish two types of scripts in these manuscripts; older and younger. According to Caland, a pandit of Madras library wrote to him that the original palm-leaf manuscript of the Madras manuscript would be four hundred years old at the time of early 1920s. But it would be too much. The palm leaf manuscript cannot endure the heat and humidity of Kerala coast area so long. But I will not go into this problem here.
newer type of Mal. script.)

\(K_1\): No.95, Kitaĩnaśšeri Mana, Iriĩjālakkuta. [Old] No date. No title. 128 leaves (including fragments). Composite MS. of GS, ŠS, Br. (plus 14 floating leaves not copied by \(M\): 4 of GS. itself, 1 of Šulbasūtra commentary(fragment) and 9 of ŠS Prayoga.

\(K_2\): No.101, Kitaĩnaśšeri Mana, Iriĩjālakkuta. [Old] No date. 148 leaves. Composite MS. of GS, ŠS(Chapters 1–7 with Pravargya plus 12th Chapter) and fragments of Prāyaścitta Br. Although sequence of leaves in this MS. is quite corrupt, \(K_2\) covers the almost complete description of GS. It also gives a couple of sections of ŠS which are not found in other MSS. Title: Vādhūlakagrhyasūtram.

\(K_3\) : No.51, Kitaĩnaśšeri Mana, Iriĩjālakkuta. [Old] No date. No title. 149 leaves. MS. of ŠS (Chapters 1–7 with Pravargya) plus 2 leaves of GS Prayoga of a different hand.

\(K_4\) : No.92, Kitaĩnaśšeri Mana, Iriĩjālakkuta. [Mod] No date. No title. 129 leaves. \(K_1\)'s copy made several decades (at least) before \(M\).

\(N_1\) : No.122, Neḍumpillī Mana, Iriĩjālakkuta. [Old] No date. 109 leaves. MS. of ŠS(Chapters 1–7 with Pravargya). Title: Śrauta Somayāga-prayoga.

\(N_2\) : No.121b, Neḍumpillī Mana, Iriĩjālakkuta. [Mod] No date. 113 leaves. MS. of ŠS(Chapters 1–7 with Pravargya) plus 11 leaves of Somapravoga fragments. Title: Vādhūlapraśārrtham.

\(N_3\) : No.145, Neḍumpillī Mana, Iriĩjālakkuta. [Old] No date. 52 leaves. Composite MS. of Grhyasūtra (incomplete) and Grhyaprayoga. Title: Grhyasūtram kārikāyum.

\(N_4\) : No.115, Neḍumpillī Mana, Iriĩjālakkuta. [Mod] No date. 98 leaves. Composite MS. of Grhyasūtra and Grhyaprayoga (Skt. and Mal.). Title: Pākayajñam.

\(T_1+T_2\) : T 1081B, Oriental Research Institute and MSS. Library,
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$T_1$ is the main text of this MS. transcribed from $N_2$ with Devanāgarī, while the text is later revised with the reading of $N_1$; $T_2$ is attached as variants taken from $N_1$ and transcribed with Devanāgarī.

Taking the example of the Śrautasūtra MSS., the relationship of these new manuscripts with the already known ones can be illustrated by the following diagram.

**Stemma of the Śrautasūtra MSS.**

![Stemma Diagram]

Several points are to be noticed in this diagram.

First, the original manuscript of the previously known manuscripts ($M, *M_c, C, H$) was found by me among the Kitaññāśeri Mana collection in 1994. It had been regarded as lost since the time of its being copied into the Madras manuscript. It is named as $K_1$.\(^7\) Although this is the original of

\(^7\) K is the abbreviation of Kitaññāśeri, and not of Kerala.
the Madras manuscript ($M$) and $H$, the present state of $K_1$ has been decayed to further extent than it was in 1922–23 when it was transcribed into the MS. $M$ with Devanāgarī script.

Further, I could discover a Malayālam copy of $K_1$ in 1997 again among the Kitaṅgaśeri Mana collection. The discovery of this manuscript has shed a new light into several unsolved questions concerning the sequence of manuscripts and the lost leaves of $K_1$ and $M$. Further advantage of this manuscript lies in the fact that it has less lacunae than both $K_1$ and $M$ and it offers a good basis for forming conjecture in making the critical text. This manuscript was written with the younger Malayālam script and it seems that $K_4$ was written at least several decades before the making of Madras manuscript.

Secondly, with the discovery of new manuscripts, an another recension of manuscripts has been added to the previous manuscript group, the $K_1$ recension. And the newly found manuscripts generally show less damage of the leaves than that of $K_1$ recension. So, these two recensions well complement each other for reconstructing the more original text of the Vādhūla school.

The final and the most important point is that the manuscript group of the right side of the stemma diagram, which comprises $N_1$, $K_2$, $K_3$ and their secondary copies, shares a common distinctive feature. The Śrautasūtra description of this group comes to end with the description of the Agniśṭoma, which is regarded as a model type of the Soma rituals. It accompanies the description of the Pravargya, which is assigned the place last but one in the whole Śrautasūtra in the $K_1$ recension MSS. group.

There are three basic texts, so far known in the Vādhūla school, which belong to the Vedic period: the Śrautasūtra, the Grhyasūtra and the Anvākhyāna (or the Brāhmaṇa). As the most extensive manuscripts more or less comprising the descriptions of these three texts are those of $K_1$ recension, I give the Table of Correspondence of $K_1$ recension manuscripts in the following two pages.

---

8 Descriptions of all the variation types of the Soma ritual are omitted in this group of MSS.
9 The last chapter is the section of the sacrificer’s role ($yājāmāna$) of the Agniśṭoma. See the Table of Correspondence given in pages 8 and 9.
Table of Correspondence: Contents of Madras MS. & Malāyalam MSS. of K₁ and K₄.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M(Madras MS.)</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>K₁</th>
<th>K₄</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(K fols. uncopied: 1-3, 9-11,27,46-47)</td>
<td>VGṛhyavākyāprayogakṣīti (fr.) [Reconstructed from K2 &amp; N4]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*p.1-28 (with lacunae)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VGṛhyasūtra 1 (Gṛhya)</td>
<td>Ex.12, —, 4, 5a1-b8, 5b8-b14,6,7,8, Ex.13a-b5</td>
<td>125, —, —, 5a1-b8, 5b8-b14,6,7,8, 127a1-b6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VGṛhyasūtra 2 (Pitṛmeṣṭha)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VGṛhyaprayoga[?] (fr.)</td>
<td>Ex.13a12-14; Ex.13a14-b5</td>
<td>127a12-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agnyādheya Preliminaries (cf.BŚS 2.1-11)</td>
<td>Ex.13b5-b14,Ex.11, Fl.oat. ms. (inserted after 20)</td>
<td>127b6-b14,128,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.28-438</td>
<td>Vādh.Śrāutaśāstra</td>
<td>12-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.28-</td>
<td>I. Agnyādheya</td>
<td>12-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.41-</td>
<td>Punarādheya</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.47-</td>
<td>Agnihotra</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.51-</td>
<td>Agnyupasthāna</td>
<td>15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.57-</td>
<td>II. Purodaśi</td>
<td>16-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.84-</td>
<td>III. Yājamāna to Iṣṭi</td>
<td>21-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.99-</td>
<td>Āgrayaṇa</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.102-</td>
<td>Brahmatva</td>
<td>24-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.107-</td>
<td>IV. Cāturmāsya</td>
<td>26-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.138-</td>
<td>V. Pāsubandha</td>
<td>31-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.156-</td>
<td>VI. Agnīṣṭoma 1</td>
<td>35-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.194-</td>
<td>VII. &quot;</td>
<td>43-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.234-</td>
<td>VIII. Agnicayana</td>
<td>52-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.311-</td>
<td>IX. Vājapeya</td>
<td>66-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.325-</td>
<td>X. Rājasūya (with Sautrāmaṇi)</td>
<td>68-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.352-</td>
<td>XI. Aśvamedha</td>
<td>73-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madras MS.</td>
<td>Contents</td>
<td>K₁</td>
<td>K₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.402-407</td>
<td>(cont. of VŚŚ) [XII. Aptyoryāna (with a reference to Dvādaśāha)]</td>
<td>81-82</td>
<td>81-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.407-409</td>
<td>Pavitreṣṭi</td>
<td>82-83</td>
<td>82-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.409-430</td>
<td>[XIII. Pravargya]</td>
<td>83-86</td>
<td>83-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.430-438</td>
<td>[XIV. Yājamāna to Agniṣṭoma]</td>
<td>86-87</td>
<td>86-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.438-454</td>
<td>Mantrapariśeṣa</td>
<td>88-89</td>
<td>88-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.454-625</td>
<td>Anvākhyāna</td>
<td>90-119</td>
<td>90-119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*p.454-467</td>
<td>I. Agnyādheya</td>
<td>90-93</td>
<td>90-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.467-482</td>
<td>II. Agnihotra</td>
<td>93-96</td>
<td>93-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.482-498</td>
<td>III. Paśubandha</td>
<td>96-99</td>
<td>96-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.599-625</td>
<td>V. Agnicayana</td>
<td>115-119</td>
<td>115-119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.625-655</td>
<td>Yajñaprayāścitta</td>
<td>119-122</td>
<td>119-122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>122-123</td>
<td>122-123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[End]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Extra folios**

For the folios Ex.11-13 & a floating one, see VGS above.

| Comm. to Śulba-sūtra (fr.) | Ex.1 | 124 |
| Prayoga on Soma (fr.) | | 126 |
| Prayoga on Śrauta rituals(fr.) | Ex.2-10 | 129-137 |
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The manuscripts of $K_1$ recension are characteristic of a composite text, that is, several kinds of texts are combined in a single manuscript.

The manuscripts belonging to $K_1$ recension are three: $K_1$, $K_4$ and $M$.\(^{10}\)

As all the manuscripts utilized for the previous studies are $M (=\text{Madras MS.})$ and its secondary copies, I put the page numbers of $M$ on the left-most column. As being referred to above, $K_1$ is the MS. written in the Malayālam script, being the original from which $M$ was directly copied in Madras during 1922–23. $K_4$ is another Malayālam MS. which was also directly copied from $K_1$ probably sometime in the last century.

Cursory investigation into these three MSS., namely $K_1$, $K_4$ and $M$, has revealed the following facts:

1. $K_1$, originally consisting of 123 leaves, lacks the folios Nos.1–3, 9–11, 27 and 46–47.\(^{11}\)

   In addition, $K_1$ has a floating folio which is placed after the folio No.20. As the left end of the folio has extensively been damaged, we are not able to identify the folio-number which is usually written on the left end of recto. This was not copied by $M$. The place of the corresponding folio of $K_4$ seems to indicate that the original number of the folio is No.11.

2. $K_4$ lacks the folios Nos.1–4, 9–10, 46–47.\(^{12}\)

3. $M$, which records each corresponding page number of its original($K_1$) on the left column, seems not to have copied the following folios: Nos.1–3, 9–11, 27, 46–47 and 90. In addition to that, MS. $M$ did not transcribe the extra folios at all which are attached to the end of $K_1$.

The discovery of the new Malayālam MSS., $K_1$ and $K_4$, has made it possible to recover the following missing folios with $M$: Nos. 4, 11, 27 and 90. Further, examination of the floating folios attached to the end of these

---

\(^{10}\) I do not go into details of the secondary copies made from $M$. As for the brief description of the MSS. $K_1$ and $M$, see ZINBUN: Annals of the Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University, Number 30 (1995), pp.4 f.

\(^{11}\) Total number of leaves of the present MS. is 128. We may distinguish from the first original 123 folios the last thirteen folios, which are the extra folios. The latter ones seem to have been differentiated from others at some point of textual transmission and have been attached to the end. As will be discussed below, some of these extra folios have turned out to be the folios which might have been regarded as 'missing' by the owner of the MS.

\(^{12}\) Total number of the original MS. is 137, among which the last fourteen leaves were regarded as the extra folios. Just as the case with $K_1$, some of these extra folios have been identified as the “missing” folios.
two Malayālam MSS. has led me to recover the folios Nos. 2, 10 and 11.13

The content of folio No. 90 includes the beginning of the Anvākhyāna (= Vādhūla Brāhmaṇa) which is missing in the excerpts published by W. Caland14. In the Appendix, I present to the reader the text of this quite interesting beginning portion of the Agnyādheya Anvākhyāna.

The text concerning the Grhya, that is, the household ritual, occupies the first part (corresponding to pages 1–28 of the Madras manuscript), while my reconstruction of the Grhya portion has revealed that several preceding pages are missing here, which correspond to the also missing two folios of $K_1$ and $K_4$.

I have reconstructed this part of the Grhya portion utilizing the extra folios of $K_1$ and $K_4$ attached to the end and a floating folio inserted at random place of $K_1$. In addition to this, the parallel portions of MSS. $K_2$ and $N_4$ have enabled me to reconstruct the text with reasonable ground.

This collection of Grhya material is further subdivided into several portions, that is, the text of the Grhya sutra and the Prayoga fragments, which are of much later composition.

A small subdivision here named as “Agnyādheya Preliminaries” consists of the bridge portion which just precedes the Śrautasūtra. It has a quite interesting feature, to which I shall refer later in the discussion of the Grhya section.

Some Notes on the Vādhūla Śrautasūtra

Contents of $K_1$ recension MSS.15

13 Contents of Nos. 2–4 belong to the portion of the Vādhula Grhyasūtra; that of No. 11 belongs to the preliminary ritual of the Agnyādheya, which, however, has been taken out of the present structure of the Agnyādheya ritual of the Vādhula Śrautasūtra. The fact suggests that the introductory portion of the Agnyādheya ritual was revised at an early period in the Vādhula school. This portion involves the description of the rite that is very close both in style and contents to the so-called Gopitrtyajña or Upavasathagavi of the Baudhāyana Śrautasūtra, which belongs to the oldest group of the Yajurvedasūtras together with the Vādhula Śrautasūtra. I shall discuss in a separate paper the text and the problems concerning this ritual component of the Vādhula school. Folio No. 27 is a part of the Cāturmāśyāni ritual.

14 In his “Eine dritte Mitteilung über das Vādhulāsūtra”, Acta Orientalia IV, 1926, pp. 1ff. (= Kleine Schriften, 1990, pp. 303ff.)

15 $K_1$: nos. 12–89; $K_4$: nos. 12–89; $M$: pp. 29–454. Partly with $H$: p. 281.6–p. 40; $C$: pp. 1–106
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A. 1. Agnyādheya, Punarādheya, Agnihotra, Agnyupasthāna, Pra-vasadupasthāna
   2. Purodāśī (= Darśapūrṇamāsa)
   3. Yājamāna, Āgrayaṇa, Brahmatva
   4. Cāturāsyaṃi
   5. Paśubandha
   6. Jyotiṣṭoma I
   7. Jyotiṣṭoma II

B. 8. Agnicayana
   9. Vājapeya
   10. Rājasūya (with Sautrāmaṇi)
   11. Āsvamedha

C. 12. Aptoryāma
   Dvādaśāha [only with the first line]
   Pavitreṣṭi
   13. Pravargya
   14. Yājamāna (Jyotiṣṭoma)
   (15. Mantraparīśeṣa [Grhya and Śrāuta])

The contents of the Śrautasūtra can be divided into three parts; A, B and C. While the contents of A and B have parallels in other Śrautasūtras, the contents of part C are quite different from those of other sūtras and these items of rituals look like a supplement or an addendum to the previous parts of the Śrautasūtra, to the Soma ritual in particular. It is interesting to note that Āryadāsa, a commentator to the Śrautasūtra, gives a quite different contents to the corresponding portion of C. And it seems probable that Āryadāsa here might comment on the previous text of the Śrautasūtra, as Prof. Witzel discussed in his article. But it is impossible to reconstruct the original text of the Śrautasūtra solely from the commentary of Āryadāsa.

I would like to add a comment on the place of Agnyādheya ritual in the whole Vādhūla Śrautasūtra. The manner of mantra quotation found in the part of A1 has led me to the conclusion that the original place of A1 is after A2. Therefore, the description of the Vādhūla Śrautasūtra starts from the

---

16 The text runs with abbreviation: “dvādaśāhāya dikṣīṣyamāṇāḥ samavasyanti=”.
17 Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik, 1 (1975), pp.78f.
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Darśapūrṇamāsa, īṣṭis of the the New Moon and the Full Moon, as is the case with the older strata of the Śrautasūtras of the Yajurveda.

Some Notes on the Vādhūla Anvākhyāna

As is shown by the Table of Contents of K recension MSS., Vādhūla Anvākhyāna covers only the following rituals:

- Agnyādheya 13 anuvākas (10 according to colophon), 22 paṭalas
- Agnihotra 11 anuvākas, 14 paṭalas
- Paśubandha 8 anuvākas, 13 paṭalas
- Agniṣṭoma 58 anuvākas, 94 paṭalas
- Agnicayana 28 anuvākas, 34 paṭalas

In his excerpt edition and study of the ‘Vādhūlasūtra’ published in Acta Orientalia, Prof. Caland extensively presented us the text of the Anvākhyāna. His excerpts, however, cover only half of the whole text material preserved in his copy of MS. which was available to him. Fairly large extent of the text has remained unknown to the Vedic students. In the Appendix, I have shown the provisional text of the first seven paṭalas of the very beginning portion of the Anvākhyāna of the Agnyādheya, which was not known to Dr. Caland, since this portion was missing in his MS. These paṭalas testify the existence of quite interesting Brāhmaṇa passages which have parallels in the younger Brāhmaṇas and the Brāhmaṇa-like section of the Baudhāyana Śrāutasūtra.

Immediately following these Anvākhyāna sections, K recension MSS., give, in the last place, a long section on the ritual redemption (prāyaścitta) which was totally neglected by Caland and was not published. It consists altogether of 22 anuvākas (24 paṭalas). This Yajñaprāyaścitta seems to be divided into two parts: one in the brāhmaṇa style and the other in the sūtra style.

Some Notes on the Vādhūla Gṛhyasūtra

The Gṛhyasūtra of this school has been considered to be lost for a long time, because Prof. Caland, who first introduced the texts of the Vādhūla

18 In collaboration with Prof. Witzel, I have been preparing the critical edition and annotated translation of the entire Vādhūla Anvākhyāna.
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school to the scholars of Indology, regarded the first part of the Madras manuscript to be that of the commentary to the Grîhyasūtra, as the colophon of the manuscript itself indicated that the title was "Grîhyakalpavākhyā".

It was Prof. Witzel who first pointed out that the Grîhya material given at the beginning of the Madras manuscript was nothing but that of the Grîhyasūtra. His assertion was based upon the comparison of the text fragments with the parallel passages of the Āgniveśya Grîhyasūtra, the Grîhya text of the sister school of the Vâdhûla. And he was definitely right.

The fragmental condition of the original manuscript of Madras manuscript, however, did not allow anyone to reconstruct the full text of the original. As I think I have succeeded in identifying the contents of several old manuscripts in Malayalam script as those of the Grîhyasūtra of the Vâdhûla school, I am very happy to announce that we are now able to edit the text of the Vâdhûla Grîhyasūtra for the first time in the history of Vedic study.

In the following, I give the provisional contents of the Grîhyasūtra that have been glimpsed from the various Malayalam MSS.

General Contents:

1. Samāvartana
   Vivāha
   Aṣṭakā
   Upanayana
   Aupāsanāgni

2. Pitrmedha Brāhmaṇa 1
   Pitrmedha Brāhmaṇa 2
   Śrāddha
   Antyeṣṭi [with a śaṃti mantra on top and end]
   Dahanavidhi
   Asthisāncayana
   Mṛtabali
   Ekoddīṣṭa
   Sapinḍīkaraṇa

After these two sections and just before treating the description of Śrauta ritual starting from the Agnyādheya, the MSS. give the following ritual components which belong to the Śrauta ritual.
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3. Ārtvijyam [reception of the ētvijas, the officiating priests]
   Upavāsa 1 [sacrificer’s rules of self-control on the day before the rite]
   Upavāsa 2 [ ]
   Srucor ādāna [manner of handling the ritual spoons and some preliminary rites]
   Upavasathagavi/Gopitryajña [ancestor ritual: offering of cow-meat on the Upavasath day of the Agnyādheya ritual]19

As there remain several points to be cleared up before presenting the stemma of the Grhya manuscripts, I just mention the fact that, as in the case of the Śrautasūtra, there is a division of two recensions among the manuscripts.

Comparing with other Grhyasūtras, the contents of the Grhya of this school look very simple. Graduation ritual (samāvartana), marriage (vivaha), Aṣṭakā ritual which is an old type of ancestor ritual performed towards the end of the year, especially before the winter solstice, initiation ritual or the start of Veda study (upanayana), and the household fire and various offerings to it (aupāsanāgni). If we compare this list of household rituals with that of the Baudhāyana school, we may see the similar composition: marriage (vivaha), rituals concerning the newborn baby (pumsavana, simantonnayana, jātakarma etc.), upanayana, samāvartana and aupāsanāgni (with various types of offerings). Then Baudhāyana starts the descriptions of annual function rituals, like śilagava, pratyavarohaṇa etc.

It is interesting to take note that Vādhuła omits other types of ritual than those of the rituals concerning the passage of life. The Grhya rituals can generally be classified into two types: life-stage rituals and the annual functions conforming to the cycle of the year. Vādhuła omits all the annual functions, like pratyavarohaṇa (ritual held at each beginning of a season) or āgrayaṇa (the harvest ritual). While such kind of abbreviation or simplification of the Grhya rituals is observed in the modernized society in various parts of India, it generally coincides with the general tendency of the Tai­ttiriya schools of the Yajurveda: concentration of the Grhya ritual to the life-stage rituals and excluding the annual functions from its list of rituals.

Another point is that Vādhuła has the complete set of rituals for the

---

19 The section Upavasathagavi/Gopitryajña was originally a part of the Agnyādheya ritual complex. It has its close parallel with the Agnyādheya of the BaudhŚŚ (II.8-11).
dead, and this set can be compared with the Pitṛmeḍḥasūtra which is independently composed in some of the Yajurveda sūtras, like the Baudhāyana, the Bhāradvāja, the Satyāṣādha. Or, the set of rituals for the dead is separately collected together as in the schools of the Āpastamba, the Vaikhānasā or the Āgnivesya.

It is also interesting to note that the Vādhula Grhyasūtra contains some esoteric doctrine of a Brāhmaṇa style in the beginning of the Pitṛmedha section. This style is rather rare with the ordinary Grhyasūtra. After describing the syndrome of a person who is approaching death, the doctrine starts on the relationship between the soul, which is called ‘puruṣa’, and the life-breaths called ‘prāṇas’; this could be compared with some famous Upaniṣad passages. In fact, some passages have parallels with those of the Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa 4.27. This fact, therefore, may suggest that these Vādhula passages may have been recited for a person being on his death bed.

What makes us feel strange with the Grhya material of the Vādhula school is the description of several rites which directly follow the final portion of the Grhya text.20

These rites are not Grhya ones and they could be regarded as the preliminary components of the Śrauta ritual. The first one, Ārtvijya is the sacrificer’s reception of ārtviṣṣa, who are the priests coming for the performance of the Śrauta ritual.

The last one in this series of rites is a peculiar rite. It is a kind of ancestor ritual with an offering to three generations of ancestors of the sacrificer. Its description shows a close parallel to the so-called Upavasathagavi or the Gopitrīyājñā which is elsewhere known only in the Baudhāyana Śrautasūtra (II.8-11). The latter is performed on the preceding day of the main ritual (upavasatha) of the Agnyādhīya ritual. Comparison between these two parallels found in the two old schools of the Yajurveda clearly shows that they are almost twin rituals with minor variations. The Baudhāyana school seems to prescribe the ritual of the Upavasathagavi as the component part of the preliminary rituals of the Agnyādhīya. On the other hand, the place of this ritual in the description of the Vādhulasūtra is not clear, at first sight, since the Agnyādhīya sūtra of this school simply refers to the offering for the ancestors on the Upavasatha day; it does not give full description of the

20 See number 3 of the Grhya contents.
Comparative investigation of these two ‘Gopitryajña’s in the sūtras of the Baudhāyana and the Vādhūla may suggest that the isolated Upavasathagavi of the Vādhūla school might have originally been a part of the Agnyādheya ritual of the Śrauta tradition as in the Baudhāyana school and then, at some later stage, was taken out of the original context. This state of things occurred probably because of the movement of revisioning and restructuring the basic text which took place within this school at a stage of its historical development.22

(Professor, Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University)

21 Cf. Vādhūla ŚS 1.1.3–7. 3. adyopavasatha ity annam eva kurvitāpi ha gām paced vaśaś căsa ya syād 4–5. (Source of the fire to be used.) 6. tam aparāhna uddhṛtyānvāhāryopacanasvyoddhate nidadhāti 7. tat pitṛbhya dadāti (See ZINBUN, No.31(1995), pp.21–22.)

22 Cf. note 12 above. I shall discuss this subject of the Upavasathagavi portion of the Vādhūlasūtra in another article to be published shortly.
Appendix: Excerpts from the Agnyādheya Anvākhyāna.

Vādhūla Anvākhyāna (=Vādhūla Brāhmaṇa)

The following is the beginning portion of the Vādhūla Anvākhyāna (=Vādhūla Brāhmaṇa). M failed to copy the folio no.90 of K₁. In the first part of his excerpts of the Anvākhyāna portion of the “Vādhūlasūtra” published in Acta Orientalia IV, 1926, (=Kleine Schriften, 1990, pp.307ff.), W. Caland, depending indirectly upon the MS. M, therefore, missed the starting six patañlas of the entire Brāhmaṇa contained in this folio. He noticed the fact that there was some missing portion in the beginning and deplored it in his introductory note to his excerpt edition. In the newly obtained MSS., K₁ (=K95, the original of M, found by me at the Kitaññāssēri Mana in 1994) and K₄ (=K92, found in 1997 also among the Kitaññāssēri Mana collection), a folio has respectively been found between folio nos.89 and 91. Although K₁’s left end of folio including margin space has been broken off and the folio number cannot be identified, this must be the folio 90 that was left uncopied by the scribe of M. This is confirmed by the existence of the corresponding and numbered folio in K₄.¹

Notes to the text and the apparatus:
- [ ]: filling up of lacuna by the editor.
- avagraha sign is added by the editor for the reader’s convenience, although it is never used in the Malayalam MSS.
- The underlined portion shows that the reading is not certain.
- Anunāsikā ‘ṅ’ occurring in K₁ and K₄ is transcribed with so-called “guṇ” nasal in M. In the apparatus, the latter is shown by ‘ṅ*’.
- ‘ḥ’ represents Upadhāmnīya.
- ‘*l’ is used to differentiate two different types of consonant letter ‘l’ used in Malayalam MSS.
- ‘t*’ is used to indicate the independent consonant letter ‘t’ without vowel; see note to my second part of VadhSS edition.

¹ Caland’s excerpts start with: 1... (prāṇam uvāvakatā这一切 pāpabhadravī titikṣate, tasya na hāsa āhya bhavati yad gārhapataḥ; ... This passage corresponds to the latter part of 1.7(=1.4.2) of my new edition to be prepared; that is, Caland could not see the first six sections (and a half) of the original Agnyādheya Anvākhyāna.
AGNYĀDHeya

The first seven paṭalas [1.1–1.7(=1.1.1–1.4.2)] of the Agnyādheya Anväkhyāna are introduced here for the first time to the reader. They are reconstructed from the folio 90a–b of K₁ and K₄, both of which were recently discovered by me in central Kerala.

In the following text, the number given in the bracket after “ . . . ” shows the approximate number of syllables in lacuna. Compared to the space of lacuna in K₁ which was estimated by me in the MS., that of K₄ is often random and is not exact. It seems that K₄’s copyist just tried to show the existence of lacuna in its original, K₁, and to give by blank space its rough amount. In the apparatus, I have just tried to give the extent of space as there is in this MS. K₁’s lacuna space sometimes consists of two numbers; the first number is that of lacuna syllables upto the end of a line, and the second is the one from the beginning of the next line.

In the presentation of the text, general style is the same with those of my critical editions of the Vādhūla ŚŚ (see, ZINBUN, No.31(1995), No.32(1996), Kyoto University) although some different sandhis are involved here. The quotation marks are supplied by the editor; he is, therefore, responsible for the sandhi resolution shown in the text with the insertion of hyphen.³

1.1 (=1.1.1)

4. . .(20)[ya]j[j[e]na devās suvargaṁ⁵ lokam āyan teśām manusyaṁānām aklptena yajñena yajamānānām kusindhāny eva právardhanta⁶ nānyānī kāni ⁷canāṅgāni no ha devān havyaṁ pṛāpa te devā abruvaṁ “manusya vā aklptena yajñena yajante tenainena ta rdv . . .(12)ti te vāca . . .(6)bruvan⁹

² Numbering of paṭalas is provisional, although the basic principle of numbering is the same as already given in my previous edition articles: see, for instance, ZINBUN, No.31 (1995), pp.15–16.

³ I would like to thank my esteemed friend, Prof. Toshifumi Goto, for his invaluable suggestions on the readings and interpretations of 1.1–2(=1.1.1–2).

⁴ K₁: . . .(25)varggaṁ
⁵ K₄: suvarggaṁ
⁶ K₁,K₄: právarddhanta
⁷ K₁,K₄: canāṅgāni
⁸ K₁: akl. . .(15+22)van vraja.m yuvam
⁹ Thus emended. K₄: sruvan
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vrajatam yuvam manusyebhayo yajnam kalpayatam¹⁰ iti tau hāgatyā manu-
ṣyān itacatur "āvaṃ¹¹ vai vo yajnam¹² kalpayisyāva¹³" iti teṣām ha manu-
ṣyānām priyaṃ babhūva tan mano vācāṃ prāviṣat tato manur ajāyata
¹⁴sā vān manuṃ prāviṣat tata iḍā māṇavy ajāyata sa manur idām prāviṣat¹⁵
tataḥ¹⁶ pururavāḥ priyo jāyata sedā pu[ruravasam]¹⁷ prāviṣat tata urvasya¹⁸
ajāyata manusyaḥ ha pururavasaṃ rājānām akurvata¹⁹ ²⁰ gandharvā horvaśin
duhitaraṃ akurvata²¹ tau tathā manusyebhayo yajnam icchantau²² ceratus
sa ha pururavā mrgayān²³ carann apsaraso²⁴ ²⁵ dhijagāma tāsāṃ²⁶ horvaśim
evābhidadhyaυ tān jāyāṃ cakre sa garbhan dadhe taṃ paraivāsā sa
dvitiyaṃ dadhe taṃ paraivāsā [sā tṛti]yan²⁸ dadhe taṃ paraivāsā sa
caturthan²⁹ dadhe sa hovāca-"ayam ubhayēśāṃ devamanusyāpām³⁰ annādo
bhaviṣyati pitṛṣv imaṃ³¹ janayāṇi"-iti sā³² horvaśi pitṛṇ vijanitum³³ iyāya

¹⁰ K₁, K₄: katpayatam
¹¹ K₁: āvaṃ
¹² After this, K₄ repeats the passage "katpayatam iti — vo yajnam" once again probably because of haplology.
¹³ K₁, K₄: katpayisyāva
¹⁴ K₁: sā v. . . (15+22) āviṣat tata urvvaś y ajāyata
¹⁵ Thus emended. K₄: pr. . .nt
¹⁶ Thus emended. K₄: pururavāṃ edo jāyata [owing to misreading of "-.ḥ priyo"].
¹⁷ Thus construed. K₄: pu . . -(4)
¹⁸ K₁, K₄: urvvaś y
¹⁹ K₁, K₄: akurvvaτa
²⁰ K₁, K₄: gandharvā horvvaśin
²¹ K₁, K₄: akurvvaτa
²² K₁, K₄: icsanțau
²³ K₁: carannahḥ phsaraso
²⁴ K₄: aphsaraso; K₁: phsaraso
²⁵ K₁: dhijaga . . . (15+22) dh(ā) taṃ paraivāsā sa caturthana dadhe
²⁶ K₄: horvvaśin evābhidadhyaυ
²⁷ Thus emended. K₄: parāsasa
²⁸ Thus construed. K₄: . . . tayan
²⁹ K₄: caturthana
³⁰ Thus emended. K₄: devamanusyām
³¹ K₄: imaṇi
³² K₁, K₄: horvvaśi
³³ K₄: vijanitum
tasmād 34 u taitat strī pitṛn 35 vijanitum 36 iyād etām evānu devavhihitim īśvaro hännādo 37 bhavitor yan tatra janayati sā 38 horvaśī pumāmsaṁ janayāṁ cakāra tasya häyur iti nāma dadhus tan nu haitad āyur “āyur” iti caranty “āyusmān aśītham asi”-iti sa ha purūravā āvavrāja “putram ānayiṣyāmi jáyām u ca”-iti tām hägatyovāca “vi vā 39 ajanisṭhā yāca pitṛṇ 40 kiṅ cit kam” iti sā 41 horvaśī pitṛn 42 yāyācaśām ha devānāṁ priyaṁ babhūva sādhu yan 43 manuṣyānāṁ evānu devavhihitin tasyai ha gandharvā 44 varan daduḥ 45

1.2 (=1.1.2) tasyai=dadu 46 sā hovāca “yajñāṁ vrṇa 47” iti te hāpratyucya devānāṁ ardhām 48 uddudruvvus tān 49 hocur “devā duhitre vai vijātāyai va . . . (15+18) 51 yajñō gamāṣyati netvā asmat tanād iva”-iti tān hocur “na 52

34 Thus K1, K4: utaita
35 K1: vijanī . . . (15+22) häyur iti nāma dadhus
36 K4: vijanitum
37 K4: bhavito yan
38 K4: horvvaśī
data=41 ajanisṭhāyā . . . (15+18)ām evānu devavhihitin
40 K4: kiṅ cit∗
41 K4: horvvaśī
data=42 Thus emended. K4: yāyācaśām
43 Here K4 seems to have carelessly skipped a line and have crept into the line “manuṣyān / yajñō gamāṣyati netvā — ” which is to be read next to the one intended! Therefore, the passage “-ām evānu — va . . . (15+18)” is found only in K1.
44 K1, K4: gandharvā
45 Thus construed. K1, K4: hoc.r ddevā
46 Abbreviation of the last phrase of the preceding paṭala. Such type of word-repetition is the style of the Vādhula text showing the division of padtala level. See my note to the edition of the VādhulaŚŚ (ZINBUN, No.30,1995, p.17 cum note 47).
47 K1 is ambiguous: it can be read either ‘vrṇa’ or ‘vrṇa’.
48 K1, K4: arddham
49 Thus construed. K1, K4: hoc.r ddevā
50 As the copyist of K4 carelessly skipped a line of its original, it misses passage corresponding to K1, 90a6. Therefore the lacunae of K1 could not be filled up with the help of K4.
51 Here onwards we find K4 again.
52 K1, K4: nna
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khalu 53 yuṣmabhyaṃ āśrāvayāṇ na vaṣaṭkaraṇān 54 darvihoma 55 eva yuṣmā- kam pra hi yuṣyaṃ yaṣñām 57adāt-iti tasmād 58 gandharvebhyaṃ 59 nā- śrāvayanti na vaṣaṭkurvanti darvihoma eva teṣām pra hi te yaṣñam ayacchān 51 sa ha purūravāḥ putram evetarasmin haste cakre yaṣñam itarasmīṃs tābhyaṃ tathāvārvāja tābhyaṃ ubhābhyaṃ saha grāman 62nābhyavaṃjigaṃ sat so 'ranye 63yaṣñān 64 nidhāya putreṇa saha grāman abhyaveyāya tam madhye 65 grāmasya nidhāya yajñasyārdham 66 āvavrāja tam anyathārūpam ivāntarhitam ājāgāma sa ha devānām 67uddudrāva tān hovāca "devāḥ putreṇa ca yajñena ca saha grāman 68 āvavrājīṣan 69 70 tābhyaṃ ubhābhyaṃ saha grāman nābhyavaṃjigaṃsīṣaṃ so 'ranye 71yaṣñān nidhāya putreṇa saha 72 grāmam abhyaveyāgān tam madhye 73 grāmasya nidhāya yajñasyārdham 74 āvavrājīṣan 75 tam anyathārūpam ivāntarhitam āgāmam" iti "kim u tatrāgamad" ity "etān yasṭau kapalāni"-iti hovāca "sa vāva 76yaṣñā" iti hocuḥ "kim uvevānyad" ity "etā oṣadhayo 'bhiṭa jātā" iti
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77 hocus “tad” barhis tāni pavitrāṇi sa vāva yajñāḥ kim uvevānyad ity “ete vanaspatayo ’bhito jātā” iti hovāca “sa vāva yajñā” iti hocus “sa idhmas” sa edhas sa vāva yajñāḥ kim uvevānyad ity “eso ’svatthaś śamyāṇ rūḍha” iti hovāca “sa vāva yajñā” iti hocus “tat satyam sā yajñiyā tanūs sa vāva yajñāḥ pratyakṣam” iti sa eṣa evam āhrto yajñāḥ purūra-vasā manusyebhīyas tato vai manusyaśāṃ klptena yajñena yajamānānām aṅgāparūṁśya aṅguliparūṁśi prāvardhanta 85 yathemāṇi pūṛuṣasyāṅgāparūṁśya 87 aṅguliparūṁśi prāvardhanta evan tasmān nu “urvasy asi” ity evāraṇīm ādadīta “purūrava” ity 90 u=yur asi”-iti jātama abhimantar-ayate sa vā eṣa 91 āyuḥ paurūravasā ubhayēṣam devamanuṣyaṇāṁ annādā gnidevabhagavān ubhayēṣam ha vai devamanuṣyaṇāṁ annādā bhavati ya evam vidvān agnī 92 ādhatte 93 yasya vaivam vidvān agnī ādadhāti tad āhur “yāṁ” tāṁs turiyapurvān garbhān adhatta katama etā” iti sūtakāgnīr

77 Or to be emended into “hovāca”, since we expect here the word of Pururavas, instead of the word of the gods.

78 K4: tat*

79 Or to be emended into “iti hocur”, since we expect here the word of the gods.

80 K4: iddhmas

81 K4: vāpa

82 K1: kim uvevā . . .(12) dha iti hovāca sa v. . .(45+18) mgāparūṁsy

83 K4: aṅgāparūṁsy

84 K4: aṅguliparūṁśi prāvarddhanta

85 K1: ya . . .āṇī pūrasyāṅgāparūṁśi . . .(51+18)v(e) devamanuṣyaṇāṁ annādo bhavati

86 Thus emended. K4: pūrasyāṅgāparūṁsy

87 K4: aṅguliparūṁśi prāvarddhanta

88 K4: horvvasy

89 Thus emended. K4: evāraṇīm

90 K4 has an abbreviation sign. The abbreviated passage could be reconstructed as: uttarāraṇīṁ “ghṛtendakte” ity anakti “vṛṣaṇām adadhāthāṁ” ity avadbhātī “gāyatrīni chando ’nu prajāyasva”-iti chandobhir atmānaṁ abhi nivartayaṭe “traiśṭubhaṁ chando ’nu prajāyasva jāgataṁ chando ’nu prajāyasva”-iti dasahotāram aranyor vyācāste manthantya agnim “ā(yur asi iti jātama abhimantarayate) [Cf. Vādhūla SS 1.1.3.10–14.]

91 Thus emended. K4: āyubhaurūrasa

92 K1: agnim[?]

93 K1: yasya vaivamvidv . . . (58+18) jānāyāṁ . . . [upto the end of K1, 90a]

94 K4: yāṁs

95 Thus emended. K4: tāṁs trīyapurvān Although there is some space at the right end of the line[K4,90a,12] after “tāṁstriya”, I have neglected it without taking this as lacuna.
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eva teṣāṁ\textsuperscript{96} prathamo yena mṛtana dahnāti sa dvitiyo \textsuperscript{97}yenaivaitat striya upastham kalpante\textsuperscript{98} sa tṛtiya \textsuperscript{99}etān ha vāvaitad brāhmaṇam adhivadaty \textsuperscript{100}agnes trayo jyāyāmso=prāmiyanta”-ity ete ha vāva te\textsuperscript{101}

1.3\textsuperscript{(=1.2.1)}

\textsuperscript{102}sa yad\textsuperscript{103} brahmaudanamān pacati tanveva haudanān ālabhate ye ke \textsuperscript{104}caudanā nāmocyan tān atha yad asminn āyam upasiktaṁ bhavati \textsuperscript{105}tad u haiyāyāny ālabhate yāṁ kāṁ cājyāṁī nāmocyan tāny \textsuperscript{106}atha \textsuperscript{107}yad brahmaudane prandnya gaiyātrhibhis samidho ‘bhyaḥadhāti tā u\textsuperscript{108} tāḥ pauṛṇamāsya\textsuperscript{109} aśṭakāmavāsyety atro haitās tisro rātrī ālabhate ’tro haiyāsya darśāpūrṇamāsāv\textsuperscript{111} ālabdhau bhavatas tasmān nāṇijāno darśāpūrṇamāsāv\textsuperscript{112} atinayed ya enāv atinayed ālabdahav enau santāv atinayeta tasmād u naivātinayed etā vā idāṁ rātrī\textsuperscript{113} anu\textsuperscript{114} sarvam\textsuperscript{115} bhavati

\textsuperscript{96} Thus emended. K\textsuperscript{4}: teṣāḥ
\textsuperscript{97} K\textsuperscript{4}: yenaivaitat*
\textsuperscript{98} K\textsuperscript{4}: katpante
\textsuperscript{99} Thus emended. K\textsuperscript{4}: etāhnavaitat*
\textsuperscript{100} Thus emended. K\textsuperscript{4}: agnesūyo The abbreviated passage would be reconstructed as: agnes trayo jyāyāṁso bhṛtara āsan te devebhyo havayām vahantaḥ prāmiyanta (TS 2.6.6.1)
\textsuperscript{101} After this, K\textsuperscript{4} gives [EM]. (End of K\textsuperscript{4}, 90a, 13)
\textsuperscript{102} The first line of K\textsubscript{1}, 90b is totally broken off.
\textsuperscript{103} K\textsuperscript{4}: yat*
\textsuperscript{104} Thus emended. K\textsuperscript{4}: caudanāmocyan
te
\textsuperscript{105} Thus emended. K\textsuperscript{4}: tāduhaiyāyāny
te
\textsuperscript{106} Thus emended. K\textsuperscript{4}: avayat*
\textsuperscript{107} Thus reconstructed. K\textsuperscript{4}: yad brahma[au] \ldots (3)[o]ndan For this passage, cf. Vādhula ŚS 1.1.2.11–13: “samidhāgin duvasya”-iti atriva brahmaudane prondan gaiyātrhibhis samidho ‘bhyaḥadhāti “ghṛtair bodhayatātithim āsmin havayā juhotana svāhā”-iti svāhākāras sarvās sarvaśu samītsu “upa tvāgne haviṣmatār ghṛtāci=samidho mama svāhā, tan tvā samidbhir aṅgiro=bṛhac chocā yaviṣṭhya svāhā”-iti
\textsuperscript{108} Do we see some extent of lacunaafter ‘u’, because of space at the line-end?
\textsuperscript{109} The second line of K\textsubscript{1}, 90b is also totally broken off.
\textsuperscript{110} K\textsuperscript{4}: pauṛṇamāsya
\textsuperscript{111} K\textsuperscript{4}: darśāpūrṇamāsāv
\textsuperscript{112} K\textsuperscript{4}: darśāpūrṇamāsāv
\textsuperscript{113} Do we see some extent of lacunaafter “rātrī a”, because of space at the line-end?
\textsuperscript{114} Do we see some extent of lacunaafter ‘nu’, because of space at the line-beginning?
\textsuperscript{115} K\textsuperscript{4}: sarvam
Y. IKARI

yad idam kiṃ ca sarvānī hāsyā bhūtanyā ālabdhānī bhavanti ya evaṃ veda varuṇo 'gnimādhatte sa svapann āgnyādheyāyopāvasat taṃ pāpāṃvavartataḥ [sa] sapāmā vyāvṛttapāpāṃ palyayata sa punar ādhatta sa jāgrat upāvasat tato vai sa pāpmanā vyāvartataḥ sa vyāvṛttapāpāṃpāpāṃ palyayata sa yat svapann āgnyādheyāyopāvasat pāpmo hainam anuvartate sa sapāmāvyāvṛttapāpāṃ palyayate tasman nu ha jāgrat evaṅgyādheyāyopāvasat vi ha pāpmanā vartate sa vyāvṛttapāpāṃpāpāṃ palyayate.

1.4 (=1.3.1)

idam vā i124 avahur aditiḥ putrakāmā= tasyai vyṛddham āṇḍam ajāyata tad āṇḍā jātām arejata tad rājanyo 'bhavad rejanyo ha vai nāma taṃ rājanyaya ity ācakṣate parokaṇsena parokaṇśapriyā īva hi devē śāḍīye bhaya eva trīyam apacadm etebhya eva putrebhya bhogāya "ma"127 128 i1daṃ śṛṇāntam astv" iti te129 bruvan "varam vṛṇāmahā athaitad vikariyāma 'smabhya eva brahmaudanan nirvapānī"-i1ti tasmād ādityebhya131 132 brahmaudanan

116 K4: sarvānī
117 K4: -ānavaṛtta
118 Thus added by the editor.
119 K4: vyāvarttata
120 K1,90b.3: vyāvṛtta . . . (15) dh(a)yāyopāvasat pāpmo . . . . [lacuna to the end of the line]
121 K4: anuvarttate
122 K4: varttate
123 After this, K4 gives [EM].
124 K1,90b.4: (anvā). . . . (15)d rājanyo bhavad rejanyo ha vai nāma taṃ rājanyaya ity ācakṣate prokṣe . . . . [lacuna to the end of the line]
125 For this abbreviated passage, cf. TS6.5.6.1: aditiḥ putrakāmā śādhyebhyo deverbhya brahmanyapacam apacat tasya učheṣṭanam adadus tat prāṃśat sa reto 'dhatte tasyai cauvara āditya ajāyanta sa duṭṭhyam apacat sāmanyata učheṣṭanān ma ime 'jñāta yad agre prā sisyāṃto me vasyāṃso janiṣṭyanta iti śagre prāṃśat sa reto 'dhatte tasyai vyṛddham āṇḍam ajāyata
126 K4: rājanyagātācakṣate
127 Do we see some extent of lacuna after 'ma', because of space at the line-end?
128 K1,90b.5: . . . (15)bhyo brahmaudanan nirvapanti tad iṭhāma vyakurvan ya . . . (8)yad atya.icyata tat sāṛddhaṃ samadī . . . . [lacuna upto the end of this line.]
129 K4: nte
130 Thus emended. K4: nirvapānī
t
131 Thus emended. K4: ādityebhya
132 Thus K1. K4: brahmaudananirvapati
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nirvapanti\(^{133}\) tad ittham vyakurvan\(^{134}\) yathaitarhi manuṣyās tato yad atyaricyata\(^{135}\) tasyārdham sam adihan sa hasty abhavat\(^{136}\) tasmādd\(^{137}\) hastinan na pratigrhṇīyād ati hi sa puruṣam aricyata tasmād yan manyeta-“ati vā idam puruṣam ricyata” iti tan na pratigrhṇīyāt\(^{138}\) kāmam anyat ta ādityāḥ\(^{139}\)

1.5 (=1.3.2)

kāma=dityā\(^{140}\) rājanyam evāsya lokasya goptāram adhivaptāram adhipatīm akurvaṁs\(^{141}\) te 'bruvan “katham enam anyair manuṣyair vyāvartayema” iti tasya\(^{143}\) dundubhim eva vācam akurvan\(^{144}\) dhanur vyāttaṁ\(^{145}\) iṣūn dantān khāḍgam\(^{146}\) evānyatvacam akurvan\(^{147}\) rathāṃ pādau sa\(^{148}\) yāvat kyac caitaīr anṅgai\(^{149}\) rājanyo nu samanvāgacchaty\(^{150}\) anāpto haiva tāvad rājanyo 'tha\(^{151}\) yāvat kyac caitaīr anṅgai rājanyo nu samanvāgacchaty\(^{153}\) 'tha haivāpto rājanyas tad āhur

\(^{133}\) K1: nirvapanti; K4: nirvapati

\(^{134}\) K1,K4: vyakurvan

\(^{135}\) K1,K4: tasyārdham

\(^{136}\) Do wee see some extent of lacuna after ‘ddha’, because of space at the line-end?

\(^{137}\) K1,90b,6: . . . (15) l(o)kasya goptāram adhivaptāram adhipatīm akurvaṁ . . . .

[ lacuna upto the end of this line.]

\(^{138}\) K4: pratigrhṇīyāt*

\(^{139}\) After this, K4 gives [EM].

\(^{140}\) The last phrase of the preceding paṭala is abbreviated here.

\(^{141}\) K4: akurvaṁs; K1: akurvaṁ.

\(^{142}\) K4: mmanuṣyair vyāvartayema iti

\(^{143}\) K1,90b,7: . . . (15)va tāvad rājanyo tha yāvac kyac caitaīr anṅgai rājanyo . . . .(49?)

[ lacuna upto the end of this line.]

\(^{144}\) K4: akurvan

\(^{145}\) K4: vvyāttaṁ

\(^{146}\) K4: kḥā*gam

\(^{147}\) K4: akurvan

\(^{148}\) K1: yāvac kyac

\(^{149}\) K1,K4: anṅgai

\(^{150}\) K4: samanvāgacṣaty

\(^{151}\) Thus emended K1: yāvac kyac caitaīr; K4: yāval kyac caitaīr

\(^{152}\) K1,K4: anṅgai

\(^{153}\) K4: samanvāgacṣaty
Y. IKARI

yat
devasya tvā=dityai juṣṭam ādityebhyo juṣṭam agnīsomābhyaṁ juṣṭam indrāṇiḥbhyaṁ juṣṭam prajāpataye juṣṭam brahmaṇe juṣṭan nirvāpāṁ"-iti nirvapaṁti tan nāḍṛtyam "adityai juṣṭam ādityebhyo juṣṭan nirvāpāṁ"-ity eva nirvaped evā hi tan devāta agre niravapaṁs tasmād ēva eva nirupyaḥ

1.6 (=1.4.1)

manasā saṃkalpayatā agnīṁ ādhaśya iti tan mano reto dhatte sa vācāpy āharaty ādhaśya iti tad u haiva mano vācaṁ kramate sā vāg garbhini palyayate yāvad agnīṁ ādhaṭte sa vā agnīṁ ādhaṭte tad u haiva vāg vijāyaṭe divyāṇi jyotimśi divyāṇi mukhāṇi divyāṇ putrān mukhatas sṛjate sa yasya ha vāṣā syād agnīṁ ādadhānasya vācaye vair evainam agnyādheya evam evaitāni svayam ātmano hi divyāṇi jyotimśi divyāṇi mukhāṇi divyāṇ putrān mukhatas sṛjate ta uha vā ete dvayā evetthāṃvida āhitāṅgeḥ putrāt agnaya u haivāṅgayo retassica u vaivetare mānuṣāḥ putrās ta enam ubhaye bhuṛijanti sa yat itthāṃvid asmāl

154 K4: yad
155 For the abbreviated mantra passage, see VādhaŚŚ1.1.2.1 [brahmaudana preparation]: "devasya tvā sauvatūḥ prasavate svūnaḥ bāhubhyām puṣno hastābhyaṁ adityai juṣṭam ādityebhyo juṣṭan nirvāpāṁ"-iti caturaś camasān vṛtiṁan
156 K4 1,90b: . . . (15)ty (ai) juṣṭam ādityebhyo juṣṭan nirvāpāṁty eva nirvaped evā hi tan devāta agre niravapaṁs tasmād e . . . vam eva nirupaḥ . . . (15) dhāṣya iti . . . (18) [lacuna upto the end of this line.]
157 Thus emended. K4: indrāṇiḥ juṣṭaṁ indrāṇiḥbhyaṁ juṣṭaṁ
158 Thus emended. K4: brahmaṇa rājanyo nu samanvāgaśaṭy anāpto haiva ta)ṇa juṣṭaṁ
159 K4: nirvāpāṁty nirvāpānti
160 K4, K4: nirvāpāṁty eva nirvaped
161 K4,90b: . . . (15)t(a) yāvad agnīṁ ādhaṭte sa vā agnīṁ ādhaṭte tad u haiva vāg vijāyaṭe divyāṇi jyotimśi divyāṇi mukhāṇi divyāṇ putrān muj. ta. sr . . . (10)yād agnīṁ ādadhānasya vāca . . . (12) [lacuna upto the end of this line.]
162 After this, K4 gives [EM].
163 K4: saṃkalpayaty
164 K4: jyotim
165 K4,90b,10: sr(jate). . . (15)vyāni mukhāṇi divyāṇ putrān mukhatas sṛjate ta u ha vā ete dvayā evetthāṃvida āhitāṅgeḥ putrāt agnaya u haivāṅgayor eva vaivetare mānuṣāḥ putrās ta enam ubhaye bhu . . . (12)
166 Drop of final sibilant.
167 K4: iha
168 Thus K1, K4: uvaṅtare
169 K4,90b,11: itthāṃ. . . (16)r eva divyai jyotibhir ddivyair mukhaṁ ddivyaiḥ putraṁ
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lokād āhitāgniḥ praiti yad enan diṣṭam itam agnāv abhyādadhati sa etair eva\(^{170}\) divyāir āyatibhir\(^{171}\) divyāir mukhair\(^{172}\) divyaiḥ putrais sahāmuṁ lokam eti tair amuśmīṁ loke bhāty atha haitān retassico mānuśān putrān asmin loke\(^{173}\) jahāti tair uvevāsmin loke bhāti sa vā eṣa ubhayor eva lokayor\(^{174}\) bhāty. \(^{175}\) amuśmīṁ ca lojke 'muśmīṁś ca tasmān nu hainān ubhayān\(^{177}\) evopapīdaiśed vaṇaṁ cāṣya svaṁ evamvidam u ha vai śrotiyāṁ śrotiyāḥ pita daṇḍena pravicchayāँ\(^{178}\) cakāra\(^{179}\)  

1.7\((=1.4.2)\)\(^{180}\)

\(^{181}\) pita daṇḍena pravicchayāँ\(^{182}\) cakāra taṁ ha praty uparamyovāca kataran nāṁsomo 'vatādyata na. nāv\(^{183}\) amuśmīṁś ca bhūyaś cakāra"-ity \(^{184}\) aṅg(a) . . . (3) ti kim abhaviśya" iti \(^{185}\) hovāca "yad ahann ājanisye yarhi nvā ahann ājanisye tarhīn nvā ahaṁ śreyāṁ abhaviśyam ajātam u vai

sahāmuṁ lokam eti tair amuśmīṁ loke bhāty atha haitān retassico mānuśān putrān asmin *loke jahāti tai . . . (12)]
\(^{170}\) K\(_1\), K\(_4\): divyaijjḥyotibhir
\(^{171}\) K\(_1\), K\(_4\): ddīyaiḥ mmukhāir ddīyaiḥ
\(^{172}\) K\(_4\): mμuyair
\(^{173}\) K\(_1\), K\(_4\): *loke
\(^{174}\) K\(_4\): *lokayor
\(^{175}\) Thus construed. K\(_4\): asmiṁ . . ke
\(^{176}\) K\(_1\), 90b, 12: asmiṁ . . . (20) hainān ubhayān evopapīdaiśed vaṇaṁ cāṣya svaṁ evamvidam u ha vai śrotiyāṁ śrotiyāḥ pita daṇḍena pravicchayāँ cakāra [EM] pita daṇḍena pravicchayāँ cakāra taṁ ha . . . (12)
\(^{177}\) K\(_4\): evopapīdaiśed
\(^{178}\) K\(_1\), K\(_4\): pravicchayāँ
\(^{179}\) After this, K\(_1\), K\(_4\) give [EM].
\(^{180}\) Corresponding lines of MSS.: K\(_1\), 90b, 12–91a, 7; K\(_4\), 90b, 12–91a, 8; M454–5.Cf. Caland's Excerpts. nos.1–2 \((AO IV, p.6–7=Kleine Schriften, pp.308–9.)\) As noticed above, M and C start only from the passages corresponding to folio no. 91 of K\(_1\) (and K\(_4\)). They miss the beginning portion of this paṭala\((=K_1, 90b, 12–14 and K_4, 90b, 12–15).\)
\(^{181}\) The first sentence is the repetition of the last one of the preceding paṭala.
\(^{182}\) K\(_4\): pravicchayāँ
\(^{183}\) ? K\(_4\): katarannāṁsomovādayata
\(^{184}\) K\(_1\), 90b, 13: . . . (15)ṁ abhaviśya iti hovāca yad ahann ājanisye yarhi nvā ahann ājanisye tarhīn nvā ahaṁ śreyāṁ abhaviśyam ajātam u vai mama śreyo jāyamāṇeno vai tvam mayā sarvvaṁ *lokān ajayo ye . . . (12)
\(^{185}\) K\(_4\): aṅg(a) . . . (3) ti
\(^{186}\) Thus K\(_1\), K\(_4\): hovā . . . (6) sye yarhi nvā ahan

28
mama śreyo jāyamāneno vai tvam mayā sarvān
lokānām ocyante tān" iti tad u ha .
manuṣyā va (ā)
lokānām ocyante tasmād evaṁviduṣaṁ putra ṣāyaṁ
tad āhuḥ prāṇā vā agnayas ta iha vā etā evaṁhīpu
rūṣam prāṇā bhavantī yad agnayaḥ prāṇ(e/o)
vā vā prajitānāṁ pāpabhadraṁ
titikṣate
tasya nu haiṣa āhito bhavati yad
garhapatyaḥ so ’muṣmin loke
prāṇena prāṇiti caksur āhavanīyas tat satyaṁ sa yo ha vā asmin
satyaṁ vadati
tasya nu haiṣa āhito [bhavati] yad āhavanīyaḥ so ’muṣmin
loke caksuṣā paśyāti śrotam ānugāryapacanah
śraddhaḥ sa yo ha vā asmin loke śraddhatte
tasya nu haiṣa āhito bhavati yad ānugārya-

\[187 K_1,K_4: sarvān\]
\[188 K_1:*lokanām\]
\[189 K_4:*lokanām\]
\[190 K_1,90b,14: (lo) . . .(15)jāyamāneno vai pitā putreṇa sarvvāṁ *lokaṁ jayati ye ke ca
*lokanām ocyante tasmi evaṁ viduṣaṁ putra iṣyam tad āhuḥ kim
agnaya iti prāṇā vā agnayas ta iha vā etā ima e . . .(12)\]
\[191 K_4: sarvām\]
\[192 Thus K1. K4: . . .(8) ca *lokanām ocyante\]
\[193 K_1,K_4:*lokaṁ\]
\[194 K_1,K_4:*lokanām\]
\[195 K_4: āhum\]
\[196 End of K4,90b\]
bhūtānāṁ; K1: . . . m [lacuna from the left end of folio is of about 20 syllables.]; M:
. . .(22)ṇam; Caland: . . . (prā)ṇam\]
\[198 M: upā\]
\[199 K_1: pāpabhadraṁ; M: pāpabhandran\]
\[200 M,C: titikṣate\]
\[201 K_1: yat*\]
\[202 M: praṇiti\]
\[203 K_1: a . . n\]
\[204 K_1: *loke\]
\[205 M: vavati [originally written ‘bhavati’. This is corrected by an another hand into
‘vavati’, while the character da inserted between vav and ti is deleted.]\]
\[206 Thus supplied by C. K1: āhit(o) . . .(15) ti; K4: āhit. . .(7)yaso . . .(3)loke ca . . .
(3)ti; M: āhite . . .(17)ti\]
\[207 K_1: anvāhāryapacanah; M: anvāhāryapacanah\]
\[208 M: sa śraddhā\]
\[209 K_1: asmiṁ *loke; M: asmī*lo ke\]
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pācanaḥ so 'muṣmin loke śrotreṇa śṛṇoti sa yasmin ha vā etāni trīṇi sampadyante titikṣā satyaṁ śraddheti devānāṁ eva sa eko bhavati . .(5)śa saṁka . .(5)āgnyādheyam etadd ha vai saubabhravo vādhūlāya procyovāca "pra nva vayaṁ yākāyāgnyādheyam avocāma"-iti kämaṁ haivaitat procyā bruyāt "pra te gnyādheyam avocāma"-ity, etadd hy evāgnyādheyaṁ

---

210 K1: anvāhāryapacanaḥ; M: anvāhāryapacanaḥ
211 K1: muṣmin
212 Thus K4. C: (traya)ṇi; K1: . . ni; M: . .(5)ṇi
213 C: titikṣā.
214 M: satyaṁ
215 Thus K4. K1: deva . .(15)āgnyādheyam ; M: deva . .(18) a gnyādheyam
216 K1,K4: saubabhravo
217 M: avocameti
218 End of Caland’s Excerpts no.1.
219 K1: haivaitat*
220 K1: . dheyam
221 M: etardhy
222 K4: evāgnyādheyaṁ [EM] idaṁ vānvāhul prajāpatir vvacas satyam apasyat tenāgni= ity āhāsmin eva tena *loke pratiṭiṣṭhati; K1: evāgnyādheyaḥ . .(15); M: evāgnyādheyaḥ . .(20) asmin eva tena loke pratiṭiṣṭhati
223 After this, K1,K4 have the mark [EM]