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The New Manuscripts of the Vādhuła School

The set of manuscripts in Malayalam 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 Vādhuła manuscripts were found among the private collections of the Nambudiri brahmin families who belong to the gotra of Vādhuła. As I see it, all of the important Vādhuła 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 Neḻumpilli Mana(House) and the Kitaṁnaśšeri Mana. Both of them are located at the outskirt area of Iriṁjālakkuṭa, 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 Vādhuła 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 Rgveda, Jaiminiya 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-Caṭaṇṇu, which is a practical manual of the Grhya 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 Grhya 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 Caranāvyaḥas, 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 Anvākhyāna. 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 Jaiminiya and Vādhūla Traditions of South India and the Pāṇḍu/Pāṇḍava Problem, Studia Orientalia 55 (1984), p.10. I was informed during my stay in Iriñjālakkuṭa 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 1975³, two editions of the Vādhula Śrutasūtra finally came out within these ten years. One is the edition of the first prapāṭhaka by Dr. M. Sparreboom and Prof. J.C. Heesterman⁴, and the other is that of Prof. B.B. Chaubey of Hoshiarpur⁵.

In spite of the recent studies and editions of the Vādhula 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 Vādhula 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 Vādhula 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 Vādhula school (Vādhula śrutasūtra 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, Vādhula Śrutasūtram, Hoshiarpur 1993.
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Vādhūla school, that is, the Brāhmaṇa, or Anvākhyāṇa, 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 Grhyasūtra (=GS) fragments, Śrautasūtra (=ŚS) and Brāhmaṇa (=Anvākhyāṇa) (=Br.) (from leaf nos. 4–123 of the original $K = K_1$).
Title on MS.: Vādhūlaśrautakalpavyakhya (revised from “Vādhūlagrhyakalpavyakhya”); Title by catalogue (Triennial Catalogue, p.6425): Vādhūlaśparakalpavyakhya.

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

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, Kitainnasseri Mana, Iriijnjalakkuṭa. [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, Kitainnasseri Mana, Iriijnjalakkuṭa. [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: Vādhūlakagṛhyasūtram.

\( K_3 \): No.51, Kitainnasseri Mana, Iriijnjalakkuṭa. [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, Kitainnasseri Mana, Iriijnjalakkuṭa. [Mod] No date. No title. 129 leaves. \( K_1 \)'s copy made several decades (at least) before \( M \).

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

\( N_2 \): No.121b, Neḍumpilli Mana, Iriijnjalakkuṭa. [Mod] No date. 113 leaves.
MS. of ŠS(Chapters 1–7 with Pravargya) plus 11 leaves of Soma-prayoga fragments. Title: Vādhūlapraisārttham.

\( N_3 \): No.145, Neḍumpilli Mana, Iriijnjalakkuṭa. [Old] No date. 52 leaves.
Composite MS. of Gṛhyasūtra (incomplete) and Gṛhyaprayoga. Title: Gṛhyasūtram ḍārikāyūṃ.

\( N_4 \): No.115, Neḍumpilli Mana, Iriijnjalakkuṭa. [Mod] No date. 98 leaves.
Composite MS. of Gṛhyasūtra and Gṛhyaprayoga (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 Kitaňnaśeri 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 Kitaňnaśeri, and not of Kerala.
the Madras manuscript (M) and H, the present state of K₁ 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 K₁ in 1997 again among the Kitaṅgasēri 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 K₁ and M. Further advantage of this manuscript lies in the fact that it has less lacunae than both K₁ 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 K₄ 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 K₁ recension. And the newly found manuscripts generally show less damage of the leaves than that of K₁ 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 N₁, K₂, K₃ and their secondary copies, shares a common distinctive feature. The Śrautasūtra description of this group comes to end with the description of the Agniṣṭoma, which is regarded as a model type of the Soma rituals.⁸ It accompanies the description of the Pravargya, which is assigned the place last but one in the whole Śrautasūtra in the K₁ recension MSS. group.⁹

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 K₁ recension, I give the Table of Correspondence of K₁ 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 (yajamāna) of the Agniṣṭoma. 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></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(K fols. uncopied: 1-3, 9-11, 27, 46-47)</td>
<td><strong>VGṛḥavyākhyāpraprayogakṣṭi (fr.)</strong> [Reconstructed from K2 &amp; N4]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>p.1-28</strong></td>
<td><strong>VGṛḥyasūtra 1 (Gṛhya)</strong></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><strong>VGṛḥyasūtra 2(Piṭṛmedha)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>VGṛḥaprayoga[?] (fr.)</strong></td>
<td>Ex.13a12-14; Ex.13a14-b5</td>
<td>127a12-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Agnṛyādheya Preliminaries</strong> (cf.BSS 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><strong>p.28-438</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vādh.Śrautasūtra</strong></td>
<td>12-87</td>
<td>12-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. Agnyādheya</td>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>12-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Punarādheya</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agnihotta</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agnipasthāna</td>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II. Purodaśi</td>
<td>16-21</td>
<td>16-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III. Yājamaṇa to Iṣṭi</td>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>21-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Āgrayaṇa</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brahmāta</td>
<td>24-26</td>
<td>24-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV. Cāturmāsya</td>
<td>26-31</td>
<td>26-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V. Paśuṁbāda</td>
<td>31-34</td>
<td>31-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VI. Agniṣṭoma 1</td>
<td>35-43</td>
<td>35-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VII.  2</td>
<td>43-51</td>
<td>43-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII. Agnicayana</td>
<td>52-66</td>
<td>52-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IX. Vājapeya</td>
<td>66-68</td>
<td>66-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X. Rājasūya (with Sautrāmaṇi)</td>
<td>68-73</td>
<td>68-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XI. Aśvamedha</td>
<td>73-81</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. Aptoryāna (with a reference to Dvādaśāha)]</td>
<td>81-82</td>
<td>81-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.407-409</td>
<td>Pavitresṭi</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>Mantraparipāśena</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. Agniḥotra</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>Yajñaprāyaścitta 1 &quot;</td>
<td>119-122</td>
<td>119-122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>[For the folios Ex.1-13 &amp; a floating one, see VGS above.]</th>
<th>[For the folios 125, 127, 128, see VGS above.]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comm. to Śulba-sūtra (fr.)</td>
<td>Ex.1</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayoga on Soma (fr.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayoga on Śrauta rituals (fr.)</td>
<td>Ex.2-10</td>
<td>129-137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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 $M$. As all the manuscripts utilized for the previous studies are $M$ (=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.\footnote{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.}

   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.\footnote{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.}

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 extra folios at all which are attached to the end of $K_1$.\footnote{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.\textsuperscript{13} The content of folio No. 90 includes the beginning of the Anvākhyāna (= Vādhūla Brāhmaṇa) which is missing in the excerpts published by W. Caland\textsuperscript{14}. 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\textsubscript{1} and K\textsubscript{4}.

I have reconstructed this part of the Grhya portion utilizing the extra folios of K\textsubscript{1} and K\textsubscript{4} attached to the end and a floating folio inserted at random place of K\textsubscript{1}. In addition to this, the parallel portions of MSS. K\textsubscript{2} and N\textsubscript{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 Grhyasūtra and the Prayoga fragments, which are of much later composition.

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

Some Notes on the Vādhūla Śrutasūtra

\textbf{Contents of K\textsubscript{1} recension MSS.}\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{13} Contents of Nos. 2–4 belong to the portion of the Vādhūla 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 Vādhūla Śrutasūtra. The fact suggests that the introductory portion of the Agnyādheya ritual was revised at an early period in the Vādhūla school. This portion involves the description of the rite that is very close both in style and contents to the so-called Gopitryajña or Upavasathagavi of the Baudhāyana Śrutasūtra, which belongs to the oldest group of the Yajurvedasūtras together with the Vādhūla Śrutasūtra. I shall discuss in a separate paper the text and the problems concerning this ritual component of the Vādhūla school. Folio No. 27 is a part of the Cāturmāsyaṇi ritual.

\textsuperscript{14} In his “Eine dritte Mitteilung über das Vādhūlasūtra”, \textit{Acta Orientalia} IV, 1926, pp.1f. (= \textit{Kleine Schriften}, 1990, pp.303f.)

\textsuperscript{15} K\textsubscript{1}: nos. 12–89; K\textsubscript{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, Agrihotra, Agnyupasthāna, Pravasadupasthāna
   2. Purodāsī (=Darsāpurṇamāsa)
   3. Yaḍamāna, Āgrayaṇa, Brahmavatva
   4. Cāturmāsvānī
   5. Paśubandha
   6. Jyotiṣṭoma I
   7. Jyotiṣṭoma II

B. 8. Agnicayana
   9. Vājapeya
   10. Rājasūya (with Sautrāmaṇī)
   11. Aśvamedha

C. 12. Aptoryāma
       Dvādaśāha [only with the first line]
       Pavitreṣṭi
   13. Pravargya
   14. Yaḍamāna (Jyotiṣṭoma)
   (15. Mantraparīṣeṣa [Grhya and Śrauta])

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 dikṣiṣṭyamāṇāh samavasyanti=”.
17 Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik, 1 (1975), pp.78f.
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Darśapūrṇamāsa, ists 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 Śrautasūtra.

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

Some Notes on the Vādhūla Grhyasūtra

The Grhyasūtra 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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to the scholars of Indology, regarded the first part of the Madras manuscript to be that of the commentary to the Grhyastra, as the colophon of the manuscript itself indicated that the title was “Grhyakalpavyākhyā”.

It was Prof. Witzel who first pointed out that the Grhya material given at the beginning of the Madras manuscript was nothing but that of the Grhyastra. His assertion was based upon the comparison of the text fragments with the parallel passages of the Āgnivesya Grhyastra, the Grhya text of the sister school of the Vādhūla. 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 Grhyastra of the Vādhūla school, I am very happy to announce that we are now able to edit the text of the Vādhūla Grhyastra for the first time in the history of Vedic study.

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

General Contents:

1. Samāvartana
   Vivāha
   Aṣṭakā
   Upanayana
   Aūpāsanāgni

2. Pitrmedha Brāhmaṇa 1
   Pitrmedha Brāhmaṇa 2
   Śrāddha
   Antyeṣṭi [with a śānti mantra on top and end]
   Dahanavidhi
   Asthisāncayana
   Mrtabali
   Ekoddīṣṭa
   Sapinḍikaraṇa

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 rtiyas, 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 Upavasatha day of the Agnyādheya ritual]19

As there remain several points to be cleared up before presenting the stemma of the Gṛhya 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 Gṛhyasūtras, the contents of the Gṛhya of this school look very simple. Graduation ritual (samāvartana), marriage (vivāha), Aśṭakā 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 (upalayana), 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 (vivāha), rituals concerning the newborn baby (pumsavāna, sīmantonnayana, jātakarma etc.), upanayana, samāvartana and aupāsanāgni (with various types of offerings). Then Baudhāyana starts the descriptions of annual function rituals, like śilagava, pratyavavarohaṇa etc.

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

Another point is that Vādhūla 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 Pitṛmedhasūtra which is independently composed in some of the Yajurveda sūtras, like the Baudhāyana, the Bhāradvāja, the Satyāśādha. Or, the set of rituals for the dead is separately collected together as in the schools of the Āpastamba, the Vaikhānasa or the Āgniveśya.

It is also interesting to note that the Vādhūla 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 ‘prānas’; this could be compared with some famous Upaniṣad passages. In fact, some passages have parallels with those of the Jāminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa 4.27. This fact, therefore, may suggest that these Vādhūla passages may have been recited for a person being on his death bed.

What makes us feel strange with the Grhya material of the Vādhūla school is the description of several rites which directly follow the final portion of the Grhya text. These rites are not Grhya ones and they could be regarded as the preliminary components of the Śrauta ritual. The first one, Ārvijya is the sacrificer’s reception of ṛtviṣas, 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 Gopitṛyajña which is elsewhere known only in the Baudhāyana Śrutasūtra (II.8–11). The latter is performed on the preceding day of the main ritual (upavasatha) of the Agnyādheya 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 Agnyādheya. On the other hand, the place of this ritual in the description of the Vādhūlasūtra is not clear, at first sight, since the Agnyādheya 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.
Y. IKARI

rite.\textsuperscript{21}

Comparative investigation of these two ‘Gopitṛyajña’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.\textsuperscript{22}

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

\textsuperscript{21} Cf. VādhūlaŚS 1.1.3–7. 3. adyopavasatha ity annam eva kuruviṭāpi ha gām paced vaśā ś cāsyā syād 4–5. (Source of the fire to be used.) 6. tam aparāḥna uddhṛtyānvāhāryopacanasayoddhate nidadhāti 7. tat pitṛbhoyo dādāti (See ZINBUN, No.31(1995), pp.21–22.)

\textsuperscript{22} Cf. note 12 above. I shall discuss this subject of the Upavasathagavi portion of the Vādhūlasūtra in an another article to be published shortly.
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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 pātalas 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 Kitaññaśeri Mana in 1994) and K4 (= K92, found in 1997 also among the Kitaññaśeri 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 Malayālam MSS.
• The underlined portion shows that the reading is not certain.
• Anunāsikā ‘ṁ’ occurring in K1 and K4 is transcribed with so-called “guṇ” nasal in M. In the apparatus, the latter is shown by ‘ṁ*’.
• ‘ḥ’ represents Upadhīmāniya.
• ‘*l’ is used to differentiate two different types of consonant letter ‘l’ used in Malayālam MSS.
• ‘t*’ is used to indicate the independent consonant letter ‘t’ without vowel; see note to my second part of Vadhūś edition.

1 Caland’s excerpts start with: 1. . . . (prā)ṇam uvāravajitānāṁ pāpakhdaraṁ titkṣate, tasya nu haśa āhito bhavatī yad gārhapatyah; . . . 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 \[1.1-1.7(=1.1.1-1.4.2)\]2 of the Agnyādheya Anvākhyāna are introduced here for the first time to the reader. They are reconstitected from the folio 90a-b of \(K_1\) and \(K_4\), 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 \(K_1\) which was estimated by me in the MS., that of \(K_4\) is often random and is not exact. It seems that \(K_4\)’s copyist just tried to show the existence of lacuna in its original, \(K_1\), 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. \(K_1\)’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 SS (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][e]n devās suvargam\(^5\) lokam āyan teśām manusyānām aklptena yajñena yajamānānām kusindhāny eva prāvardhanta\(^6\) nānyāni kāni \(\text{canāṅgāni no ha devān havyām prāpa te devā abruvan “manusyā vā aklptena yajñena yajante tenainena tā ḍhv . . .(12)ti te vāca . . .(6)bruvan}\(^9\)

---

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 \(K_1\): . . .(25)varggaṁ
5 \(K_4\): suvarggaṁ
6 \(K_1, K_4\): prāvarddhanta
7 \(K_1, K_4\): canāṅgāni
8 \(K_1\): akl. . .(15+22)van vraja.m yuvam
9 Thus emended. \(K_4\): sruvan
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vrajataṁ yuvam manuṣyebhīyo yajñam kalpayataṁ\(^{10}\) iti tau hāgatyā manuṣyān icatur “āvaṁ\(^{11}\) vai vo yajñam\(^{12}\) kalpayiṣyāva\(^{13}\)” iti teṣāṁ ha manuṣyānāṁ priyaṁ babhūva tān mano vācaṁ prāviśat tato manur ajāyata \(^{14}\) sā vāṁ manuṁ prāviśat tata iḍā mānavy ajāyata sa manur iḍāṁ prāviśat\(^{15}\) tataḥ\(^{16}\) purūravahḥ priyo ‘jāyata seḍa pu[rūravasaṁ]\(^{17}\) prāviśat tata urvasyā\(^{18}\) ajāyata manuṣyā ha purūravasaṁ rājānam akurvata\(^{19}\) \(^{20}\) gandharvā horvaśin duhitaraṁ akurvata\(^{21}\) tau tathā manuṣyebhīyo yajñam icchantau\(^{22}\) ceratus sa ha purūravā mrgayān\(^{23}\) carann apsaraso\(^{24}\) \(^{25}\) dhijagāma tāsāṁ\(^{26}\) horvaśīm evābhidadhyau tān jāyān cakre sā garbhan dadhe tāṁ paraivāsa sā dvitiyai dadhe tāṁ paraivāsa [sā tṛṭi]yān\(^{28}\) dadhe tāṁ paraivāsa sā cacurthan\(^{29}\) dadhe sā hovāca “ayam ubhayeṣān devamanuṣyāṇāṁ\(^{30}\) annādo bhaviṣyāti pitṛṣv imaṅ\(^{31}\) janayāṇī”-iti sā\(^{32}\) horvaśī pitṛṇ vijanitum\(^{33}\) iyāya

---

\(^{10}\) K₁, K₄: katpayatam
\(^{11}\) K₁: āvaṁ
\(^{12}\) After this, K₄ repeats the passage “katpayatam iti — vo yajñam” once again probably because of haplogy.
\(^{13}\) K₁, K₄: katpayiṣyāva
\(^{14}\) K₁: sā v. . .(15+22) āviśat tata urvāṣy ājāyata
\(^{15}\) Thus emended. K₄: pr. . .nt
\(^{16}\) Thus emended. K₄: purūravāṁ edo jāyata [owing to misreading of “-ḥ priyo” .]
\(^{17}\) Thus construed. K₄: pu . . .(4)
\(^{18}\) K₁, K₄: urvāṣy
\(^{19}\) K₁, K₄: akurvata
\(^{20}\) K₁, K₄: gandharvā horvāṣīn
\(^{21}\) K₁, K₄: akurvata
\(^{22}\) K₁, K₄: icśantau
\(^{23}\) K₁: carannāḥ phsaraso
\(^{24}\) K₄: apsrasaro; K₁: phsaraso
\(^{25}\) K₁: dhijaga . . .(15+22)dh(a) tāṁ paraivāsa sā cacurththān dadhe
\(^{26}\) K₄: horvāṣīṃ evābhidadhyau
\(^{27}\) Thus emended. K₄: paraśasa
\(^{28}\) Thus construed. K₄: . . .tayan
\(^{29}\) K₄: cacurththān
\(^{30}\) Thus emended. K₄: devamanuṣyāṁ
\(^{31}\) K₄: imaṅ
\(^{32}\) K₁, K₄: horvāṣī
\(^{33}\) K₄: vijanitum
tasmād 34 u taitat strī pitṛn 35 vijanitūn 36 iyād etām evānu devavihitim īśvaro hānādō 37 bhavītor yan tatra janayati sā 38 horvaśī pumāmsaṁ janayāṁ cakāra tasya hāyur iti nāma dadhus tan nu haitad āyur “āyur” iti caranty “āyusmān asītham asi”-iti sa ha purūravā āavavrāja “putram ānayiṣyāmi jāyāṁ u ca”-iti tāṁ hāgatyovāca “vi vā 39 ajaniṣṭhā yāca pitṛn 40 kiṁ cit kam” iti sā 41 horvaśī pitṛn 42 yāyācaśāṁ ha devānāṁ priyāṁ babhūva sādhū yaṁ 43 manuṣyaṁānām evānu devavihitin tasyai ha gandharvā 44 varan daduḥ 45

1.2 (=1.1.2)

   tasyai=daduś 46 sā hovāca “yajñāṁ vṛṇa 47” iti te hāpratyucya devānāṁ ardhaṁ 48 uddudrūvus tān 49 hocur “devā duhitre vai vijātāyai 50 va...

51 yajñō gamiṣyati netvā asmat tanād iva”-iti tān hocur “na 52

---

34 Thus K1, K4: utaita
35 K1: vijāṁis . . . (15+22) hāyur iti nāma dadhus
36 K4: vijāntūn
37 K4: bhavīto yan
38 K4: horvaśī
39 K1: ajaniṣṭhāyā . . . (15+18)āṁ evānu devavihitin
40 K4: kiṁ cit*
41 K4: horvaśī
42 Thus emended. K4: yayācaśāṁ
43 Here K4 seems to have carelessly skipped a line and have crept into the line “manuṣyaṁ / yajñō gamiṣyati netvā — ” which is to be read next to the one intended! Therefore, the passage “-āṁ evānu — va . . . (15+18)” is found only in K1.
44 K1, K4: gandharvā
45 K1 and K4 put a special figure to indicate the end of a paṭala. I call this figure hereafter as an “end mark” and indicate it with a sign ‘[EM]’.
46 Abbreviation of the last phrase of the preceding paṭala. Such type of word-repetition is the style of the Vadhūla text showing the division of padṭala level. See my note to the edition of the Vadhūla ŚŚ (ZINBUN, No.30,1995, p.17 cum note 47).
47 K1 is ambiguous: it can be read either ‘vṛṇa’ or ‘vṛṇa’.
48 K1, K4: arddham
49 Thus construed. K1, K4: hocr ddēvā
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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khalu⁵³ yuṣmabhyam āsrāvayān na vaṣaṭkaravān⁵⁴ darvihoma⁵⁵ eva yuṣmākam pra hi⁵⁶ yuṣmā yajñam⁵⁷ adātã-iti tasmād⁵⁸ gandharvebhya⁵⁹ nāśrāvayanti na vaṣaṭkurvanti darvihoma eva teṣāṁ pra hi te yajñam ayacchan⁶¹ sa ha purūravāḥ putram evetarasmin haste cakre yajñam itarasmiṁs tābhyaṁ tathāvavrāja tābhyaṁ ubhābhyaṁ saha grāmam⁶² nābhavyāvājīgāṁsati so 'ranye⁶³ yajñan⁶⁴ nidhāya putreṇa saha grāmam abhyaveyāya tam madhye⁶⁵ grāmasya nidhāya yajñasyārdham⁶⁶ āavārāja tam anyathārūpam ivāntarhitam ājagāma sa ha devānām⁶⁷ uddudrāva tān hovacā "devāḥ putreṇa ca yajñena ca saha grāmam⁶⁸ avāvāriṇa⁶⁹ ⁷⁰ tābhyaṁ ubhābhyaṁ saha grāmam nābhavyāvājīgāṁsiṣaṁ so 'ranye⁷¹ yajñan nidhāya putreṇa saha⁷² grāmam abhyavyāgāṅ tam madhye⁷³ grāmasya nidhāya yajñasyārdham⁷⁴ avāriṣṭa⁷⁵ tam anyathārūpam ivāntarhitam āgamam" iti "kim u tatrāgamad" ity "etāṁ aṣṭau kapālāni"-iti hovacā "sa vāva⁷⁶ yajñā" iti hocuḥ "kim uvevānyad" ity "etā oṣadhayo 'bhito jātā" iti

⁵³ K₄: yuṣmabhyamātracayān
⁵⁴ K₁,K₄: vaṣaṭ∗karavān
⁵⁵ K₄: darvihoma
⁵⁶ K₁: yuṣma. . .(6)āt∗ gandharvebhya nāśrāva . . .(15+18)(i)n haste cakre
⁵⁷ Thus emended. K₄: abhāteti [?] 
⁵⁸ K₁: . āt∗; K₄: tasmā∗
⁵⁹ K₄: gandharvebhya
⁶⁰ K₄: vaṣaṭ∗kurvanti darvihoma
⁶¹ K₄: ayacchān
⁶² Thus K₁: nābhavyāvājīgāṁsati; K₄: nābhavyāvājīhāṁsat∗
⁶³ K₁: yaj. . .(12)yāya . . .(21+18)n hovāca
⁶⁴ Thus emended. K₄: yajñā
⁶⁵ K₄: maddhye
⁶⁶ K₄: -ārddhām
⁶⁷ Thus emended. K₄: amuddudrāva
⁶⁸ K₁: grāma.
⁶⁹ Thus emended. K₁: avavāriṇa; K₄: avaprajiṣān
⁷⁰ K₁: tābhhyāṁ .bhābh. saha grā . . .(35+18)ty [e]tāny
⁷¹ Thus emended. K₄: yajñanidhāya
⁷² K₄: ssaḥa
⁷³ K₄: maddhye
⁷⁴ K₄: -ārddhām
⁷⁵ Thus emended. K₄: āvavāriṇa
⁷⁶ K₁: yaj . . .(49+18)cus sa iddhmas
Y. IKARI

77 hucus "tad78 barhis tāni pavitrāṇī sa vāva yajñaḥ kim uvevānyad" ity79 "ete vanaspatayo 'bhito jātā" iti hovāca "sa vāva yajña" iti hucus "sa idhmās80 sa edhas sa vāva yajña82kim uvevānyad" ity "eso 'śvattaś śaṁyāṁ rūḍha" iti hovāca "sa vāva yajña" iti hucus "tat satyam sā yajñiyā tanūs sa vāva yajñaḥ pratyakṣam" iti sa eṣa evam āhṛto yajñaḥ purūravaśā manusyebhyas tato vai manusyaṁaṁ kṛptena yajñaṇa yajjamānaṁ aṅgāparūṁśy83 84aṅguliparūṁśi prāvardhanta 85 yathemāṇi 86 puruṣasyaāṅgāparūṁśy 87 aṅguliparūṁśi prāvardhanta evan tasmān nu 88 ha-'urvasy asī'-ity 89 evāraṇīm ādāḍita "purūrava" ity 90 u=yur asī"-iti jāṭam abhimantrayate sa vā eṣa 91āyuḥ paurūravasa ubhayeṣāṁ devamanusyaṁaṁ annādo 'gnidevabhagavān ubhayeṣāṁ ha vai devamanusyaṁaṁ annādo bhavati ya evam vidvān agniṁ 92 ādhatte 93 yasya vaivam vidvān agniṁ ādadhāti tad āhur "yāṁs94 95 tāṁs turiyāpurvān garbhān adhatta katama etā" iti sūtakāgnir

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)dhā iti hovāca sa v. . .(45+18)ṁgāparūṁśy

83 K4: aṅgāparūṁśy

84 K4: aṅguliparūṁśi prāvarddhanta

85 K1: yā . . .āni pūrusyāṅgāparūṁśī . . .(51+18)v(e) devamanusyaṁaṁ annado bhavati

86 Thus emended. K4: pūrusyāṅgāparūṁśy

87 K4: aṅguliparūṁśi prāvarddhanta

88 K4: horvvaśy

89 Thus emended. K4: evāraṇīm

90 K4 has an abbreviation sign. The abbreviated passage could be reconstructed as: uttarāraṇīm "ghṛtenākte" ity anakti "vṛṣaṇaṁ adhāthāṁ" ity avadadhāti "gāyatrāṇi chando 'nu prajāyasva'-iti chandobhir atmnām abhi nivartayaite "traiṣṭuḥbhaṅ chando 'nu prajāyasva jāgataṁ chando 'nu prajāyasva"-iti dasahotāram aranyor vyācaṣte manthanty agnim "ā(yur asī" iti jāṭam abhimantrayate) [Cf. Vādhula ŚSS 1.1.3.10–14.]

91 Thus emended. K4: āyubhauṟūravasa

92 K1: agnim[?]

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

94 K4: yāṁs

95 Thus emended. K4: tāṁs turiyāpurvān Although there is some space at the right end of the line[K4,90a,12] after "tāṁstrīya", I have neglected it without taking this as lacuna.
eva teṣāṁ⁹⁶ prathamo yena mṛtaḥ dahanti sa dvitiyo⁹⁷ yenaivaitat striya upasthaṁ kalpante⁹⁸ sa tṛtiya⁹⁹ etāṁ ha vāvaitad brāhmaṇam adhivadaty⁹⁰ agnes trayo jyāyāṁso=prāmiyanta”-ity ete ha vāva te¹⁰¹

1.3 ( = 1.2.1)¹⁰² sa yad¹⁰³ brahmaudanāṁ pacati tanveva hauḍanaṁ ālabhate ye ke caudanā nāmocyeante tāṁ atha yad asmin ājyaṁ upasiktaṁ bhavati tad u haiva jyāṁ ālabhate yāṁ kāṁ cājyaṁi nāmocyante tāṁ atha yad brahmāudane prōndan gāyatribhis samidho ‘bhyaḍadhaṁi tā u¹⁰⁸ tāḥ paurnāmasya¹¹⁰ aṣṭakāmāvāsyety atro haitas tisro rātṛī ālabhate ‘tro haivaṣya daraḥpurṇamāsāṁ¹¹¹ ālabdhau bhavatas tasmān nāṁījāno daraḥpurṇamāsāv¹¹² atinayed ya enav atinayed ālabdhav enau santāv atinayet tasmād u naiva tinayed etā vā idam rātṛī¹¹³ anu¹¹⁴ sarvaṁ¹¹⁵ bhavati

---

⁹⁶ Thus emended. K₄: teṣāḥ
⁹⁷ K₄: yenaivaitat*
⁹⁸ K₄: katpante
⁹⁹ Thus emended. K₄: etāḥnavaitat*
¹⁰⁰ Thus emended. K₄: agnesuyyo The abbreviated passage would be reconstructed as: agnes trayo jyāyāṁso bhṛtara āsan te debebhya havyaṁ vahantaḥ prāmiyanta (TS 2.6.6.1)
¹⁰¹ After this, K₄ gives [EM]. (End of K₄,90a,13)
¹⁰² The first line of K₁,90b is totally broken off.
¹⁰³ K₄: yat*
¹⁰⁴ Thus emended. K₄: caudanāmocyeante
¹⁰⁵ Thus emended. K₄: tāduhaiva jyāṁyā
t¹⁰⁶ Thus emended. K₄: avayat*
¹⁰⁷ Thus reconstructed. K₄: yad brahm[a]u . . (3)[o]ndan For this passage, cf. Vādhuḥūla Ś 1.1.2.11–13: “samidhāṅnin duvāṣyata”-iti atraiwa brahmaudane prōndan gāyatribhis samidho ‘bhyaḍadhaṁi “ghṛtair bodhayatātithim āśmin havyā juhotana svāhā”-iti svāhākāras sarvasu samītusu- “upa tvāgne haviśmatiḥ ghṛtāci=samidho mama svāhā, tan tvā samidbhīr aṅgiro=ṛhac chocā yaviṣṭhya svāhā”-iti
¹⁰⁸ Do we see some extent of lacuna after ‘u’, because of space at the line-end?
¹⁰⁹ The second line of K₁,90b is also totally broken off.
¹¹₀ K₄: paurnāmasya
¹¹¹ K₄: daraḥpurṇamāsāv
¹¹² K₄: daraḥpurṇamāsāv
¹¹³ Do we see some extent of lacuna after “rātṛī a”, because of space at the line-end?
¹¹⁴ Do we see some extent of lacuna before ‘nu’, because of space at the line-beginning?
¹¹⁵ K₄: sarvvaṁ
yad idam kiś ca sarvāṇiḥ hāsyā bhūtāṇy ālabdhāṇi bhavanti ya evam veda

varuṇo 'gnim ădhattra sa svapann agnyādheyāyopāvasat taṁ pāṃmān-

vantaraḥ [sa] sa papāmā vyāvṛttapāmpā palyayata sa punar ădhattra sa

jaģrad upāvasat tato vai sa pāpmāṇa vyāvartata sa pāṃmāṇa vyāvṛttapāmpa-
pāmā palyayata sa yat svapann agnyādheyāyopavasati pāpmo hainam

anuvartate sa papāmā vyāvṛttapāmpā palyayate taśmān nu ha jaģrad

evānyādheyāyopavased vi ha pāpmāṇa vartate sa vyāvṛttapāmpa-
pāmā palyayate

1.4 (=1.3.1)

idam va anvāhur aditiḥ putrakāmā=taisyai vṛddham āṇḍam ajā-
yata tad āṇḍaṁ jātam arejata tad rājanyo 'bhavad rejan yo ha vai nāma taṁ

rājanya ity ācakṣate parokṣena parokṣapriyā iva hi devās sādityebhya
eva tṛtīyam apacad  etebhya eva putrebhya bhogāya “ma” śrāntam

astv” iti te bruva “varām vṛṇmamāḥ athaitad vikarisyāma 'smabhyam
eva brahmādanan nirvapānī”-iti tasmād ādityebhya brahmādanan
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nirvapanti\textsuperscript{133} tad itthāṃ vyakurvan\textsuperscript{134} yathaitarhi manusyās tato yad atyā-ricyata\textsuperscript{135} tasyārdham sam adihān sa hasty abhavat \textsuperscript{136} tasmādd \textsuperscript{137} hastināna prātiṛghnīyād ati hi sa puruṣam aricyata tasmād yan manyeta-“ati vā idam puruṣam ricyata” iti tan na prātiṛghnīyāt\textsuperscript{138} kāmam anyat ta ādityāḥ\textsuperscript{139}

1.5 (=1.3.2)

kāma=dityā\textsuperscript{140} rājanyam evāśya lokasya goptāram adhivaptāram adhipatīm akurvaḥ\textsuperscript{141} te ’bruvan “katham enam anyair manuṣyair vyāvartayema” iti tasya \textsuperscript{143} dundubhim eva vācam akurvan\textsuperscript{144} dhānur vyāttam\textsuperscript{145} iṣūn dantān khāḍgam\textsuperscript{146} evānyatvacam akurvan\textsuperscript{147} ratham pādau sa \textsuperscript{148} yāvat kyac caitair aṅgai\textsuperscript{149} rājanyo nu samanvāgacchaty\textsuperscript{150} anāpto haiva tāvad rājanyo 'tha \textsuperscript{151} yāvat kyac caitair aṅgai\textsuperscript{152} rājanyo nu samanvāgacchaty\textsuperscript{153} ‘tha haivāpto rājanyas tad āhur

\textsuperscript{133} K\textsubscript{1}: nirvapanti; K\textsubscript{4}: nirvvpati
\textsuperscript{134} K\textsubscript{1},K\textsubscript{4}: vyakurwvan
\textsuperscript{135} K\textsubscript{1},K\textsubscript{4}: tasyārdham
\textsuperscript{136} Do we see some extent of lacuna after ‘ddha’, because of space at the line-end?
\textsuperscript{137} K\textsubscript{1},90b,6: . . . (15) l(o)kasya goptāram adhivaptāram adhipatīm akurvaḥ . . .

[lacuna upto the end of this line.]
\textsuperscript{138} K\textsubscript{4}: prātiṛghnīyāt*
\textsuperscript{139} After this, K\textsubscript{4} gives [EM].
\textsuperscript{140} The last phrase of the preceding paṭāla is abbreviated here.
\textsuperscript{141} K\textsubscript{4}: akurvaḥ; K\textsubscript{1}: akurvaḥ.
\textsuperscript{142} K\textsubscript{4}: manuṣyair vyāvartayema iti
\textsuperscript{143} K\textsubscript{1},90b,7: . . . (15)va tāvad rājanyo tha yāvac kyac caitair aṅgai rājanyo . . . (49?)

[lacuna upto the end of this line.]
\textsuperscript{144} K\textsubscript{4}: akurwvan
\textsuperscript{145} K\textsubscript{4}: vyāttam
\textsuperscript{146} K\textsubscript{4}: khāṭ*gam
\textsuperscript{147} K\textsubscript{4}: akurwvan
\textsuperscript{148} K\textsubscript{1}: yāvac kyac
\textsuperscript{149} K\textsubscript{1},K\textsubscript{4}: aṅgai
\textsuperscript{150} K\textsubscript{4}: samanvāgacšaty
\textsuperscript{151} Thus emended K\textsubscript{1}: yāvac kyac caitair; K\textsubscript{4}: yāval kyac caitair
\textsuperscript{152} K\textsubscript{1},K\textsubscript{4}: aṅgai
\textsuperscript{153} K\textsubscript{4}: samanvāgacšaty
1.6.(1.4.1)

manasā saṃkalpayatya163 agnīn ādhāsya iti tan mano reto dhatte sa vācāpy āharaty ādhāsya iti tad u haiva mano vācāṃ kramate sā vāg garbhini palyayate yāvad agnīn ādhatte sa vā agnīn ādhatte tad u haiva vāg vijāyate divyāni jyotिमिष्ठ164 divyāni mukhāni divyān putrān mukhatas 165 sṛjate sa yasya ha vaśā166 syād agnīn ādadhānasya vācayeyur evainam agnyādheya evam evaitāni svayam ātmano hi divyāni jyotिमिष्ठ divyāni mukhāni divyān putrān mukhatas sṛjate ta167 u ha vā ete dva yā evetthāṃvīda āhitīgñēḥ putṛā agnaya u haivāgnaya retassīca168 u vaivetare mānuṣāḥ putrās ta enam ubhaye bhūfjanti sa yad169 itthāṃvid asmāl

154 K₄: yad
155 For the abbreviated mantra passage, see VādhaŚŚ1.1.2.1[brahmaudana preparation]: “devasa tvā dityaj juṣṭam ādityebhyo juṣṭam agnīṣomābhyaṁ juṣṭam157 indrāṅg nibhyāṁ juṣṭam pra jāpataye juṣṭam158 brahmaṃe juṣṭan159 nirvāpāṁi”-iti nirvapanti tan nādṛtyam “adityai juṣṭam ādityebhyo juṣṭan160 nirvāpāṁi”-ity eva nirvaped eva hi tan devatā agrē161 nirvapāṁs tasmād eṣa evam eva nirupyaḥ162

156 K₄,90b,8: . . . (15)ty (ai) juṣṭam ādityebhyo juṣṭan nirvāpāṁty eva nirvaped etā hi tan devatā agrē nirvapāṁs tasmād e . . . vam eva nirupāy . . . (15) dhāsya iti . . . . (18)[lacuna upto the end of this line.]

157 Thus emended. K₄: indrāṅgīnī juṣṭam indrāṅg nibhyāṁ juṣṭaṁ
158 Thus emended. K₄: brahmage rājanyo nu samanvāgacṣatya anāpto haiva ta)ṇa juṣṭan
159 K₄: nirvāpāṁty nirvapante
160 K₄,K₄: nirvāpāṁty eva nirvaped
161 K₄,90b,9: . . . (15)t(a) yāvad agnīn ādhatte sa vā agnīn ādhatte tad u haiva vāg vijāyate divyāni jyotिमिष्ठ[sic.] divyāni mukhāni divyān putrān mu . ta. sr . . . (10)yād agnīn ādadhānasya vāca . . . . (12) [lacuna upto the end of this line.]

162 After this, K₄ gives [EM].
163 K₄: saṃkalpayatya
164 K₁: jyotिम
165 K₄,90b,10: sr(jate). . . (15)vyāni mukhāni divyān putrān mukhatas sṛjate ta u ha vā ete dva yā evetthāṃvīda āhitīgñēḥ putṛā agnaya u haivāgnayor etā . . . u vaivetare mānuṣāḥ putṛās ta enam ubhaye bhu . . . .(12)

166 Drop of final sibilant.
167 K₄: iha
168 Thus K₃,K₄: uvaitare
169 K₃,90b,11: itthāṃ. . . (16)r eva divyai jyotibhir ddivyair mmukhair ddivyaiḥ putrais
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lokäd ähitägnih praiti yad enan dištam itam agnäv abhyädadhati sa etair eva 170 divyair jyotibhir 171 divyair mukhair 172 divyaiḥ putrais sahämum lokam eti tair amuśmim loke bhāty atha haitän retassico mänusän puträn asmin loke 173 jahati tair uvevasm in loke bhāti sa va eśa ubhayor eva lokayor 174 bhāty. 175 176 asmi[iś ca lo]ke 'muśmimś ca taśmän nu hainän ubhayän 177 evopapādaiśed vaśaś cāyā syād evamvidam u ha vai śrotriyāṁ śrotriyāḥ pitā daṇḍena pravicchayāṁ 178 cakārā 179

1.7 (=1.4.2)180

181 pitā daṇḍena pravicchayāṁ 182 cakārā taṃ ha praty uparamyovāca "183 kataran nāṃsomo 'vatādyata na . nāv 184 anyonyasmai bhūyaś cakārā" - ity 185 aṅg(a) . . . (3) ti kim abhaviśya" iti 186 hovāca "yad ahann ājaniśye yarhi nāv aham ājaniśye tarhin nāv aham śreyāṁ abhaviśym ajātam u vai

sahämum lokam eti tair amuśmim loke bhāty atha haitän retassico mänusän putrān asmin *loke jahati tai . . . (12)[

K1,K4: divyājjyotibhir
K1,K4: ddīvayair mmukhair ddīvaiḥ
K4: mmuyair
K1,K4: *loke
K4: *lokayor
Thush construed. K4: asmiṁ . . ke
K1,90b,12: asmiṁ .. (20) hainän ubhayän evopapādaiśed vaśaś cāyā syād evamvidam u ha vai śrotriyāṁ śrotriyāḥ pitā daṇḍena pravicchayāṁ cakārā [EM] pitā daṇḍena pravicchayāṁ cakārā taṃ ha . . . . (12)

K4: evopapādaiśed
K1,K4: pravicchayāṁ
After this, K1,K4 give [EM].

Corresponding lines of MSS.: K1,90b,12–91a,7;K4,90b,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 K1 (and K4). They miss the beginning portion of this paṭala (=K1,90b,12–14 and K4,90b,12–15).

The first sentence is the repetition of the last one of the preceding paṭala.

K4: pravicchayāṁ

? K4: katarannāṃsomovatādyata

K1,90b,13: . . . (15)m abhaviśya iti hovāca yad ahann ājaniśye yarhi nāv aham ājaniśye tarhin nāv aham śreyāṁ abhaviśym ajātam u vai mama śreyo jāyamāneno vai tvam mayā sarvāṃ *lokān ajayo ye . . . . (12)

Thus K1, K4: hovā . . .(6)ye yarhi nāv aham

28
mama śreyo jayamāneno vai tvam mayā sarvāṇ 187 lokāṇ 188 ajayo ye ke ca lokāṇām 189 ocyante tān" iti tad u ha . . .(10)va manuṣyaṇā . . .(4)(ā) jayamāneno vai pitā putreṇa sarvāṇ 191 lokāṇ 192 jayati ye ke ca lokāṇām 194 ocyante tasmād evamviduṣaṇaḥ putra iṣyān tad āhuḥ 195 "kim agnaya" iti prāṇā vā agnayaḥ ta iha vā eta ima evābhīpurusam prāṇā bhavanti yad agnayaḥ prāṇ(e/o) 196 197 . . .(25)sām bhūtanām 198 u vā prajītanām pāpabhadrāṁ 199 titiṣate 200 tasya nu haiṣa āhito bhavati yad 201 gārhapatyaḥ so 'muṣmin loke praṇena praṇīti 202 caṅsūr āhavanīyas tat satyaṃ sa yo ha vā asmin 203 loke 204 satyaṃ vadati 205 tasya nu haiṣa 206 āhito [bhavati yad āhavanīyaḥ so 'muṣmin loke caṅsūṣa paśyaḥ] ti śrotam anvāhāryapacanah 207 , 208 sā śraddhaḥ sa yo ha vā 209 asmin loke śraddhatte tasya nu haiṣa āhito bhavati yad anvāhārya-

187 K1,K4: sarvāṇ
188 K1: *lokaṇ
189 K4: *lokaṇām
190 K1,90b,14: (lo) . . .(15)jayamāneno vai pitā putreṇa sarvāṇ *lokaṇ jayati ye ke ca *lokaṇām ocyante tasmād evam viduṣaṇaḥ putra iṣyān tat āhuḥ kiṃ agnaya iti prāṇā vā agnayaḥ ta iha vā eta ima e . . .(12)
191 K4: sarvāṇ
192 Thus K1. K4: . . .(8) ca *lokaṇām ocyante
193 K1,K4: *lokaṇ
194 K1,K4: *lokaṇām
195 K4: āhum
196 End of K4,90b
197 Beginning of K1,91a and K4,91a. M and C start from here. K4: . . .(25)sām bhūtanām; K1: . . . m [lacuna from the left end of folio is of about 20 syllables.]; M: . . .(22)ṇam; Caland: . . . (pra)ṇam
198 M: upā
199 K1: pāpabhadrāṁ; M: pāpabhandran
200 M,C: titiṣate
201 K1: yat*
202 M: prāṇiti
203 K1: a . n
204 K1: *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 K1: anvāhāryapacanah; M: anvāhāryapacanah
208 M: sa śraddhaḥ
209 K1: asmiṃ *loke; M: asmi*l loke
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pacanaḥ
dośmuṣmin
loke śrotreṇa śṛṇotī sa yaśmin ha vā etāni trīṇ vapadyante titikṣā
satyaṁ śraddheti devānāṁ eva sa eko bhavati . . .(5)śa saṁka . . .(5)āgnyādheyam etadd ha vai saubabhravo vādhulāya procyovāca "pra n vai vayaṁ yāskāyāgnyādheyam avocāma”-iti kāmaṁ ṛśa āyādheyam eva brahman eva prajāpati vocavya satyam apasyateṣ\n. . .(15); M: evāgnyādheyam . . .(20) asmin eva tena loke pratitiṣṭhāti

210 K1: anvāhāryapačanas; M: anvāhāryapačanas
211 K1: muṣmin
212 Thus K4. C: (traya)ṇi; K1: . . ſi; M: . . (5)ṇi
213 C: titikṣā.
214 M: satyaṁ
215 Thus K4. K1: deva . . .(15)āgnyādheyam ; M: deva . . .(18) agnyādheyam
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: evāgnyādheyam [EM] idaṁ vānvāhuḥ prajāpatir vvaḥaḥ satyam aparṣyaḥ tenaṁgni=
. . . ity āhāsmiṁ eva tena *loke pratitiṣṭhāti; K1: evāgnyādheyah . . .(15); M: evāgnyā
dheyah . . .(20) asmin eva tena loke pratitiṣṭhāti
223 After this, K1, K4 have the mark [EM]
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