

WSK 2023

Special Panel (Veda) - Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā : its history, background and relation to the other Vedic texts

Isabelle Dupéron

Some remarks on the chronological relations

between the Yajamāna Brāhmaṇa of the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā

and its parallels in the Kāthaka and Taittirīya Saṃhitās

In the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, the section I, 4, called Yajamāna-brāhmaṇa, deals with the part of the sacrificer during the Darśapūrṇamāsa ritual, and contains both the *mantras* to be uttered by the *yajamāna* (and his wife), and the *brāhmaṇa* or prose commentary of these *mantras*. This situation of the YB in the first *kāṇḍa* contrasts with the fact that the *brāhmaṇa* section commenting on the *mantras* to be uttered by the priests belongs to the fourth (and last) *kāṇḍa*, which is the *khila* or supplementary part of the whole book.

Here I will try to show that the YB reflects the earliest state of the Darśapūrṇamāsa ritual known to us, and predates the parallel passages contained in the Black Yajur-veda Saṃhitās (Kāthaka and Taittirīya) dealing with this topic. Moreover, it will appear that the parallel passage of the KS is earlier than that of the TS.

I Composition of the MS Yajamāna-brāhmaṇa

The text of the MS YB appears to be composed of several layers.

1) *Mantras*

In the YB we first find the *mantras*, and then the *brāhmaṇas* commenting on these *mantras*. But the *mantra* part itself exhibits some traces of internal stratification.

From I, 4, 1 : 47, 1 up to I, 4, 3 : 50, 16, the *mantras* follow one another in an order which conforms to the sequence of their use in the ritual. They run from the preparation which takes place on the eve of the sacrifice (the *upavasatha* day) to the closing procedures which are performed at the end of the sacrifice the next day.

But this first layer of the *mantras* is followed, from I, 4, 3 : 50, 16 up to I, 4, 4 : 52, 8, by a series of additions related to various moments of the sacrifice.

- A first addition is composed of a set of three *mantras* related to the topic of the use of the *véda* or ritual broom, to be uttered during the Sacrifice to the wives of the gods (*patnīsaṃyājá*) which follows the main rites of the Darśapūrṇāmasa, but takes place before the closing procedures ; plus of a *mantra* which is uttered at the end of the whole sacrifice, according to KS, TS and the Śrauta-sūtras.

- I, 4, 3 : 50, 16-18

vedò 'si védo mā ābhara tṛṣṭò 'hám // (...) vedó vājam dadātu me (at the end of the *patnīsaṃyājá* the broom is held out to the wife of the sacrificer ; according to MŚS I, 3, 5, 15-16 these *mantra* dedicated to the broom are used in a dialogue between the *adhvaryú* and the wife).

- I, 4, 3 : 51, 1

nír dviṣantaṃ nír árātiṃ daha, rudrās tvā yachann, ādityās tvā strṇan (according to MŚS I, 4, 3, 4 the first *mantra* is uttered when the broom is loosened and strewn between the fires, before the *samiṣṭayajus* oblation).

- I, 4, 3, 51, 2-3

*gómaṃ agné 'vimaṃ aśví yajñó nṛvātsakhā sádám íd apramṣyáḥ /
ídāvān eśó asura prajāvān dīrghó rayiḥ pṛhubudhnáḥ sabhāvān //*

Though KS, TS and the Śrauta-sūtras agree to say that it is one of the very last *mantras* of the sacrifice, we cannot exclude the (rather unlikely) possibility that in an archaic form of the sacrifice, it was uttered in a previous stage of the ritual sequence. Moreover, this *mantra* might have been added to the list afterwards, separately from the two preceding ones, since it deals with a different topic.

Do we have to believe that this first additional series of *mantras* represents a first development of the earliest state of the ritual (as far as the part of the *yajamāna* is concerned)?

- Then we find a set of three groups of *mantras* which pertain to the wife and relatives of the sacrificer.

- I, 4, 3 : 51, 4-6

sám pátnī pátyā sukṛtēsu gachatāṃ yajñāsya yuktáu dhúryā abhūthām //

āprīnānu vijáhatā árātiṃ divi jyótir uttamám á rabhethāṃ svāhā // (according to the MŚS I, 3, 5, 5, this *mantra* is uttered by the *adhvaryú* when, in the course of the *patnīsaṃyājá*, the wife of the sacrificer holds him from behind ; this happens *before* the time when the broom is held out to the wife.

- I, 4, 3 : 51, 7

pátni patny eśá te lokó, námas te astu, má mā hiṃsír (the *adhvaryú* indicates her place to the wife of the sacrificer ; according to the MŚS I, 2, 5, 10, this *mantra* is uttered at the beginning of the day of the sacrifice, when the sacrificial ground is being prepared – the *pravará* having not been recited yet. Such a use of the *mantra* appears to be very puzzling to us, since it is related to a completely different moment of the rite. I believe that we can put forth another interpretation. Here we have to draw a comparison with the *brāhmaṇa* commenting on the parallel list of *mantras* in the KS : as I will show later on, the KS has rearranged the *mantras* in the correct order, and though the text does not mention *pátni patny eśá te lokó* any more in the list of the *mantras* itself, it still mentions it in the *brāhmaṇa*, just before *sám pátnī pátyā sukṛtēsu gachatām* – thus the close link between these two *mantras* is preserved in the KS in spite of the rearrangement. The *brāhmaṇa* of *pátni patny eśá te lokó* might perhaps be understood in this way : if the wife had remained seated in her normal place near the fire, this fire would have burnt his progeny ; but then she is invited to join another place; that is to say to hold the *adhvaryú* from behind, and so her progeny will not be burnt by the fire.

- I, 4, 3 : 51, 7-9

yá sárasvatī veśayámanī tásyai svāhā // yá sárasvatī veśabhagīnā tásyās te bhaktiváno bhūyāsmá // (according to MŚS I, 3, 5, 12, after the oblation to the wives of the gods, and before the broom is held out to the sacrificer's wife, the *adhvaryú* offers the chaff of the grains in the *dakṣiṇāgní* fire with the first *mantra*, and the sacrifice wipes his face with the second one).

We thus see that these *mantras* deal with some ritual acts which take place *before* the broom handling at the close of the *patnīsaṃyājá*, though in the list they occur *after* the *mantras* related to the broom : this shows that they have been added to the preceding ones afterwards.

- And finally, we find a set of four *mantras* or groups of *mantras* concerning the topic of expiations. We cannot be sure that the three last ones have not been added afterwards, separately from the first one.

- I, 4, 3 : 51, 10-12

ayāś cāgné 'sy anabhiśastiś ca satyám it tvám ayā asi /

ayāh sán mánasā kṛ3ttò 'yāh sán havyám ūhiṣe 'yā no dhehi bheṣajám svāhā // (According to the MŚS I, 3, 5, 20, this *mantra* is uttered during a libation of *ghī* following the loosening and strewing of the broom. But according to the KS it is uttered at a slightly earlier stage, after the *mantra sám pátnī pátyā*, and before the *mantra yā sárasvatī veśayámanī tásyai svāhā*. In both the MS and KS it is used (by the sacrificer ?) for a general expiation.

- I, 4, 4 : 51, 13-16

devān jánam agan yajñás, táto mā yajñásyāśīr āgachatu, pitṛñ (...) manu3ṣyān (...) apá óśadhīr vānaspatīn (...) pañcajanám jánam agan yajñás, táto mā yajñásyāśīr āgachatu (according to the MŚS III, 1, 20 this *mantra* is used as an expiation in case an offering has been spilled and has to be thrown out ; but the KS list of *mantras* locates it in the regular closing procedures – before the uttering of the *ye devā yajñahanaḥ* formulas, and has it immediately followed by the *mantras pañcānām tvā vātānām dhartrāya grhñāmi, etc...* and *bhūr asmākam etc.*, just as it is the case in the MS. The MS and KS *brāhmaṇas* do state that the *mantra devān jánam agan yajñás...* is to be applied to the offerings which have been spilled (*skanna*), but the purpose here is to get back the blessings that might have fled away from the sacrificer (seemingly with the spilled offerings).

- I, 4, 4 : 51, 16 à 52, 6

pañcānām tvā vātānām dhartrāya grhñāmi (...) pañcānām tvā pañcajanánām dhartrāya grhñāmi carósvā pañcabilasya dhartrāya grhñāmi // dhāmāsi priyám devānām ánādhr̥ṣṭam devayájanam / devāvūtyai tvā grhñāmi //

In MŚS I, 4, 1, 15, just as in TS and in the other *Śrauta-sūtras*, we find that this *mantra* is uttered by the sacrificer at an early stage of the sacrifice (the preparation of the sacrificial ground), when the *adhvaryú* scoops *ghī* with the sacrificial ladles ; this use of the *mantra* is in agreement with the fact that the verbal root GR̥H commonly denotes the ritual scooping of a material for making a libation. As a matter of fact at the end of this series of MS *mantras* the term *ajya-grahá* does occur. But the KS list of *mantras* locates the formulas *pañcānām tvā vātānām dhartrāya grhñāmi* towards the end of the sacrifice, just after *devān jánam agan yajñás*, and thus before the formulas *ye devā yajñahanaḥ*. They might then have some relation with the preceding expiation. And the KS *brāhmaṇa* applies GR̥H to the sacrifice itself, and then to different items which are seemingly some of the possible benedictions obtained by the sacrifice : *yajñam evāsmāi grhñāti...paśūn...diśah...* As to the MS *brāhmaṇa* (which is very similar in content), it clearly uses the root GR̥H as a synonym of Ā-LABH in the same context : *yāvan evá yajñá tám ālabdha...tám evāgrahūt*. Thus, the idea here seems to be close to that of the *devān jánam agan yajñás* formulas, that is to say, taking back the part of the sacrifice (and of the related benedictions) which have gone away through spilling. The formulas *pañcānām tvā vātānām dhartrāya grhñāmi* are concluded with a *mantra* dedicated to the *ghī*, that is to say *dhāmāsi priyám devānām etc...* ; we can suppose that this *mantra* deals with the taking back of the spilled *ghī* – the MS *brāhmaṇa* here says : *prājñāta ājyagrahá pathā*, which might mean “the ladleful of butter, having been discerned, has gone along its (normal?) path”, and the KS *brāhmaṇa* adds : *na yajñād dhūrchatī, nāsmād yajño hūrchatī ya evamī veda* “it does not sneak away from the sacrifice, the sacrifice does not sneak away from him who thus knows”. Of course, the *mantra dhāmāsi priyám devānām* is also uttered by the *adhvaryú* in the early stage of the ritual sequence, when the *ghī* is scooped in the ladles (in MS I, 1, 11 and KS I, 10), but the KS *brāhmaṇa* which we have just cited hints at the idea that in the YB this *mantra* is used by the sacrificer in the concluding rites to prevent the sacrifice from being deprived of any part of the *ghī* libations. We cannot completely exclude the possibility that in the MS the formulas *devān jánam agan yajñás* and *pañcānām tvā vātānām dhartrāya grhñāmi* were a series of optional *mantras* to be uttered *only* at the time when some *ghī* may have been spilled, and that the KS chose to include them towards the end of the ritual performance in order to make sure that no part of the sacrifice had gone away (and that the TS chose to use them in a completely different place because they can be interpreted as being fit to accompany the scooping of the *ghī*). But the other possibility is that the KS ritual sequence shows us the correct way to interpret the MS *mantras*.

- I, 4, 4 : 52, 7-8

bhūr asmākaṃ havyāṃ devānām āśīṣo yájamanasya, devātābhyas tvā devātābhir gṛhṇāmi. This double *mantra* is the continuation and the end of the set of previous formulas containing the GRH root ; in the MS *brāhmaṇa* it is related to the asking for benedictions (*āśāste*). In KS the first part is inserted between *pañcānām tvā pañcajanānām dhartrāya gṛhṇāmi* and *carostvā pañcabilasya dhartrāya gṛhṇāmi*, and the second part appears at the end of the whole set ; in TS the double *mantra* is not split (just as in MS) and appears at the end of the formulas for scooping the *ghī*.

We thus see in the MS *mantras* for the sacrificer, that the earliest form of the ritual was gradually enriched with new elements, which all pertain to the last part of the ritual sequence, and for some of them involve the wife of the sacrificer.

We can distinguish two layers of additions to the original bulk of MS *mantras*, plus a third one containing expiations – which may or may not be later than the second additional layer, since it is anyway usual for expiations to be appended at the end of the development of a ritual topic.

In fact we have no proof that in the earliest form of the ritual – that which preceded the addition of some sets of new *mantras* in the MS YB – the rite of the *patnīsaṃyājā* was already in existence. At the time of the Yajur-veda Saṃhitās, we find very few *mantras* for the *patnīsaṃyājā* in the sections containing the *mantras* for the *adhvaryú* : none in the MS and KS, and three in TS (TS I, 1, 13, p-r). Our knowledge of the existence of the *patnīsaṃyājā* thus essentially comes from the lists of *mantras* to be uttered by the sacrificer.

2) Brāhmaṇas

In the text of the MS YB, the list of the *mantras* is followed by a long sequence of *brāhmaṇas*, which clearly exhibits signs of internal stratification.

At first, we find a rather long development (from I, 4, 5 to I, 4, 9) which comments one by one the *mantras* of the preceding list, following their order in the text (that is to say, the additional *mantras* are commented upon after the *mantras* of the main part, though they relate to events which take place at an earlier stage of the ritual sequence). In this way, we can surmise that this part of the *brāhmaṇas* has been redacted after the addition of the supplementary *mantras*, when the list of *mantras* had been completed. The style of these comments is worthy of notice : they are very terse and simple, containing no speculations or Prajāpati theology ; they just point out what ritual act the sacrificer is doing when he has to utter the corresponding *mantra*, or what it serves for. Moreover, the text justifies the legitimacy of asking for blessings during the call of the Iḍā and at the close of the sacrifice – just as if it was composed in a time when there was still no unanimity concerning these aspects of the ritual.

Then we find in I, 4, 10 the addition of a section which contains comments on miscellaneous aspects of the New and Full-Moon rite, mainly concerning the ritual acts performed on the beginning of the main day of the sacrifice. Concrete details are given (e. g. on the fast food, or on the time of silence), contrary to what could be found in the previous part commenting on the *mantras*, and the passage gives greater importance to speculations concerning the symbolic meaning or mythological justifications of the details of the rite (the

Prajāpati theology appears once). The style is very different from that of I, 4, 5 to I, 4, 9, and we can guess that it comes from a different origin.

The I, 4, 10 section has no real internal organization and looks more like a mere accumulation of remarks ; in spite of this, I think it should be treated as a whole – just as the KS has understood it : the KS has also added it, without important modification, to its initial group of *brāhmaṇas* commenting upon the list of the *mantras* for the sacrificer. After this addition, the KS ends there its *brāhmaṇa* section dealing with the role of the sacrificer. But in the MS it is continued by a new layer of additions.

Then we have a third layer : I, 4, 11 and I, 4, 12 seem to form a whole (though any kind of internal stratification cannot be completely excluded) : these two sections are composed of miscellaneous developments on different topics more or less related to the theme of ensuring that the sacrifice may be successful for the sacrificer. Three news *mantras* are introduced in passages which have a parallel in the KS *brāhmaṇa* section (while the other passages do not have such a parallel in KS) :

- I, 4, 11 (3) features the *mantra* : *dévāḥ pitarāḥ pítaro devās, yó'smi sá sán yajé, yó'smi sá sán karomi, śunám ma iṣṭám śunám śántám śunám kṛtám bhūyāt*, to be uttered during the recitation of the *pravará*, in order to prevent the *ṛṣi* ancestors from reaping the benefit of the ongoing sacrifice.
- I, 4, 11 (4) features the *mantra* : *yajñásya tvā pramáyābhimáyā parimáyonmáya páriḡṛhñāmi*, to be uttered, according to KS XXXII, 4, after the completion of the *patnīsaṃyajyas* (contrary to the use mentioned in later *śrauta-sūtras*).
- I, 4, 12 (5) features the *mantra* : *brádhna pāhí / bhájatām bhāgí mábhāgó bhakta brāhmaññām idám havíḥ somyāñām somapánām, néhábrāhmaṇasyápy asti , kurvató me má kṣeṣṭa dádato me mópadasat*, which serves as an expiation (found by Vaṣiṣṭha) in case a part of the sacrificial cake is eaten by a sacrificer who is a non-brahmin. While uttering this *mantra*, the sacrificer touches the sacrificial cake, but the MS YB does not tell the moment when this has to be done. According to the KS and the *Śrauta-sūtras*, it takes place after the rite of the calling of the *Idā* (in order to “milk” her). We should note that, in the *mantra* section of the MS YB (and in the first layer of the *brāhmaṇas* commenting upon these *mantras*), the *eating* of a part of the sacrificial cake by the sacrificer takes place towards the end of the sacrifice, in the vicinity of the *samiṣṭayajus* oblation, just before the closing rites which start with the continuous pouring of water upon the *prañītā*-waters. We find the same location in the *Śrauta-sūtras* ; but the KS *brāhmaṇa* strangely mentions the eating of the sacrificer's share immediately following the recitation of the Vaṣiṣṭha expiatory *mantra*.

In I, 4, 13 we find a fourth layer, featuring different types of expiations (for various faults likely to be committed during the sacrifice), or explaining how to avoid some bad results ; these *brāhmaṇas* have no parallel in the KS. Since it is customary to put the expiations at the end of a section, this layer may not necessarily be later than the preceding one.

And eventually we have a supplement concerning the optional *iṣṭis* in I, 4, 14-15, which has no parallel in KS.

II Comparing MS, KS and TS *mantras* of the sacrificer in Darśapūrnamāsa

1) Comparing MS and KS *mantras*

There is almost no doubt that the *mantras* of the MS YB (including those which have been added at the end of the original list) are older than those of KS and TS. They are fewer and reflect a less developed state of the ritual. The new *mantras* introduced in KS and TS are too numerous to be cited here, for example we have in KS IV, 14 a set of *mantras* dedicated to the five seasons to be uttered by the sacrificer during the fore-offerings (*vasantām ṛtūnām prīṇāmi, sá mā prītāḥ prīṇātu, vasantásyāhám devayajyáyórjasvān páyasvān bhūyāsam*, etc... for the next seasons ; // TS I, 6, 2, less developed than in the KS). One of the most significant innovations is the introduction by the KS and the TS of a *mantra* dedicated to Prajāpati, to be uttered by the sacrificer when the *anvāhārya* (or rice-mess which serves as a fee for the priests) is put on the altar – the importance of this *mantra* lies in the fact that it is linked with the search for keeping an inexhaustible supply of *iṣṭāpūrta* in heaven for the sacrificer – a concern which seems totally absent in the YB of the MS.

The study of the relationship between MS and KS *mantras* can be pushed further on. We note that the MS *mantras* have been fully rearranged to follow the order of their use in the ritual : the *mantras* from the additional layers of the MS list have been inserted by the KS list at their correct place in the ritual sequence. What is still more remarkable is that the three supplementary *mantras* introduced by the MS *brāhmaṇas* (namely, *yajñāsya tvā pramāyā...*, *dévāḥ pitarāḥ pítaro devāḥ...*, and *brádhna pāhí...*) have been also inserted (with sometimes some changes) at a place which indicates their position within the ritual sequence. This seems to mean that the KS list of *mantras* is even later than the MS *brāhmaṇas* featuring the three additional *mantras*.

This point needs further discussion. Could not some redactor of the MS *brāhmaṇas* have heard of these three KS *mantras*, and have wanted to add them in the MS ritual by mentioning them in the MS *brāhmaṇas*, at a time when the list of MS *mantras* was considered to be definitively closed ? An examination of the content of these *mantras* shows that this is not the most plausible hypothesis.

Concerning the *mantra* *dévāḥ pitarāḥ pítaro devāḥ...*, one can note that, though the global purpose of the formula is the same in both MS and KS (preventing the *ṛṣi* ancestors from reaping the benefit of the sacrifice), the KS *mantra* displays some specific features which are linked to the interpretation of its role as developed in the corresponding KS *brāhmaṇa* (XXXI, 15) : the KS *mantra* puts a greater emphasis on drawing the attention of the ancestors to the fact that the sacrifice is the property of the sacrificer (*tád vaḥ prabravāmi tásya me vitta, svám ma iṣṭám astu...*), which matches with the corresponding *brāhmaṇa* where the KS develops the theory that by the power of this *mantra* the sacrifice is entrusted to the fathers who guard it, so that it becomes inexhaustible *iṣṭāpūrta* in heaven. In view of such elements, N. Nishimura has concluded (2019) that there has been an interval of “theological” elaboration between the MS and the KS version of the *pravarā* *mantra* for the sacrificer, and this view seems to me to be perfectly sound.

Concerning the *mantra* *brádhna pāhí...*, one feels at first sight puzzled by the KS version of it, which begins with *bradhna pinvasva kalpantām diśo yājamānasyāyuṣe*. Since the *bradhna*, “ruddy one”, is the sacrificial cake, equated with the sun, why ask it to “swell”, and what is the

relation of an expiation and such a swelling ? The KS *brāhmaṇa* explains here that, since the word *bradhna* refers to the sun, the effect of this *mantra* is to make at sunrise the cosmic directions favourable to the life of the sacrificer who knows this – the KS clearly wants to emphasize the importance of a reference to the sun, but the relation of the “swelling” with the purpose of the expiation is not explained at all. We are forced to agree that the much simpler wording of the MS – *brādhna pāhí* – better fits with the purpose of making an atonement. Moreover, the MS clearly states that this is an optional formula to be used in the case the sacrificer is not a brahmin, with the aim of repairing the resulting ritual fault (we can guess that in most cases among the Maitrayānīya the sacrificer was a brahmin). On the contrary in the KS version the expiation formula does not appear to be optional, it has been integrated in the normal, “standard” course of the sacrifice (we can guess here that among the Kāṭha, sacrifices where much more often performed by non-brahmin, that is to say *kṣatriya* sacrificers)¹. I find it likely that here a formula which originally was optional expiations became in a later stage included in the normal sequence of the ritual. It is remarkable that the *mantras* which in the KS list precede the *mantra bradhna pinvasva*, also contain the word *pinvasva*. These are the formulas for “milking” the Iḍā, by asking for benedictions : we have *brahma tejo me pinvasva*, *kṣatram ojo me pinvasva*, etc..., asking her to “make swell my sacred power and my luster, my political power and my energy”, and so on (we see again that here both brahmins and *kṣatriya* sacrificers are concerned together by the standard form of the ritual). I suppose that the wording of the formula *brahma pinvasva* has been influenced by the preceding *mantras* of the KS list. Of course, we could also imagine that the sacrificial cake is asked to grow in size in order to restore the small part which has been already cut from it (at an earlier stage) in order to become the share of the sacrificer. Anyhow, the MS wording of the *mantra* appears to be the original one.

Eventually I will give a striking example of the anteriority of the MS *mantras* compared to those of the KS. Among the closing procedures of the New and Full-moon sacrifice is the striding of the Viṣṇu strides by the sacrificer. At each step he has to utter a particular formula. In the MS YB *mantras* (MS I, 4, 2), we find only three formulas, which means that the sacrificer takes three steps, in agreement with the old Ṛg-vedic tradition of the three Viṣṇu strides (climbing up the three worlds). But in the KS list of *mantras* (KS V, 5) we find *four* formulas, which means that one more step has been added to the traditional list (in order to reach all the directions of space). A similar shift from the original traditions can be found in the Atharvanic tradition : in AVŚ X, 5, 25-35 we find list of *mantras* for *ten* Viṣṇu-strides of the sacrificer.

The tricky question is now to determine whether KS *mantras* are older than those of TS, or if it is the opposite.

2) Comparing KS and TS *mantras*

Both KS and TS *mantras* correspond to a more developed state of the ritual than the MS *mantras*. The TS list of *mantras* is closer to that of KS than to that of the MS, while it also features characteristics which seem to come from a tradition different than that of MS/KS. We can find a good illustration of this phenomena in the formulas for the Viṣṇu-strides of the

¹ This social difference has already been seen by Nishimura (2019) in the case of the MS and KS versions of the formula *dévāḥ pitarah pítaro devāḥ*.

sacrificer. Just as the KS (and unlike the MS), the TS has *four* formulas, but the wording of the TS formulas differs from that of the KS (while the wording of the KS formulas is close to that of the MS) : in the MS we have (for the first step) *viṣṇuḥ pṛthivyāṁ vyākramṣta gāyatrēṇa chāndasā, nīrbhaktaḥ sā yāṁ dviṣmó* ; in KS *pṛthivīm viṣṇur vyākramṣta gāyatrēṇa chāndasā, nīrbhakto yaṁ dviṣmo* ; but in the TS *viṣṇoḥ krāmo 'sy abhimātihā, gāyatrēṇa chāndasā pṛthivīm ānu ví krame, nīrbhaktaḥ sā yāṁ dviṣmās* – this TS wording perhaps shows an influence from AVŚ X, 5, 25.

As far as the development of the list of *mantras* is concerned, the KS is somewhat comparable to the TS, but in a puzzling way. In some cases, the TS *mantras* are more developed than those of the KS, and in other cases it is the reverse. For example, TS I, 6, 2, 1 has formulas to be uttered before the yoking of the fire, when the enclosing sticks are placed around : *dhruvò 'si dhruvò 'haṁ sajātēṣu bhūyāsam*, etc..., which are totally lacking in the KS (and the MS) ; TS I, 6, 5, 1 has a *mantra* to be uttered when the *dhruvā* is being filled up for the *samiṣṭayajus* oblation (*āpyāyatām dhruvā ghr̥tēna yajñām yajñām prāti*, etc...), which is lacking in the KS (but is also found in the White Yajurveda's Kāṇva Vājasaneyi Saṁhitā II, 5, 3).

Conversely, the *mantra devāḥ pītarah pītaro devāḥ*, present in the KS, is completely lacking in the TS ; the formulas for the fore-offerings have a less developed wording in the TS I, 6, 2 (*vasantām ṛtūnām prīṇāmi, sā mā prītāḥ prīṇātu*) than in the KS IV, 14 (*vasantām ṛtūnām prīṇāmi, sā mā prītāḥ prīṇātu, vasantāsyāhām devayajyāyórjasvān páyasvān bhūyāsam*) ; the *mantra brádhna pínvasva* has also a much less developed wording in the TS than in the KS (as we shall see later). There is sometimes a trend in the KS formulas to a kind of “verbal swelling” that we do not find in the TS.

In my opinion, the TS sections have made an eclectic use of the MS / KS tradition and have carefully knitted it with some other traditions ; this applies to the *mantras* as well as to the *brāhmaṇas*. As far as the *mantras* are concerned, I will try to support this opinion by examining the case of two *mantras*, a version of which appears in both KS and TS.

Let us first go back to the *mantra brádhna pínvasva* : it appears in TS I, 6, 3, 3, followed by *dádato me má kṣāyi kurvató me mópadasat* ; the wording here is exactly the same as in the KS. But in the KS version we find a sequel to this, namely *bhajatām bhagī mābhāgo bhakta ye brāhmaṇās somyās teṣām idaṁ havir nāsomyasyāpy asti*, which does *not* appear in the TS (but is present in the MS). We cannot suppose here that the TS version is the earlier one, and that the KS would have added a sequel to it, because here the KS version is dependant on the MS version (and has replaced the MS *brádhna pahí* by *bradhna pinvasva*). Moreover, we are led to note that the meaning of this TS shorter wording of the formula is rather vague, since any reference to the subject of the expiation is lacking in it – does it really have any relation to an expiation ? In the corresponding TS *brāhmaṇa* in I, 7, 1, 6, the answer is clearly negative. The “ruddy one” represents there the sacrifice, which has to swell, that is to say to be magnified ; it seems that “sacrifice” in this context means what it given to the gods, that is to say to the priests (who are the gods living on earth) – the sacrificer should only place in the priests what he gives to them, but not his cattle (this is supposed to prevent his cattle from accompanying the sacrificial fee). Such an explanation seems quite embarrassed, as though the TS redactors had wanted to keep on including a traditional *mantra* in their ritual, while not adhering any more to its traditional interpretation. This situation is not completely surprising, because in the TS ritual, the eating of a share of the sacrificial cake by a non-brahmin does not represent a ritual fault,

and so needs no expiation at all (the non-brahmin sacrificer was supposed to have been transformed into a brahmin as long as he was under consecration). In other words, the TS has completely modified the meaning of the earlier KS *mantra*.

As to the words *dádato me má kṣāyi kurvató me mópadasat*, they seem to have been linked by the TS with the next *mantra* in the list, which relates to the giving of the *anvāhāryà* or rice mess which served as a sacrificial fee for the officiating priests. This is the second *mantra* I want to examine now. Here too the TS has introduced a modification in the previous ritual. In the MS YB, the giving of the *anvāhāryà* took place during the closing rites, and the sacrificer did not have to utter a special *mantra* at that time. But in the KS, the *anvāhāryà* begins to acquire a grand status, with a deep symbolic meaning : it becomes “the share of Prajāpati”, endowed with an endless life force. It serves to grant *ákṣiti* to the sacrificer ; though the meaning of this word is not explicitly clarified in the KS, we can understand that it is related to the development of the search for unlimited *iṣṭāpūrtá* (which will grant an imperishable life in heaven after the earthly death). Thus in the KS the sacrificer has to utter this *mantra* ; *prajāpater bhāgo 'sy ūrjasvān payasvān akṣito 'sy akṣityai tvākṣito nāmāsi mā me kṣeṣṭhāḥ prāṇāpanāu me pāhi samānavyānāu me pāhy udānarūpe me pāhy ūrg asy ūrjaṃ mayi dhehy ā mā gamyāḥ*. The location of the formula in the KS list of *mantras* indicates that the giving of the *anvāhāryà* is still located among the closing rites (like in the MS). This kind of theorization of the role of the *anvāhāryà* was unknown to the MS YB, but we find it again in the TS I, 6, 3, 3, with another version of the same *mantra* : *prajāpater bhagò 'sy ūrjasvān páyasvān, prāṇāpanāu me pāhi samānavyānāu me pāhy udānavyānāu me pāhy ákṣito 'sy ákṣityai tvā má me kṣeṣṭhā amútrāmúsmiṃ loké*. The wording is more developed in the KS version of the *mantra*, which heavily emphasizes the notion of imperishability by repeatedly using the root *KṢI* ; but on the other hand, the TS gives a precision that is missing in the KS version, namely that this *mantra* is meant to avoid the perishing of the *iṣṭāpūrtá* in the heavenly world (*amútrāmúsmiṃ loké*) – the whole theory of the exhaustion of the *iṣṭāpūrtá* in heaven is further clearly explained in the corresponding TS *brāhmaṇa* (I, 7, 3, 4), while it is completely lacking in the KS. The Kaṭhas here may have wanted to keep secret this theory – but the secret could not be kept for a long time ! Here I would like to insist on the main difference between the KS and the TS versions : in the KS list of *mantras* (like in the MS) the giving of the *anvāhāryà* takes place at the time of the closing procedures of the sacrifice – this clearly is the oldest form of the ritual ; but in the TS list the *anvāhāryà* is given to the priests at a *much earlier* stage of the ritual sequence, namely after the eating of the *Idā* and before the *anuyājas*. In other words, the TS ritualists have modified the previous structure of the ritual – that which was previously in use among the Maitrayaṇīyas and the Kaṭhas – probably to give more symbolic importance to the giving of the *anvāhāryà* as a *dákṣiṇā* to the priests. This change might have been related to the growing development of the theory of the perishing of the *iṣṭāpūrtá* (which later on took the form of the *punar-mṛtyú* theory). This analysis leads me to think that the KS version of the *mantra* predates the TS version.

The anteriority of the KS compared to the TS is more obvious when it comes to the *brāhmaṇas*.

III Comparing MS, KS and TS *brāhmaṇas*

1) Comparing the general structures

As we have seen before, the MS *brāhmaṇa* section has a first layer (I, 4, 5-9) which comments on the list of MS *mantras* (without rearranging their order), then a layer containing miscellaneous remarks concerning some current aspects of the sacrifice (I, 4, 10), followed by a layer of supplementary elements dealing with some methods to make the sacrifice successful (including three new *mantras*) – for the convenience of the presentation I need not take here into account the section of the expiations and that of the optional *iṣṭis*. The KS list of *mantras* has then rearranged the MS *mantras* in their correct order, *including the three new ones*. We should thus expect the KS *brāhmaṇa* section commenting on this list of KS *mantras* to be more recent than the first three layers of the MS *brāhmaṇa* section.

The KS *brāhmaṇa* section has only two layers. The first one (from XXXI, 15 to XXXII, 6) comments upon the list of KS *mantras*, strictly following their order (that is to say following the order of their use within the ritual sequence) with some minor exceptions (the commentary upon the *mantra* for eating the share of the sacrificer appears immediately after the *bradhna pinvasva* formula, though the actual eating takes place only after the *samiṣṭayjus* oblation, and the *brāhmaṇa* concerning the use of the broom (*veda*) has also been shifted to an incorrect location). The content of the KS *brāhmaṇas* is closely related to the materials contained in the first and third layer of the MS *brāhmaṇa* section.

The second layer of the KS *brāhmaṇa* section corresponds to the second layer of the MS *brāhmaṇa* section, with very little change in the wording. To some extent, the plan of the KS imitates that of the MS up to its second layer (except that a part of the content of the MS third layer has been transferred into the KS first layer).

When we come to the TS *brāhmaṇas*, an important change has taken place. The two layers of the MS / KS *brāhmaṇa* section have been carefully merged into a coherent whole², which contains also some elements coming from a different tradition. I will give only one example of this intelligent synthesis. In I, 6, 7 the TS *brāhmaṇa* section begins, in a perfectly logical way, with some general considerations on the nature of the New and Full Moon sacrifice, which are taken (with some modifications) from the first layer of the MS / KS *brāhmaṇa* section : *yáthā vái samṛtasomá evám vā eté samṛtayajñá yád darśapūrṇamāsáu, kásya váha devá yajñám āgáchanti kásya vā ná, bahúnám yájamānānām yó vái devátāḥ púrvaḥ parigrhñāti sá enāḥ śvó bhūté yajata* (// to MS I, 4, 5 and KS XXXI, 15). The next sentence comes from the second layer of the MS / KS *brāhmaṇa* section : *etád vái devánām āyátanaḥ yád āhavaníyo 'ntarāgní pasūnám gárhapatyo manusyānām anvāhāryàpácanaḥ pitṛñám* (// to MS I, 4, 10 and KS XXXII, 7). The third sentence is again a modified version of the content of the first layer of the MS / KS *brāhmaṇa* section : *agníḥ grhñāti svá eváyátane devátāḥ párigrhñāti táḥ śvó bhūté yajate* (// to MS I, 4, 5 and KS XXXI, 15). The fourth sentence contains original materials, foreign to the MS / TS tradition : *vraténa vái médhyo 'gnír vratápatir...*

² And also an element of the MS third layer which had not been taken into account by the KS *brāhmaṇa* section, MS I, 6, 11, 1.

We can thus see that the TS *brāhmaṇa* section has been preceded in time by the MS and KS *brāhmaṇa* sections. I will now give two illustrations showing more clearly the evolution of the ritual from the MS *brāhmaṇa* to that of the KS, and from that of the KS to that of the TS.

2) The theme of the ritual appropriation of the deities

In I, 4, 5 the prose commentary of the MS *mantras* begins with these words : *saṃṛtayajñō vā eṣā yād darśapūrṇamāsāu, kāsya vāha yakṣyamāṇasya devatā yajñām āgāchanti kāsya vā ná, bahūnāṃ samānām áhar yájamānānām yáḥ pūrve dyúr agníṃ grhṇāti sá śvó bhūtē devatā abhíyajate*). We are told that the sacrificer who wants the deities to come to his sacrifice must “appropriate” (*grhṇāti*) the fire (that is to say the *āhavanīya*) on the day preceding the sacrifice : according to Mānava Śrauta-sūtra I, 4, 1, 7, this is done by putting a log in it (to kindle it) while repeating the *vihavya mantra*, *māmāgne várco vihavéṣv astu*, which is the first *mantra* of the MS list. In this way he indeed “appropriates” the deities (that is to say binds them to come to his sacrifice on the next day), *devatā vā etát agrahīt tāḥ śvó bhūtè 'bhiyajate*.

The beginning of the parallel passage in KS XXXI, 15 resembles that of the MS, except for some details (*yakṣyamāṇasya* is omitted, *agníṃ* is replaced by *devatāḥ*, *devatā abhíyajate* is replaced by *yajñām āgacchanti*). But the process of the appropriation is explained in a more logical way than in MS : first, the KS version explains that the gods will come to the sacrifice of the sacrificer who appropriates them the previous day ; and then, it adds a traditional sentence, *agnis sarvā devatāḥ*, in order to explain why it is by appropriating the (*āhavanīya*) fire that the sacrificer is able to appropriate the gods. On the other hand, the MS version seemingly took it for granted that the deities are appropriated by appropriating the fire. We will see later on another example of the trend of the KS redactors to rationalize the presentation of the MS version.

The general meaning of the passage is the same in both MS and KS : since there is a competition between the neighbouring sacrificers to obtain the presence of the gods when the offerings are made on the day of the sacrifice, the appropriation of these gods has to take place on the *preceding* day, *pūrvedyúḥ*. To my mind, this means that at the time when both MS and KS *brāhmaṇas* were redacted, the common usage was to try to appropriate the deities on the very day of the offerings, and that the MS (followed by the KS) introduced a new procedure for surpassing the rival sacrificers who followed this common usage, which consisted in appropriating the deities *earlier* than they tried to do, that is on the *upavasatha* day.

I find a confirmation of this interpretation in the fact that the MS *brāhmaṇas* do keep track of ritual procedures by which the appropriation of the deities took place on the very day of the sacrifice – even though the text prescribes a new procedure of appropriating the deities on the previous day. It is obviously difficult for ritualists to completely remove an older state of the ritual ! More precisely, one can find *two* distinct moments at the beginning of the day of the offerings, when text of the MS mentions an appropriation of the deities ; one of these mentions is located in the first layer of the MS *brāhmaṇas*, and the other in the second layer.

In I, 4, 5, the MS *brāhmaṇa* comments on a *mantra* which the sacrificer has to utter after the beginning of the ritual procedures performed on the day of the offerings : *agníṃ hótāram úpa tām huvā, íti yéna havír nirvapsyánt syát tād abhíṃṛsed, devatānāṃ vā eṣā grāho, devatā vā*

etád agrahīt. Agni, as the god of fire, is summoned to the sacrificial ground, to carry the offering to the deities ; this happens as the *adhvaryú* is about to pour the sacrificial material (grains for making the cakes) out of the cart into the winnowing basket – the sacrificer touches the vessel or the ladle by the means of which this grain is poured. This *mantra* appears to be suitable for appropriating the gods, since it appropriates the fire deity so that the oblation may be carried to the gods ; moreover the end of the formula invites the gods to enjoy this oblation (*vyántu devā havīṣo me asyā devā yantu sumanasyāmānāḥ*) – though the cake has not been baked nor offered yet (this is only making the gods look at the menu of the meal !). The MS thus mentions that this is the appropriation (*grāha*) of the deities.

The second layer of the MS *brāhmaṇa* (I, 4, 10) mentions another occurrence of the appropriation of the deities that takes place at a slightly later stage of the ritual, when the *adhvaryú* “pours the materials for the sacrificial cakes” (*puroḍāśśyān ā vapati*) in the mortar (to crush them), while saying *agnér jihvāsi vācō visárjanam* (since this is the end of a period of ritual silence). How could this be a symbolic appropriation of the deities, as the MS eventually states (*devātānām vā eṣá grāho, devatā vā etád agrahīt*) ? This is not clear, but we can understand that at this stage also, for those who have the knowledge of it (*yá evām veda*), preparing the food for the gods is a way to invite them to come and eat the offering of this food that will be made later on, since the MS quotes here an opinion of Aruṇa Aupaveśi according to which the ritual food is sent to the gods even before it has been formally offered (*āhutāsu vā ahám āhutiṣu devatā havyaṃ gamáyāmi*).

It looks as though the time when the deities are appropriated has been progressively put forward, from some location within the day of the offerings, to the day before. The oldest practice could perhaps have been to appropriate the deities when all the oblation-materials (including the cakes) are placed on the altar (just before kindling the fire for starting the offering procedure), since both MŚS I, 4, 1, 17 and AŚS IV, 8, 6, though late works, mention that at that time the sacrificer has to utter the *vihavya mantra* (which serves to win the presence of the gods against rival sacrificers).

The content of the KS *brāhmaṇas* concerning the topic of the appropriation of the deities does not differ much from that of the MS *brāhmaṇas* : here we find again the same three occurrences of the appropriation of the deities : 1. on the *upavasatha* day (XXXI, 15) ; 2. when the sacrificer touches the vessel containing the grains while uttering *agnir hotopa taṃ huve* (XXXI, 15) ; 3. when the grain is poured into the mortar (XXXII, 7). However, when stating the second occurrence, the text of the KS shows a certain uneasiness at the idea of repeating a procedure which has already been performed the day before, since it tries to find a way to justify this repetition : *durgrahā vai devatā durgraho yajñāḥ*. This means : we are not sure of succeeding the first time, so it is safer to do it a second time. And this sentence also adds a new idea which was not found in the MS version : we do not have only to appropriate the deities, we also have to appropriate the sacrifice itself, or to take hold of it. Still, the KS does not explain here what “appropriating the sacrifice” could exactly mean, but at least the second occurrence of the appropriation process gets here some specific function. I believe that this remark inserted by the KS betrays some reflexive distance from the MS heritage, which it tries to rationalize.

The passage of the TS concerning the appropriation of the deities on the *upavasatha* day has features which distinguish it from the MS and KS parallels. Its beginning runs as follows : *yáthā vai samṛtasomā evaṃ vā eté samṛtayajñā yád darśapūrṇamāsáu, kásya váha devā yajñám*

*āgāchanti kásya vā ná, bahūnām yájamānānām yó vái devátāḥ pūrvāḥ parigrhñāti sá enāḥ śvó bhūtē yajate*³. There are two main differences : the TS adds an analogy with the *soma* sacrifice (*yáthā vái samṛtasomā*), and above all it replaces *pūrvedyūḥ* with *pūrvāḥ*. The word *pūrvāḥ* applies to the sacrificer : it is no more said – as it was the case in the MS and the KS – that in order to be the one among the neighbouring sacrificers who obtains the presence of the gods, it is enough to appropriate them on the day before the offerings ; instead, it is said that one has to be *the first one* to appropriate them, and in the context this means that one has to be *the first one on the day preceding the offerings*. Most sacrificers now try to appropriate the gods on the day preceding the offerings, and the competition between sacrificers has been shifted to the *upavasatha* day itself. This means that enough time has elapsed since the MS introduced the idea of appropriating the deities on the eve of the day of the offerings, so that this MS/KS usage has started to become a standard practice. The TS *brāhmaṇas* thus reflect a state of the ritual which is more recent than that which is described in the KS and the TS.

The continuation of the TS *brāhmaṇas* keeps track (in I, 6, 8, 3-4) of the second occurrence of the appropriation of the deities as it appeared in the MS and KS parallels – but the third one is not mentioned any more. We notice that the TS version is closer to that of KS XXXI, 15, than to that of MS I, 4, 5 : *yó vái devébhyaḥ pratiprócyā yajñéna yájate juṣānte 'sya devá havyám, havír nirupyámāṇam abhí mantrayetāgnīm hótāram ihá táṃ huva íti, devébhya evá pratiprócyā yajñéna yajate, juṣānte 'sya devá havyám, eṣá vái yajñásya gráho gṛhītvaívā yajñéna yajate*. To be more precise, the TS here only mentions the appropriation *of the sacrifice* (*yajñásya gráha*), but not the appropriation *of the deities*. We have seen that it is the KS XXXI, 15 which has introduced the notion of an appropriation of the sacrifice in the sentence *durgrahā vai devatā durgraho yajñah*, to comment on the formula *agnir hotopa taṃ huve* (*agnīm hótāram ihá táṃ huve* in the TS). This TS version represents the outcome of a tradition from which it has ruled out what seemed illogical (the three successive appropriations of the deities), but kept what seemed acceptable (the association of the second appropriation with the sacrifice). The notion of a *yajñásya gráha* is still not really explained, but at least the TS here makes it clear that it is necessary to announce the sacrifice to the gods before undertaking the offerings.

3) The theme of the ritual fires

The rest of the text of TS I, 6, 7 then presents the symbolism of the three fires used in the *śrauta* ritual ; this passage has parallels in MS I, 4, 10 and KS XXXII, 7.

The MS version runs as follows : *devátānām vā etád āyátanam yád āhavanīyo, yád antarāgní tāt paśūnām, manuṣyāṇām gārhapatyāḥ, pitṛṇām odanapácanaḥ, sárva ha vā asya yakṣyamāṇasya devatā yajñám á gachanti yá evám véda ; pūrvām cāgním áparam ca páristarítavá āha, manuṣyāṇām vái návāvasānam, priyám návāvasānam evákar medhyatváya*. This is at first sight very puzzling, because the symbolism of the fires is presented here as a secret knowledge which will attract the gods to the sacrifice (is this one more method to

³ The wording is somewhat closer to that of KS than to that of MS, since like KS, TS omits MS *yakṣyamāṇasya*, and replaces MS *agnim gṛhñāti* with *devátāḥ... parigrhñāti*. In the following, the TS will try to explain (like the KS) why the appropriation of the fire performs an appropriation of the deities, but not in the way the KS does it : it will use some information contained in MS I, 4, 10 / KS XXXII, 7 concerning the *āhavanīya*.

appropriate the deities ? or simply a condition to be met for the gods to agree to come ?) – while in truth this knowledge is the very basis of the *śrauta* ritual, and as such is by no means a hidden doctrine. I find no other explanation than thinking that this passage dates back to a remote time when many sacrificers were still not well acquainted with the basics of the *śrauta* ritual (if we believe with M. Witzel that this kind of liturgy has originated from a reformation of older modes of sacrifice). We should also note that the meaning of the second part of this passage is very unclear : after saying that on the *upavasatha* day the fires are strewn with *darbha* grass around their edges, the text mentions a new dwelling for human beings – that might refer to the sacrificial ground, or to the place near the fires where the sacrificer and his wife are going to sleep on the *upavasatha* night – and ends with the idea that he (the *adhvaryu*) has made a “pleasant new dwelling” (*priyām nāvāvasānam*) which is fit for the sacrifice – but what does these words refer to ? Is it different from the dwelling for the human beings ? Is it the *vedi* or the *āhavanīya*, which is a new dwelling, fit for sacrifice ? To whom is it pleasing – men, gods, or both ? This is not explained at all.

The text of KS XXII, 7 is close to that of MS, except that the knowledge of the symbolism of the fire is no more presented as a secret doctrine which is able to attract the deities to the sacrifice : *devatānām vā etad āyatanaṃ yad āhavanīyo yad antarāgnī tat paśūnām manuṣyāṅām gārhapatyo ’nvāhāryapacanaḥ pitṛṅnām, pūrvaṃ cāgnim aparaṃ ca paristarītavā āha, manuṣyāṅām in nvai navāvasānam, priyaṃ navāvasānam evākran medhyatvāya, sarvā ha vā asya yakṣyamānasya devatā yajñam āgacchanti ya evaṃ veda*. We can suppose that the symbolism of the fires had become at that time a rather common knowledge, so that it could not be taken any more as an efficient means to appropriate the deities. The sentence explaining the symbolism of the fires had thus become no longer useful, but the KS has still kept it and has not given up following its source. The KS has only moved the original MS sentence *sarvā ha vā asya yakṣyamānasya devatā yajñam ā gacchanti yā evaṃ veda* to the end of the passage, so that now the secret knowledge which can attract the gods to the sacrifice concerns the fact that men (and gods ?) have a new dwelling, and that the new dwelling is “pleasant” and “fit for the sacrifice”. In order for all this to make sense, we have to suppose that the new dwelling is pleasing *to the gods*, and that the knowledge of this can attract them to the sacrifice. But the wording of the text of the KS is still unclear, just as it is the case in MS.

The materials contained in the KS have been reorganized by the TS I, 6, 7, which has an original composition, even though the borrowed elements can still be recognized. The TS uses them after explaining that the gods will go to the sacrifice of the sacrificer who has been the first to appropriate them on the preceding day : *etad vai devānām āyatanaṃ yad āhavanīyo ’ntarāgnī paśūnām gārhapatyo manuṣyāṅām anvāhāryapacanaḥ pitṛṅnām ; agnīm grhṇāti svā evāyātane devatāḥ parigrhṇāti, tāḥ śvó bhūté yajate*. While the symbolism of the fires was left without any function of its own in the text of the KS, it acquires a logical function in its new context in the TS, since it serves to explain why by appropriating the *āhavanīya* on the eve of the sacrifice, the sacrificer appropriates all the deities *svā evāyātane* “in their own abode”. The TS fills the gap that the KS text had created when it had dropped the function attributed by the MS to the knowledge of the symbolism of the fires.

The TS *brāhmaṇa* goes on to mention the taking of the vow on the *upavasatha* day, since it follows the chronological order of the ritual sequence, before coming to the passage dealing with the strewing of the fires : *upastīryaḥ pūrvaś cāgnīr āparaś céty āhur ; manuṣyāḥ in nvā úpastīrṇam ichānti kīm u devā yéṣāṃ nāvāvasānam, úpāsmiñ chvó yakṣyamāṇe devatā vasanti*

yá evám vidván agnīm upastrṇāti). Even though the exact wording here differs from that of the KS (except the use of the particles *in nvái* !), the TS just like the KS links to the “new dwelling” the secret knowledge which will attract the gods to the sacrifice. But, whereas the text of the KS was fully unclear in its formulation, the TS gives us a clear gloss which enables us to understand what it is all about : both men and gods like places which have been bestrewed (they are pleasing to both of them), and this is truer of the gods, who now have a new dwelling – the one which has just be bestrewed (the *āhavanīya* ?). Here the ritual seems to have to be referred to some kind of psychology of the gods : if the sacrificer performs the strewing with the idea that it will please the gods, then the gods will wish to attend his sacrifice the next day ; what will retain the gods to the sacrifice is thus the sacrificer’s conscious intention to please them. I would say that at the time of the TS version, the original MS material has gone through a complete process of clarification and rationalization.

We see in the case of this passage how the redaction of the TS *brāhmaṇas* takes place at a later stage than those of the MS and the KS, which did not have the same concern for a clear and well-ordered explanation of the ritual. Nevertheless, we have also seen that the process of rationalization of the original MS materials started with the redaction of the KS *brāhmaṇas*.