

The Efficacy
of
Sacrifice

Clemens Cavallin

THE EFFICACY OF SACRIFICE

THE EFFICACY OF SACRIFICE

Correspondences

in the Ṛgvedic Brāhmaṇas

by

Clemens Cavallin

Göteborg 2003

Skrifter utgivna vid
Institutionen för religionsvetenskap,
Göteborgs Universitet
Nr. 29

© Clemens Cavallin 2003
ISSN 1102-9773
ISBN 91-88348-29-6

Göteborg University
Department of Religious Studies
Box 200
405 30 Göteborg
Sweden

*For Natalie,
Gabriel, Rafael and Monica*

Contents

<i>Contents</i>	<i>VII</i>
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>XI</i>
<i>Abbreviations</i>	<i>XIII</i>
<i>Introduction</i>	<i>1</i>
1.1 Issues	1
1.2 Delimitation of the material	9
1.3 Ṛgvedic Brāhmaṇas	13
1.3.1 Chronology	13
1.3.2 Editions and translations	14
1.3.3 Contents of the Ṛgveda Brāhmaṇas	15
1.4 Method	18
1.5 Previous research	21
<i>Sacrificial Theory</i>	<i>35</i>
2.1 Evolutionary theories of sacrifice	36
2.2 Sociology of sacrifice	40
2.3 Psychology of sacrifice	43
2.4 The discarding and reappearance of evolutionary explanations	45
2.5 Sacrifice as dependent upon the mind	51
<i>How the Correspondences are Expressed</i>	<i>63</i>
3.1 Different ways of expressing correspondences	63
3.2 Nominal Sentences	65
3.2.1 Introduction	65
3.2.2 The nature of nominal sentences	66
3.2.3 Complete identification	74
3.2.4 The sharing of characteristics — partial identification	79
3.2.5 Inclusion in a class	82
3.2.6 Predication of a function or role	83
3.2.7 Causal relation	84
3.2.8 Word order	85
3.2.9 Variants of nominal sentences in AiB	92
3.3 Verbal sentences	97
3.3.1 Introduction	97
3.3.2 Sentences with copula	98
3.3.3 Dative	99
3.3.4 Instrumental	99
3.4 Words that indicate correspondences	100

3.4.1 Introduction	100
3.4.2 Bandhu	100
3.4.3 Rūpa	102
3.4.4 Āyatana.....	103
3.5 Myth	105
3.6 Analogy.....	107
3.7 Conclusion.....	109
<i>The System of Correspondences in AiB.....</i>	<i>111</i>
4.1 Introductory remarks.....	111
4.2 List 1. The frequent correspondences in AiB pañcikā 1–5.....	113
4.3 The direction of the correspondences	122
4.4 The inverted correspondences	127
4.4.1 Introduction	127
4.4.2 Agni and gāyatrī.....	128
4.4.3 Indra and triṣṭubh	129
4.4.4 Indra's vajra and speech.....	129
4.4.5 Breath and Vāyu.....	130
4.4.6 Seed and breath	131
4.4.7 Virāj and food.....	132
4.4.8 The hymn and the people	133
4.5 The most frequent correspondences	133
4.5.1 Introduction	133
4.5.2 Cattle and jagatī.....	134
4.5.3 Cattle and pairing	136
4.5.4 Bṛhaspati and brahman.....	137
4.5.5 Prajāpati and the year	138
4.5.6 Anuṣṭubh and speech.....	139
4.5.7 Triṣṭubh and strength.....	140
4.5.8 The libations for pairs of gods as connected to breath.....	141
4.5.9 The hymn and the people; the nivid and the kṣatra.....	142
4.5.10 The fivefold sacrifice and the fivefold cattle	142
4.5.11 Sattra.....	143
4.6 Conclusion.....	146
<i>Comparison with Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa.....</i>	<i>149</i>
5.1 Introductory remarks	149
5.2 List 2. Correspondences that occur in both AiB and KB	151
5.3 The direction of the correspondences	158
5.4 Inverted correspondences	161
5.4.1 Introduction	161
5.4.2 Cattle and the metres: pañkti, bṛhatī, jagatī.....	161
5.4.3 Agni and Ahir budhnyas	162
5.4.4 Indra, his vajra and the metre triṣṭubh.....	163
5.4.5 Breath and Vāyu.....	164

5.4.6 The metres and the <i>soma</i> -pressings.....	165
5.4.7 The pragātha sāman and cattle	166
5.4.8 Sacrifice and Prajāpati.....	167
5.5 The most frequent correspondences	169
5.5.1 Introduction	169
5.5.2 Correspondences that occur throughout the texts	170
5.5.3 Correspondences concentrated in specific text passages	171
5.5.4 Correspondences that function as parts of formulas	174
5.6 Conclusion.....	180
<i>The Vital Powers.....</i>	<i>183</i>
6.1 The breaths and the system of ritual correspondences	183
6.2 The correspondences of breath common to AiB and KB.....	185
6.2.1 Vāyu	185
6.2.2 Savitṛ	190
6.2.3 The upāṃśu and antaryāma libations	190
6.2.4 Vanaspati.....	192
6.2.5 The fore-offerings	194
6.2.6 The introductory and concluding sacrifices	195
6.2.7 The offerings to the seasons	196
6.2.8 Vā lakhilya	196
6.3 The ‘<i>ad hoc</i>’ correspondences of the breaths in AiB	197
6.3.1 Introduction	197
6.3.2. List 3. The correspondences of breath in AiB <i>pañcikā</i> 1–5	198
6.3.3 Basic principles for the formulation of correspondences.....	201
6.3.4 Correspondences to breath that seem <i>ad hoc</i>	209
6.4 Conclusion.....	212
<i>Sacrifice as an act.....</i>	<i>215</i>
<i>Summary.....</i>	<i>223</i>
<i>Appendix 1 Correspondences in AiB pañcikā 1–5</i>	<i>233</i>
<i>Appendix 2 Correspondences in KB not noted by K. Mylius</i>	<i>251</i>
<i>Appendix 3</i>	<i>253</i>
<i>Bibliography</i>	<i>255</i>
Primary Sources (Texts and Translations)	255
Secondary Sources	257
<i>Index of Tables</i>	<i>277</i>

Acknowledgements

Albrecht Wezler has characterised the project of collecting the vast amount of correspondences from the Vedic texts as a self-sacrifice, an *ātmayajña*,¹ a term which also, albeit in a different sense, points toward the topic of the last chapter. The more modest undertaking of this book would, however, not have been possible without the help primarily of my supervisors, Professor Folke Josephson (Sanskrit and the comparative study of Indo-European languages) and Professor Britt-Mari Näsström (history of religions). I especially want to express my gratitude to Professor Josephson who has so selflessly, and with such energy, read and commented upon my drafts, particularly considering the turbulence surrounding his department at the faculty of humanities at Gothenburg University. I see it as a great loss that it is no longer possible to study Sanskrit in Gothenburg. Other persons whose help has been decisive for me in important phases of the project are: Dr. Judith Josephson, who gave me advice concerning linguistic issues; the members of the Mumbai Focolare and Dr. H. G. Ranade who guided me during my stay in Mumbai and Pune; Professor Asko Parpola and Kenneth Zysk, who provided me with good advice in the early stages of my work. I also want to thank Kristoffer Pettersson, who assisted me with proofreading in the hectic last period of writing and the Löfströms of Nedomkull for help with digital matters.

I have furthermore benefited from the comments given at the higher seminar of history of religions at Gothenburg University, and the discussions at the informal seminars of Kored have also been of great help, especially in the formulation of the fundamental issues. The staff at the university library moreover deserve recognition for their help with acquiring rare books and hard-to-get articles.

¹ Wezler, 1996, p. 518.

This project has, however, ultimately been dependent upon the support and encouragement of my wife, who has born the weight of the undertaking, as a real *coredemptrix*.

Alboga Hallåkra, March 2003

C. C.

Abbreviations

AĀ	Aitareya Āraṇyaka
acc.	accusative
AiB	Aitareya Brāhmaṇa
ĀŚ	Āśvalāyana Śrautasūtra
AU	Aitareya Upaniṣad
AV	Atharvaveda
BU	Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad
ch.	Chapter
chs.	Chapters
CU	Chāndogya Upaniṣad
Diss.	dissertation
edn.	edition
ed.	editor
eds.	editors
esp.	especially
fem.	feminine
gen.	genitive
ind.	indicative
instr.	instrumental
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society
JB	Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa
KapS.	Kapiṣṭhala Saṃhitā
KB	Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa
KKS	Kapiṣṭhala-Kaṭha Saṃhitā
KU	Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad
KŚ	Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra
KS	Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā
L	The edition of KB by Lindner (1887)
lit.	literally
loc.	locative
m.	masculine
misc.	miscellaneous
MS	Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā
MW	<i>A Sanskrit-English Dictionary</i> , by Sir Monier Monier-Williams
n.	neuter
nom.	nominative
opt.	optative

P	Ṛgvedāntargataṃ Śāṅkhāyanabrāhmaṇam (1911, Poona)
p.	person
part.	participle
PB	Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa
pl.	plural
pres.	present
publ.	published
ṚV	Ṛgveda
sing.	singular
ŚĀ	Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka
ŚB	Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa
ŚB	Ṣaḍviṃśa Brāhmaṇa
SV	Sāmaveda Saṃhitā
sk.	Sanskrit
TB	Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa
trans.	translator
TS	Taittirīya Saṃhitā
var.	variant
WAR	<i>Wörterbuch des altindischen Rituals</i> , by Klaus Mylius, 1995
WSD	<i>Wörterbuch Sanskrit-Deutsch</i> , by Klaus Mylius, 1997
YV	Yajurveda

Introduction

1.1 Issues

Sacrifice has been an important way to communicate with the world of the gods in most religious cultures. The objects sacrificed or offered could be almost anything that has a value for man, such as vegetables, animals, and even human beings.¹ In a similar fashion, the expressed purposes of sacrifices and offerings cover nearly any human wish, ranging from down-to-earth desires such as food and wealth to more lofty ones like possession of heaven and immortality.

During the last two centuries, many scholars have tried (often within their more general theories of religion) to come to grips with the concept of sacrifice and the acts that it denotes.² Sacrifice is a central religious act, and theories of religion naturally have to explain from which sphere of reality the inclination towards sacrificing receives its impetus, or to which goal it is an efficient means — if the theories are to be deemed successful.³

¹ It is hard to draw a clear dividing line between offering and sacrifice; see e.g. Smith, R., 1997, p. 197; Henninger, 1987, p. 545f. Cf. Hubert and Mauss (1898) who took the destruction of the victim/oblation as an essential element of sacrifice. Cf. a Vedic definition of sacrifice (*yajña*), in KŚ 1.2.2 (KŚ, 1978, p. 5), which does not make this distinction, *dravyam devatā tyāgaḥ*, “The offering material (of which the oblations are made), the deity and the act of giving away (the oblation to the deity) (are the three main aspects of a sacrifice).” Raymond Firth, on the other hand, treats sacrifice as a subtype of offering, the *differentia* being that sacrifice implies a substantial offering and that the resources are limited; sacrifice is thus “giving up something at a cost” (Firth, 1963, p. 13). Firth thereby emphasises the dependence of sacrifices upon their economic and ecological contexts, and the distinction between sacrifice and offering is thus relative to factors outside the ritual realm proper.

² Denotation in the logical-philosophical sense, i.e. to refer. Henceforth the uses of denotation and connotation will follow this tradition and not the use prevalent in science of language and history of literature; see Lübcke, 1993, p. 104.

³ Notwithstanding the central place that sacrifices often occupy, some religions have taken a stand against sacrificial practices — although they tend to incorporate some sacrificial notions in their traditions. For a collection of such attitudes, see Widengren, 1969, pp. 321–327; Clooney, 1985.

The task has thus been to pinpoint the efficacy of sacrifice, to lay bare its compelling mechanisms. The concept of efficacy denotes, in this context, the mechanisms that enable an act to achieve a certain goal, and the adjective ‘efficacious’ could thus be defined as “capable of or successful in producing an intended result”.⁴ That is, the efficacy of a sacrificial act is relative to the effects or functions it is believed to be able to bring about. To locate the efficacy of a sacrificial ritual, it is first necessary to single out an effect or a function toward which the sacrifice could be said to constitute an efficient means; and, on the other hand, to deprive a sacrificial act of efficacy, one has to define it as utterly incapable of attaining some specific end.⁵ It is thus clear that the views on the efficacy of a sacrifice can differ considerably between the scholar and the participant of the sacrificial cult. A scholar could, on the basis of his ontology or methodological constraints, judge the cult practitioner’s description of the goal of the ritual as impossible to attain, and thus search for the ‘real’ goal in a different sphere of reality. The efficacy of sacrifice, according to such a scholar, will hence be relative to this goal of the ritual, a goal that perhaps is not perceived by the practitioners themselves.⁶ Nevertheless, one could consider both the scholar and the theologian as propelled forward in their work by a similar cluster of questions, namely, how it is that sacrifices can bring about something, or, if they are deemed to be without power, why they nevertheless are performed.

⁴ Hanks, 1989, p. 397.

⁵ For such a discussion in the Vedic context, see Smith, B., 1996b; and for a secular ritual in Germany in 1992, see Günter, 1995.

⁶ The notion of efficacy has e.g. been used in the discussion of two different paradigms within ritual studies, viz. the symbolical approach that tries to decode ritual actions as though they are symbols of cognitive content, a method which is opposed by those that emphasise the affective or performative aspects of rituals. Schieffelin e.g. writes, “I will support the claim that symbols are effective less because they communicate meaning (though this is also important) than because, through performance, meanings are formulated in a social rather than cognitive space, and the participants are engaged with the symbols in the interactional creation of a performance reality, rather than merely being informed by them as knowers.” (Schieffelin, 1985, p. 707; see also Thompson, 1978 and Strathern, 1997.) The symbolic approach, moreover, carries within it a tension between the goal and efficacy of the ritual as it is literally expressed by the cult practitioners, e.g. healthy offspring, and the symbolic meanings, i.e. the communicative efficacy, decoded by the scholar. See Ahern, 1979.

A starting-point for the reflection upon sacrifice was provided in the 19th century by the theory of evolution, which allowed scholars to situate the primordial sacrifice and its different manifestations in a logical chain, leading from the simple to the complicated. However, no consensus about the details of the sacrificial evolution could be reached; different theories put emphasis on different aspects. Some anthropologists, for example, considered the act of presenting an object as a gift to the gods, as the most primitive form of sacrifice, from which the other sacrificial practices and aspects had evolved. According to other scholars, the sacrificial institution was a reflection of transactions going on in society, and thus some decided for the community meal as the original form of sacrifice.

In Chapter 1, some theories that try to explain why sacrifices have played and are playing such a pivotal role in many religions will be discussed. This general discussion of sacrifice will be followed by a detailed analysis of a concrete case: the Vedic sacrificial world-view.⁷ Vedic material has occasionally been used when constructing general theories of sacrifice, as the Vedic texts⁸ are both comprehensive and ancient. Hubert and Mauss, for instance, used the sacrificial cults recorded in the Old Testament and the Vedic corpus for their sociological theory of sacrifice. Moreover, Frits

⁷ World-view is, however, an imprecise notion; for an attempt to define it more narrowly, see Jones, 1972. His article was followed by a discussion; see esp. the criticism put forward by Walter J. Ong (1972). My conception of world-view is more inclined toward what Jones (1972, p. 84) calls ‘the cognitive aspect’, than toward seeing the world-view as ‘a set of feelings’, even though the importance of values and emotions connected with cognitions are acknowledged; as Mendelson (1972, p. 576) writes, “While emphasising the cognitive aspect of ideas, beliefs, and attitudes, a world view cannot be clearly separated from its normative and affective aspects.”

⁸ The Vedic ‘texts’ were not initially written but oral. They have been transmitted and preserved from teacher to pupil through generations until our times, although they were also written down at some time. It is not easy to say exactly when, due to the lack of old manuscripts. See Gonda, 1975b, p. 18. The Vedic discourses have been preserved with astonishing accuracy, despite their oral character — a feat that has been accomplished mainly through special mnemonic techniques. We can therefore speak of ‘oral texts’. That is, the fixation of discourse in human memory is in some respects similar to the encoding of discourse in a readable medium, a process described by Paul Ricoeur as follows: “...writing renders the text autonomous with respect to the intention of the author. What the text signifies no longer coincides with what the author meant...”. (Ricoeur, 1992, p. 139). However, the fixation of Vedic oral discourse is perhaps even more akin to the saving of a text file in the memory of a computer.

Staal built his theory of the meaninglessness of ritual mainly on Vedic rituals.⁹ On the other hand, theories of religion and sacrifice have also influenced the interpretations of the Veda. The writings of Jan Gonda, for example, display influences from the phenomenology of religion, and he thus states in *The Vision of the Vedic Poets* that if one wishes to study Vedic religion, it is necessary to have “a knowledge of the fundamentals of the ‘phenomenology’ of religion — or comparative study of religion...”.¹⁰ It is, moreover, possible to discern influences from theories of ‘primitive’ thinking in some Indological interpretations of the *brāhmaṇa* world-view,¹¹ influences that naturally became less apparent when the theories of primitive mentality began to lose their position. The interpretations of the Vedic world-view are thus interconnected with general questions of what sacrifice is and how it functions. The unique Vedic material is, at the same time, of importance for theories of sacrifice.

The connections between general theories of sacrifice and earlier investigations of the Vedic scriptures will, however, not be used as an argument for an arbitrary mixture of these two levels of, respectively, explanation and interpretation. As far as possible the investigation of the Vedic views upon sacrificial efficacy will be conducted in such a way that the texts are made to speak according to their own principles and not in a distorted way. Nevertheless, it is impossible to uphold, in an absolute

⁹ Hubert, 1898; Staal, 1989. Moreover, in Thomas Lawson’s and Robert McCauley’s joint venture *Rethinking Religion—Connecting Cognition and Culture* (Lawson, 1990) the Vedic sacrifice *darśapūrṇamāsa iṣṭi* is used to illustrate their theory.

¹⁰ Gonda, 1963, p. 9. In the quoted passage he refers primarily to the (sub)discipline sometimes called Phenomenology of Religion, but his writings are also influenced by the heterogeneous ‘school’ with the same name; see the discussion later in this chapter, p. 25.

¹¹ For example, the designation of the *brāhmaṇa* world-view as *Vorwissenschaftliche Wissenschaft* by Oldenberg (1919). See also Schayer, 1925. There are, however, differences between the adjectives ‘primitive’ and *vorwissenschaftlich*, the latter pointing towards those features in a ‘primitive’ culture that are the first steps on the road toward science. In the context of the correspondences this could, for example, be the interest in and reflection upon causality, while the tendency to postulate identifications directed by magical interests is more characteristic, according to such an interpretation, of a primitive mentality. Oldenberg writes e.g. “Wie aber die Identifikationen der Brāhmaṇas nach rückwärts auf primitive Vorstellungen zurückweisen, deuten sie andererseits vorwärts auf das Tat tvam asi der Upaniṣad.” (Oldenberg, 1919, p. 123.)

manner, the distinction between the formulation, or use, of a general theory of sacrifice, and the study of the views of those who perform specific sacrifices. When interpreting, e.g., an old text, basic assumptions about the mechanisms governing the performance of sacrifices are used in the very act of making the statements of the text appear meaningful and logical — or illogical. Thus, it is very difficult to avoid distortions of the views expressed in the text, and the level of distortion seems to be partly dependent upon the accuracy of the general theory of sacrifice and religion that is used, either consciously or implicitly, by the interpreter.

The issue here is thus not primarily the distinction between the ‘prejudices’¹² of the scholar and the author of a religious text, as above in the discussion of the concept of efficacy, but the discrepancy between the theoretical part of the scholar’s *Vorverstehen* and the world. The use of the world-view that is expressed in the religious text does not automatically solve this problem, as the issue here is the explanation of human actions in terms of factors lying outside consciousness. That is, the acceptance of a medieval view of cosmos will perhaps, to some extent, make us understand more properly the thoughts and aims of medieval authors. However, such a view from inside the world-view studied will not help us in explaining actions performed in a medieval society in terms of causes and functions as biological, sociological, psychological and so forth.¹³ Moreover, the interpretation of an action, or an artefact conveying meaning, has to be set against a background of such explanations. It seems therefore that the success of interpretation is to a high degree dependent upon the basic theoretical assumptions governing the interpretation. One example is, as previously mentioned, the conception of a primitive mentality, which has been used as a tool when interpreting certain features of the Vedic world-view. Hence, it is important to make such principles as manifest as possible, so that they can be reflected upon and not hidden from criticism. This explicitness of the basis of analysis also enables the scholar to enter

¹² Cf. Gadamer, 1995, p. 265ff.

¹³ Furthermore, these basic theoretical positions of the scholar shape his view of what understanding really is. The introduction of a subconscious level, e.g., makes it problematic to use the conscious beliefs and aims of a person as explanations of his/her behaviour, and this points to the necessity of a deeper level of understanding in the interpretation of the utterances and actions of a person.

into a more genuine dialogue with the religious tradition he is studying, as differences on a more basic theoretical level can be discussed.

The intention in this study is that the insights gained in the chapter dedicated to theory will be of use, mainly as regulative principles, in the detailed examination of the Vedic texts. The close study of the Vedic sacrificial system should in turn be able to influence the theoretical considerations, so that there will be a reciprocal relation between these two levels of the study. This interaction is reflected in the disposition of the study. The discussion of sacrificial theory thus both precedes and follows the investigation of the Vedic material: first the theoretical position of the study is presented and finally it will be discussed on the basis of the analysis of the *brāhmaṇa* material.¹⁴

The most conspicuous characteristic of the Vedic texts — which deal with the efficacy of sacrifices, i.e. mainly the *brāhmaṇas* — is the presence of a multitude of correspondences. The correspondences or identifications, as they formerly have been labelled, connect different entities within and outside of the sacrificial realm.¹⁵ These hidden bonds could be used by “the one who knows thus” (*ya evaṃ veda*)¹⁶ and they seem to be the

¹⁴ This approach is thus to some extent similar to the one propounded by Gavin Flood (1999) in his book *Beyond Phenomenology*.

¹⁵ They have formerly been labelled ‘identifications’, which reflects an interpretation of them as expressing the identity of two objects. However, the word *bandhu* has been used to indicate a different interpretation (Smith, B., 1998, p. 31), but I have not found more than one occurrence of *bandhu* in my primary material (AiB *pañcīkā* 1–5), and there the meaning of correspondence is not clear. The notion of correspondence is intended to cover both identifications (in a strict sense) and more symbolic relations, for even identification does not abolish the difference in common sense between objects; the identity is part of a higher knowledge (cf. the higher and lower knowledge of *advaita* monism; see e.g. the discussion by Potter, 1981, pp. 62–73, “Identity and Difference: The Theory of Relations”). For a previous use of the word ‘correspondence’ in the *brāhmaṇa* context, see Bailey, 1985, Ch. 2, “The Brāhmanical Precursor to the Pravṛtti Ideology”, and Gonda, 1976, p. 96. For an example of the use of this concept when studying systems of thought outside of India, see Antoine Faivre’s discussion of Western Esotericism (Faivre, 1994, p. 10f.).

¹⁶ Migron considers that *evaṃ* in the phrase *ya evaṃ veda* indicates the content of knowledge rather than the way of knowing; see Migron, 1999, p. 28, footnote 61. This seems reasonable and indicates therefore how the translation of *evaṃ*, in this expression, as ‘thus’, henceforth should be interpreted.

intermediate links that connect the cause (the sacrificial act) with the effect (the aim of the sacrifice).¹⁷

A possible objection against such an interpretation of the correspondences could be that ritual correspondences in general, and thus also in the *brāhmaṇas*, do not primarily function as links between a cause and an effect, but more as a system of classifications controlling the world by making it manageable, or ‘thinkable’.¹⁸ However, the correspondences in the *brāhmaṇas* are clearly used to explain how recitations can provide a certain outcome of the ritual, as for example in the following passage:

AiB 2.33.2 yaṃ kāmayeta: kṣatreṇainaṃ vyardhayānīti, madhya etasyai niviḍaḥ
sūktaṃ śaṃset. kṣatram vai nivid viṭ sūktam, kṣatreṇaivainaṃ tad
vyardhayati

If he desire of a man, ‘Let me deprive him of the lordly power,’ he should recite the hymn in the middle of the Nivid; the Nivid is the lordly power, the hymn the people; verily thus he deprives him of the lordly power.¹⁹

There is, moreover, no logical contradiction between the desire for comprehensive classifications and that of achieving specific goals. A perhaps more fruitful approach — than the establishing of a contradiction between the interests of classification and ritual efficacy — is to see classification as a potential basis for the belief in the efficacy of rituals; that is, a strong connection between two entities is potentially an

¹⁷ It is, however, not argued here that they constitute the only aspect of efficacy of sacrifice in the *brāhmaṇa* world-view, but they are used so frequently in the texts that they seem to have been the foremost form of reasoning when the effect of a sacrificial ritual was to be explained. For another approach, viz. the fertility aspect as connected with the woman, see Jamison, 1996. Another recurrent feature, in the *brāhmaṇa* texts, is the efficacy that is conferred upon a rite because it was once performed with great success, often in a mythic time by gods or semi-divine ancestors. Moreover, Heesterman argues (1985, p. 32ff.; 1993, p. 54ff.) that the belief in the efficacy of correspondences supplanted an older world-view in which the actual contest between sacrificial rivals, who risked their lives in the ritual, constituted the ‘competitive efficacy’ (Heesterman, 1993, p. 54).

¹⁸ Bruce Lincoln has proposed such an interpretation of CU 6.1–6 (Lincoln, 1985). A similar approach was later used by Brian K. Smith in his work on the Vedic ideology of the *varṇa* system (Smith, B., 1994). However, Smith writes in 1996, “They could claim, in sum, that their yajña was both efficient and efficacious because of the bandhus that made possible the manipulation of the outside world from within the boundaries of the ritual world.” Smith, B., 1996b, p. 288.

¹⁹ See also AiB 3.19.

efficacious means of influencing the one through the other. And as it is stated in KŚ 1.1.2, *phalayuktāni karmāṇi*, “The Vedic rites are (essentially) connected with (the achievement of) a reward”.²⁰

The correspondences are thus of importance for the consideration of the Vedic views on the efficacy of sacrificial rituals (*yajña*). The focus of the chapters that are dedicated to analysing the efficacy from the viewpoint of the Vedic sacrificial world-view will therefore be concentrated upon mapping out the web of relations that these correspondences establish, and the principles according to which this system works.²¹

For the sake of clarity a working definition of the notion of correspondence, in the ritual context, will be made.

A correspondence is a relation between two or more separate substances, which connects them in a way that makes it possible to influence one of them through the ritual manipulation of the other (or to explain e.g. the use of one substance in terms of the other). Such a correspondence cannot be known through normal cognition, but in order to discover it, one needs either a collection of special knowledge (i.e. *veda*), or a method for acquiring such knowledge.

One could, moreover, consider the argumentations using correspondences as dealing foremost with the notional side of concepts, and with their characteristics as words, i.e. their phonetic, etymological and morphological features. The conviction that the world of concepts stands in a direct relationship to the state of things in the three worlds leads to the idea that similarities and connections on the notional and linguistic levels

²⁰ KŚ, 1978, p. 1.

²¹ Brian K. Smith has argued, in opposition to some previous scholars, that the correspondences make up a coherent ideological system (Smith, B., 1994). See e.g. Eggeling’s introduction to his translation of the ŚB (ŚB, 1963). For collections of similar attitudes towards the *brāhmaṇas*, see Gonda, 1975b, p. 342; JB, 1987, pp. 3–6; Smith, B., 1998, p. 32ff. However, it could be argued that Smith exaggerates the scholarly misinterpretation of the *brāhmaṇa* world-view, as e.g. Klaus Mylius already in 1968 challenged the view of the correspondence system as disordered. Michael Witzel, moreover, thinks that Smith’s picture of the research done after 1920 within Vedic studies in Europe is false (Witzel, 1997b, p. 297, footnote 176). Karl Hoffman e.g. argued, namely, already in a lecture held in 1959 (Hoffmann, 1992) that the *brāhmaṇa* world-view was ordered and founded on special magical principles, which had been analysed by Hermann Oldenberg (1919) and Stanislav Schayer (1925).

are paralleled by similar relations in the ‘real’ world. The special knowledge required for the efficacy of the Vedic sacrifices is thus not foremost the knowledge of ordinary cause-and-effect relations, which are used in common sense and systematically investigated by science, but it is primarily the knowledge of how to analyse concepts. A priest dealing with the theology of Vedic sacrifice therefore had to know the methods for isolating the significant features that could be made the basis for a correspondence, i.e. the rules of taxonomy. These considerations put the debate between the interpretation of the correspondences as either identifications or statements of similarity in a somewhat different light. If we keep the levels of ‘mental’ and material phenomena apart, it becomes obvious that two concepts totally alike really are not two ideas but one, and that similarity, in this context, is not something entirely alien to identification, but signifies the scale culminating in total identification. On the material level, however, this is not so; there, identical twins are not identical, but are two manifestations of the same code (idea), a fact which could cause some trouble for a mind bent on classification.

1.2 Delimitation of the material

Vedic sacrifices have roots that go back to the period when the Iranian and Vedic tribes were in close contact,²² a fact which is reflected in the apparent similarities between the sacrificial terms used in the Avesta and the Ṛgveda.²³ The Vedic texts are mostly considered to have been composed in the period between 1500 and 500 BC, and consist partly of collections (*saṃhitā*) of hymns and sacrificial formulas, viz. Ṛg-, Sāma-, Yajur- and Atharvaveda, which were sung or recited during the solemn sacrifices (with the exception of the Atharvaveda).²⁴ The first three

²² It is a matter of debate how to proceed from the linguistic similarities between Avestan and Vedic, and from the cultural resemblance between the Avestan and Vedic religions, to a common habitat, or other possible relationships between Vedic and Avestan tribes. See Gonda, 1975b, p. 20f. Cf. a rejection of the whole theory of Vedic religion as Indo-European: Frawley, 1994. For a thorough and detailed discussion of the whole debate, see Witzel, 2001 and Edwin Bryant, 2001.

²³ See e.g. Keith, 1925, Vol. 1, pp. 32–36; Oldenberg, 1993, pp. 13–16; Hillebrandt, 1897, p. 11; Caland, 1906, pp. 469–490.

²⁴ There were specific *atharvan* rituals: see Gonda, 1975b, pp. 270, 290; Gonda, 1965b. Eggeling (ŚB, 1963, Vol. 26, p. 48, footnote 1) remarks with surprise that the

constitute a unity (*trayī vidyā*, the threefold knowledge) with the fourth as a complement.²⁵ Attached to these collections are books written in prose, the *brāhmaṇas*, which contain explanations and speculations about the significance and correct performance of the rituals. Two other text categories developed as extensions of the *brāhmaṇas*, viz. *āranyakas* and *upaniṣads*. They focused not on the outward performance of sacrifices, but on the symbolic meanings of the rituals and on the quest for ultimate truth. In addition, other texts with lower canonical status (*smṛti*) were composed during this period, such as the *śrauta*- and *grhyasūtras*, which prescribe in detail how one should perform the solemn and non-solemn sacrifices.²⁶ The *sūtras* do not contain a large amount of ‘theological’ material as do the *brāhmaṇas*, but function as practical manuals.

In later times (second half of the first millennium BC), when what has become known as Hinduism began to emerge, the complex Vedic rituals were in decline. At the same time, Hinduism inherited Vedic sacrificial terminology and thought-patterns.²⁷ Moreover, Vedic rituals never became an extinct tradition; Vedic sacrifices are still being performed in India, even though they are embedded in and interpreted through Hinduism, as, for example, in the practice of *pūjā* and *bhakti*.²⁸

offering formula to Aditi at the *prāyaṇīyeṣṭi*, is from the AV. For the importance of the rice dish offered to Aditi in the *atharvan* rituals, see Gonda 1965b, p. 21ff.

²⁵ Cf. Mehra, 1994, pp. xi–xiv, who argues that *trayī vidyā* does not refer to the three *saṃhitās*, but to the three different types of ritual utterances, viz. *ṛc*, *yajus* and *sāman*. He does this with the intention of proving the antiquity of Atharvaveda.

²⁶ The brevity of the *sūtra* style makes it necessary to supplement them with ritual manuals that are more extensive (*prayoga*). Hillebrandt, 1977, p. XV; Smith, B., 1998, p. 137f.

²⁷ Madeleine Biardeau argues in her book *Le sacrifice dans l’Inde ancienne* that there is no sharp break between Vedic religion and Hinduism: that there exists a unity at a deeper level. This is especially apparent in the case of sacrifice. (Biardeau, 1976.) Interesting in this context is the use of the Vedic horse sacrifice as a display of power and ambition by e.g. the *śuṅga* king Puṣyamitra in the second century BC. (Thapar, 1990, p. 92.)

²⁸ See Smith, Frederick, 1987, pp. 1–8. For a monumental documentation of a large Vedic sacrifice (*agnicayana*) made in the seventies, see Staal, 1983, and a commentary to an *agnicayana* performed in 1990 (Staal, 1992). For information on a *soma* sacrifice performed in London in 1996, see Smith, F., 2000, and for a study of the ideological context of a *soma* ritual performed in 1992 in Maharashtra, see Lubin, 2001.

In the Vedic corpus, the *brāhmaṇa* texts contain the major part of Vedic sacrificial theology, or rather praxology, and therefore also the discussions about the efficacy of sacrifices. There are also myths in the *brāhmaṇas*, but they are mostly fitted into a ritual context.²⁹ The creating and synthesising of *brāhmaṇas* was made within the different Vedic schools, each of the schools having a special recension of a *saṃhitā* as its foundational text.³⁰ Ṛgveda contains hymns, which the *hotṛ* and his subordinate priests recite during the rituals; Sāmaveda is a collection of songs, which are sung by the *udgātr* and his singers — the songs being mostly parts of *ṛgvedic* hymns changed to suit the melody. Yajurveda, which is divided into the black and white Yajurveda, contains sacrificial formulas. In the black Yajurveda, the formulas are arranged into a *saṃhitā* together with *brāhmaṇa* passages, while in the white Yajurveda the *brāhmaṇa* portions are collected into a separate book, the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. The *adhvaryu* priest, who performs the sacrificial acts, usually utters the formulas in a low voice during the ceremonies. The fourth *saṃhitā*, the Atharvaveda, is a collection of chants and formulas, mostly of a less solemn character, such as spells against diseases and enemies, but Atharvaveda also contains mystical and philosophical hymns. The corresponding priest, *brahmán*, is a surveyor of the ritual watching the procedures and intervening if any mistake is committed; because of this, he was called the physician of sacrifice.³¹

There are two *brāhmaṇas* attached to Ṛgveda: Aitareya and Kauṣītaki, while Sāmaveda has three main *brāhmaṇas*: Pañcaviṃśa (with another name Tāṇḍyamahābrāhmaṇa), Ṣadvimśa, which is a complement to Pañcaviṃśa, and finally, Jaiminīya. There are some other *sāmavedic brāhmaṇas*, but they seem to be late texts, as e.g. Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa.³² The black Yajurveda has four schools, all with their own combination of *mantra* and *brāhmaṇa* material: Kapiṣṭhala, Kāṭhaka, Maitrāyaṇī and Taittirīya *saṃhitā*. Taittirīya has a separate *brāhmaṇa* text, but it is also a

²⁹ For a discussion of the research (and lack of research) done on the relation between Vedic ritual and myth, see Sand, 2001.

³⁰ Renou, 1947; Witzel, 1987; Scharfe, 1996.

³¹ See AiB 5.34.2.

³² PB, 1931, p. iii.

combination of *mantra* and *brāhmaṇa* passages.³³ The white Yajurveda *saṃhitā* (Vājasaneyi) exists in two recensions: Kāṇva and Mādhyam̐dina, and contains only *mantra*-material. Both recensions have a version of the same *brāhmaṇa*, Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. Atharvaveda has also a *brāhmaṇa*, Gopatha Brāhmaṇa, but it is later than the other *brāhmaṇas* and has borrowed much material from them.³⁴

Klaus Mylius was the first scholar to analyse the system of correspondences in the *brāhmaṇas* with a statistical method,³⁵ and he chose KB as his material, since KB is a more coherent text than the other *ṛgvedic brāhmaṇa*, AiB.³⁶ To be able to compare the results obtained in the present work with the research done by Mylius, I have decided to analyse the correspondences in the first five *pañcikās* of AiB. These *pañcikās* are earlier than KB, while the last three *pañcikās* of AiB are later than KB, i.e. the first five *pañcikās* constitute a unit with the last three as an addition.

The scope of this study is thereby not extended to the whole *brāhmaṇa* genre, but is limited to the detailed study of the system of correspondences within a more restricted material. In the chapter dealing with the vital powers, however, examples from a broader spectrum of *brāhmaṇa* texts will be used, and in the final chapter some of the results of the analysis of the correspondence system will be connected to general questions about the efficacy of sacrifice, thus raising the conclusions to a level of more general significance.

³³ There are also fragments preserved from a Kaṭhaka Brāhmaṇa: see Gonda, 1975b, p. 351. For a collection of passages from other *brāhmaṇas* that have only survived as quotations in other works (even though the greater part of the book consists of passages from JB, which was not published in its entirety until 1954), see Batakriṣṇa Ghosh's book *Collection of the Fragments of Lost Brāhmaṇas* (Ghosh, 1935), esp. the collections of fragments from the other lost black *yajurvedic brāhmaṇas* belonging to the Maitrāyaṇī, Caraka and Śvetāśvara schools. For information on a late (*anu-*) *brāhmaṇa* belonging to the Vādhula school, see Renou, 1947, p. 178f and Witzel, 1987, p. 204f.

³⁴ Gonda, 1975b, p. 355.

³⁵ Mylius, 1976.

³⁶ Mylius' choice of a *ṛgvedic brāhmaṇa* is dependent upon his earlier study of the correspondences of the metres in the whole *ṛgvedic* corpus.

1.3 Ṛgvedic Brāhmaṇas

1.3.1 Chronology

There are, as previously mentioned, two surviving *brāhmaṇa* texts affiliated with the Ṛgveda: Kauṣītaki (KB) and Aitareya (AiB).³⁷ KB consists of thirty *adhyāyas* and is a more comprehensive and terse text than AiB; it also discusses a broader spectrum of rites than AiB, which is devoted almost exclusively to the *soma* sacrifices.³⁸ Most scholars consider the greater part of *pañcikā* 1–5 of AiB as older than KB, and Arthur B. Keith, in his introduction to the translation of the two texts, establishes the borderline between the earlier and later parts of AiB after *pañcikā* 5.25, which means that *pañcikā* 5.26–34 and *pañcikā* 6–8 are later additions.³⁹ Keith furthermore considers KB as younger than the first part of AiB, but older than the three last *pañcikās*.⁴⁰ His demarcation is mainly based on linguistic evidence, but the splitting of the text into two major parts is confirmed through Michael Witzel’s study of the geographical references in the Vedic texts.⁴¹ This is, however, only a relative chronology and any attempt to pinpoint the dates of the individual parts of the *brāhmaṇa* is open to serious criticism. The date for the whole *brāhmaṇa* genre is usually set to somewhere between 900 and 500 BC, and the first part of AiB belongs to the oldest strata and KB to a later one, but more precise dates are hard to arrive at.⁴² This is mainly a result of the lack of old

³⁷ For fragments from a lost *ṛgvedic brāhmaṇa*, viz. Paingāyani Brāhmaṇa, see Ghosh, 1935, p. 110.

³⁸ For a presentation of this and other differences between the two *brāhmaṇas*, see *Rig-Veda Brāhmaṇas*, 1920, pp. 22–24.

³⁹ *Rig-Veda Brāhmaṇas*, p. 35.

⁴⁰ *Rig-Veda Brāhmaṇas*, p. 47.

⁴¹ Witzel, 1987, pp. 185–189; Witzel, 1997b, pp. 317–324. Witzel, though, does not draw the line at 5.25, but between *pañcikā* 5 and 6.

⁴² Klaus Mylius, however, evaluates the different criteria available for an absolute dating of the middle Vedic literature, and comes to the conclusion that the period has a lower limit around 800 BC and an upper limit at 550 BC; he states that “The Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa was completed about 600 at the latest...” (Mylius, 1970, p. 428).

manuscripts and the absence of clear historical references in the texts that would allow a more exact dating.⁴³

1.3.2 Editions and translations

Martin Haug translated AiB into English in 1863 and this was the first translation of a whole *brāhmaṇa*. He not only used the Sanskrit commentary of Sāyaṇa, as an aid for the translation, but he also had the opportunity to be present at a Vedic sacrifice which enabled him to acquire first-hand information on the intricacies of the Vedic sacrificial procedures.⁴⁴ The two volumes published by Haug included not merely a translation of AiB, but also an edition of the Sanskrit text. AiB was later edited for a second time in 1879 by Theodor Aufrecht, and his basis for undertaking this work was, first, that Haug, according to Aufrecht, had treated the text with carelessness, and second, that Haug had not quite understood the Sanskrit commentary.⁴⁵ In this study, the edition of Aufrecht will be used, as the subsequent editions do not seem to differ in any important way.⁴⁶ The translation of AiB (together with KB) was undertaken once more in the beginning of the twentieth century (1920) by Arthur B. Keith. Keith could take into consideration the advancements in the knowledge of Vedic scriptures achieved since the time of Haug: Keith's translation will therefore primarily be used in this work. However, sometimes the translation of Haug will be used parallel to Keith's translation, mainly to give alternative interpretations, but also as it gives more information on the concrete sacrificial actions. Haug often also gives a more elaborate interpretation of the text, while Keith more often is satisfied with a literal translation.

⁴³ For an attempt to extract as many political and historical references as possible from the Vedic texts, see Witzel, 1997b.

⁴⁴ The commentaries of AiB are, however, written at a much later period than the *brāhmaṇa*. Extracts from the commentary of Sāyaṇa were published together with the AiB by Aufrecht, and in the edition of *Sāmaśramī* (AiB, 1895–1906) the whole commentary is given. For notes on manuscripts of the other three commentaries of AiB (Govindasvāmin, Baṭṭabhāskara and Ṣaḍguruśiṣya), see Raja, 1940.

⁴⁵ AiB, 1879, p. VII f. He also gives some examples of improvements made by him in comparison with the edition of Haug.

⁴⁶ *Rig-Veda Brāhmaṇas*, 1920, p. 101 f.

The situation of the editions of KB is different than that of AiB. Keith used the first edition of KB, made by B. Lindner in 1887, for his translation, but Keith was not satisfied with the edition, since it did not take into full consideration a manuscript found in Burnell's collection, which represents a different manuscript tradition than the other manuscripts. Keith, therefore, utilised readings from this manuscript called M and Lindner's edition. The situation was, however, improved with the edition of KB made in 1968 by Sreekrishna Sarma. He had several manuscripts of the same tradition as M at his disposal and could incorporate their variants into his edition.⁴⁷ I will therefore use Sarma's edition of KB and the translation made by Keith in 1920.

If I disagree with Keith's translation (of AiB or KB), or want to draw attention to an alternative translation, or want to give a word that is implicit, this will be displayed in footnotes, or within square brackets. If the translation of Keith is replaced altogether, this will be indicated with 'my translation' in square brackets. The words given in round brackets have not been added by me, but are parts of Keith's translation.

When quoting from Sanskrit, the final phoneme of the last word in the phrase will be displayed with dissolved *sandhi*, so that no misunderstanding regarding the inflection or declination of the words will arise. Sanskrit words will, furthermore, sometimes be used with English plural endings, and in those cases the whole word will be in italics, as e.g., 'Several *yajñas* were performed'.

1.3.3 Contents of the Ṛgveda Brāhmaṇas

KB starts its exposé in *adhyāya* 1 with the ritual establishment of the three *śrauta* fires (*agnyādheya*), which is a necessary prerequisite for all solemn (*śrauta*) Vedic sacrifices.⁴⁸ The *agnihotra* is then discussed in *adhyāya* 2, and in *adhyāya* 3 the basic ritual for the category of sacrifices called *iṣṭi*, that is, the new and full moon sacrifices (*darśapūrṇamāsa*),

⁴⁷ He also made a recording in 1966 of a traditional recital of the KB. He consulted this tape while trying to determine the rendering of doubtful passages. KB, 1968, Vol. 1, p. VI.

⁴⁸ This ritual has been analysed in detail by Hertha Krick, in her monumental work *Das Ritual der Feuergründung*, Krick, 1982.

constitutes the topic. They are, as their names indicate, each performed once a month.⁴⁹ The following *adhyāya* elaborates on certain rites built upon the model of the new and full moon sacrifices. Next in order for KB are the sacrifices performed thrice every year, viz. the four-monthly sacrifices (*cāturmāsya*) that mark the beginning of a new season.⁵⁰ We can thus see how KB starts with the most basic ritual (*agnyādheya*), which is necessary for all sacrifices prescribing offerings in the fires, and how the text moves on to consider the sacrifice performed each day (*agnihotra*), then the one performed twice every month (*darśapūrṇamāsa iṣṭi*), and, finally, the sacrifices performed thrice a year (*cāturmāsya*). After this section, which deals with the rituals in the order of their frequency, there is an *adhyāya* (No. 6) discussing the role of the *brahman* priest. The remaining part of KB deals with different variants of the *soma* sacrifice. KB follows in this part mostly the order of AiB, thus first commenting on the principal one-day *soma* sacrifice (*agniṣṭoma*), and thereafter moving on to the modifications of that rite, followed by the *soma* sacrifices with more than one pressing day.

AiB is, as previously mentioned, mainly concerned with the *soma* ritual, which is a complicated rite with many variants.⁵¹ The basic offerings were made with a juice ritually extracted from the plant called *soma*, which had some invigorating qualities, though we do not know with certainty what plant it was. The juice was also ceremonially drunk by the priests in connection with the three *soma*-pressings performed during the morning, midday and evening of the main day(s) of the sacrifice. The *soma* sacrifices were classified into three groups according to the number of pressing days — the first consisting of sacrifices with one pressing day (*ekāha*), the second of those with two up to twelve days (*ahīna*), and, finally, the third group is constituted by those that last twelve or more days (*sattra*).

⁴⁹ For a study of the new and full moon sacrifices, see the pioneering work of Hillebrandt, 1977 (first edition 1879).

⁵⁰ For a short description of the procedures of *cāturmāsya*, see Hillebrandt, 1897, pp. 115–119. For a more extensive and detailed discussion, with references to the *Hiraṇyakeśi śrautasūtra* and a *prayoga* (*Hiraṇyakeśicāturmāsya*prayogaḥ), consult Bhide, 1979.

⁵¹ For a longer and more detailed introduction (in French) to the AiB and the *soma* cult, see Verpoorten, 1977, pp. 13–25.

There are also a couple of preparatory days in an *ekāha* before the actual pressing day. These involve among other things the consecration (*dīkṣā*) of the *yajamāna* (the one who initiates the sacrifice for his own benefit). During the days of an *ekāha*, there are also three animal sacrifices. A goat is sacrificed the day before the pressing day, another goat on the actual pressing day, and on the final day, a barren cow is sacrificed.⁵²

AiB *pañcikā* 1–3 comments on the basic form of the sacrifices with one pressing day, viz. the *agniṣṭoma*. The *brāhmaṇa* makes its way through the rite in chronological order, beginning with the consecration of the *yajamāna* and ending with the third pressing. The text does not, however, follow the procedures in a strict fashion, since it presupposes knowledge of the actual performance of the rites. Instead, the connections between ritual, cosmos and the human person are elaborated. The aim is often to explain which effects follow from a certain recitation, or ritual action.

Pañcikā 4.1 to 5.25 discusses variants of the *soma* sacrifice, beginning with the sacrifices (apart from *agniṣṭoma*) that only have one pressing day, and then moving on to the longer and more complicated *sattras*. The *sattras* are, however, made up from one-day *soma* sacrifices, which are combined into structures of 6 days, e.g. the *pr̥ṣṭhya śadaha*, which in its turn is used to form a *dvādaśāha* consisting of twelve days.⁵³ The *sattra* called *gavām ayana* (the way of the cows) is made up of these six-day elements and lasts one whole year. A *sattra* can last for as long as a thousand years; one could thus go on combining the basic elements into larger structures, with only the human, or divine, factor determining the duration.

In 5.25 to 5.34, a sacrifice that does not include the pressing of the *soma* plant, viz. the *agnihotra*, is discussed. The *agnihotra* is a simple ritual

⁵² For a thorough description (in French) of all the procedures of the basic one-day *soma* sacrifice, the *agniṣṭoma*, see Caland, 1906–07. For a more concise presentation of the *soma* rituals see Hillebrandt, 1897, pp. 124–166; Keith, 1925, Vol. 2, pp. 326–352; Gonda, 1960a, pp. 149–162.

⁵³ The *dvādaśāha* is, however, not constituted by two *pr̥ṣṭhya śadahās*, but is instead formed through the addition of three so-called *upasads*, a special tenth day, an introductory and a concluding day, to the *pr̥ṣṭhya śadaha*.

which must be performed every morning and evening. It consists of libations of milk, which are mixed with water and offered in the fires.⁵⁴

Pañcikā 6 is devoted to the duties of the priests subordinated to the *hotṛ*, i.e. the *hotrakas*, who recite *ṛgvedic* verses, while *pañcikās* 7 and 8 are mainly concerned with the ritual anointing of the king.⁵⁵

1.4 Method

The question of which methods to use in a study of Vedic correspondences is at first sight simple to answer. We know Vedic religion only through its ‘texts’ and therefore we have to turn to philology in the quest for adequate methods, as Stephanie Jamison declares in the beginning of her book *Sacrificed Wife/Sacrificer’s Wife*:

It [sc. ancient India] can only be approached through its texts, and the philological methods employed to investigate these texts may, to the outsider, appear to approach the status of a mystery religion, to be even more esoteric than the contents of the texts they study. As a philologist, a practitioner of this cult, I am certain that the intricacies of the method are necessary.⁵⁶

However, if we accept the definition of philology elaborated by Michael Witzel, the situation becomes somewhat more complex. The definition is short: “Philology is a *Kulturwissenschaft* based on texts”. But he goes on to say that philology “comprehends the investigation of the available written and oral texts of a civilisation *and* the study of all features necessary for an understanding of these texts.”⁵⁷ Philology, therefore, has to enrol a number of ancillary disciplines, e.g. archaeology, in the interpretations of the texts and the cultures that have produced them. It is therefore possible to delineate two levels of interpretation — even though they are not absolutely separate. First, the primary philological level which consists in the collecting of manuscripts and the making of reliable editions; secondly, the secondary level which consists in the translation

⁵⁴ For a presentation of the basic procedures of the *agnihotra*, see Hillebrandt, 1897, pp. 109–111; Keith, 1925, 318f. Bodewitz has translated and collected all *brāhmaṇa* passages dealing with the *agnihotra* in one volume (*The Daily Evening and Morning Offering (Agnihotra) according to the Brāhmaṇas*, 1976).

⁵⁵ For a thorough account of the Rājasūya, see Heesterman, 1957.

⁵⁶ Jamison, 1996, p. 3.

⁵⁷ Witzel, 1997a, p. v.

and interpretation of the texts. The first level does not involve other disciplines in the same high degree as the second. An example on the secondary level, of the use of methods and theories from other disciplines, is that interpretations of the Vedic correspondences have been influenced by theories of (primitive) religion and sacrifice.⁵⁸

This has the consequence that from the perspective of history of religions it is both necessary to use the methods of philology and linguistics, and, at the same time, to choose the methods, and theories, proper for the study of the religious aspects of the texts.⁵⁹ Nevertheless, some historians of religion distrust the methods of philology, or, at least, question their primacy in the study of religion. The Norwegian scholar Einar Thomassen, for instance, lists some problems that the use of philological methods in the history of religions could introduce.⁶⁰

1. The philological methods put too much emphasis upon the religious ideas of the intellectual élite.
2. The use of philological methods could lead to the view that history is primarily the diffusion of ideas.
3. Philology emphasises differences between religions and the contextuality of religious traditions at the expense of universal features and

⁵⁸ See p. 21. But the opposite is also true, as the relation between Sylvain Lévi and Marcel Mauss shows. For an attempt to relate (within a Marxist paradigm) theories of religion to theoretical and methodological issues in Vedic studies, see Göhler, 1990.

⁵⁹ The philologist uses theories of religion in order to interpret religious aspects of texts, and the historian of religions, in his turn, uses the instruments of philology to gain access to ideas expressed in the texts of the religion that he is studying. The two disciplines thus meet and use each other's resources in a common field of inquiry. However, the religious dimension of a text is for a philologist merely one among many other interesting aspects, while, vice versa, not all philological methods are of equal worth for a historian of religions.

⁶⁰ For another discussion (in Norwegian) of criticism that has been levelled against philology, see Haugen, 2000. The arguments against philology presented by Haugen are, firstly, that it has, in its desire for the archetype, disregarded later traditions; secondly, that it has had too much confidence in its methods for establishing the texts as they were and thereby forgotten that interpretation is also active in the basic work of philology; thirdly, that it has been too focused upon details, and too oriented towards the texts of the elite; the final argument is that philology's focus upon texts has led it to disregard other sources. Haugen's article ends, however, with a positive evaluation of the future of philology.

methods of comparison, which, according to Thomassen, are characteristic for the history of religions.⁶¹

Regarding the first problem, we must answer that our only sources of information about the religious beliefs and practices of the Vedic age are the Vedic texts — until the possible discovery of new texts, or archaeological sites.

The second problem is connected with the controversy about the explanation of human action, i.e., to what degree we can explain human, and thus religious, action through the ideas of the actors and/or through the more material aspects of human life. As long as a theory of this issue has not been formulated in a convincing way, it is not advisable to say to what extent human actions are determined by the biological make-up of the agent, his social context, psychological drives, or conscious ideas.

The third problem could be countered by the statement that when one uses philology in analysing religious ideas of texts, one has to use theories of religion and the general perspective is thus not entirely missing. The ‘narrow’ focus of the philological approach can, however, be used within a framework of a post-modern relativism of some sort which insists that comparative religion is not possible, due to the unique contexts of the different religions. Also in this case, the answer is that the possibility of comparative religion depends upon human nature. If humans are constituted in a similar way irrespective of what culture they live in, then this human nature probably constitutes a basis for a universal tendency to behave and think in similar ways.⁶²

In the study of Vedic religion, it is therefore necessary to take philology seriously, and, at the same time, to be open towards methods used in analysing religion in general. We must thus, simultaneously, keep in mind the specific context and the universal principles. That is, we must go into the details of the text, while at the same time not losing the sight of the fact

⁶¹ Thomassen, 1999, p. 247ff.

⁶² That is, Thomassen’s third remark is more applicable to problems generated by cultural relativism than to philology. See e.g. the article “The Justificationist Roots of Relativism” by I. C. Jarvie (1995).

that it is a religious text, which can be ‘compared’ with other religious texts.⁶³

Moving to the more specific details of this study, we therefore assert that it is necessary to have a thorough description and discussion of the forms of the correspondences before entering into the analysis of the correspondence system. Linguistic methods and theories will therefore be used in Chapter 3; e.g. the research done on nominal sentences is important for the interpretations of the correspondences. The next two chapters (4 and 5) will follow the method used by Klaus Mylius in his analysis of the correspondences in KB, i.e. a statistical method. All the occurrences of the correspondences will be noted, and then arranged under headings in a list.⁶⁴ With the list as a source, tables will be constructed, and some of the conclusions will be based upon the relations between different categories, e.g. *Ritual entities* and *Man*. In Chapter 6, the special role of the ‘breaths’ in the correspondence system of AiB and KB will be evaluated, mainly through the detailed examination of the textual contexts of these correspondences, and through comparison with examples from other *brāhmaṇa* texts. Finally, in the last chapter, the evaluation of the efficacy of sacrifice will return to a more general theoretical level, and some points, regarding the constitution of present theories and the possible directions of future sacrificial theories, will be outlined. The basis for this final theoretical discussion will, however, be the former analysis of the Vedic correspondences.

1.5 Previous research

The focus of the following survey will be on the scholarly interpretations of the *brāhmaṇa* belief in sacrificial efficacy and more specifically the correspondences. This will have the consequence that not all research done

⁶³ Comparison without theory is, however, not feasible; cf. Lawson, 1996 and Paden, 1996. For an example of a recent attempt to bring theory and comparison together, see the invitation to base a cross-cultural comparison of religion upon theories of socio-biology and cognition, by Martin, 2001.

⁶⁴ The list with all the correspondences in AiB *pañcikā* 1–5 will be collected in Appendix 1. In Chapter 4, only the correspondences occurring at least twice will be listed. In Chapter 5, only the correspondences appearing in both AiB and KB will be listed.

on the *brāhmaṇa*, or Vedic, world-view will be discussed.⁶⁵ The intention of the survey is to indicate how different scholars have interpreted the correspondences, and how the contribution of this study fits into the framework created by former studies.

The first larger study of the *brāhmaṇa* texts, *La doctrine du sacrifice dans les Brāhmaṇas*, was written by the French Indologist Sylvain Lévi in 1898. According to him, one can extract with relative ease a coherent world-view from the *brāhmaṇas*. This world-view is naturally a system of sacrifice, as the *brāhmaṇas* are ritual texts, and Lévi states that the sacrificial system has no place for morality, but functions in a mechanical way. It works through its own inner energy and even the gods are dependent upon it. The energy of sacrifice is dangerous and blind, but can be controlled through perfectly performed ritual actions.⁶⁶ Lévi has no separate discussion of the correspondences, but from the example of the relation between faith (*śraddhā*) and the offering (and eating of the oblation)⁶⁷ called *iḍā*, we gain an insight into Lévi's general opinion. The passage is located in ŚB 11.2.7.20, (*śraddheḍā*) and translated by Lévi as, "L'iḍā, c'est la śraddhā." The translation is followed by a comment that gives us a clear picture of his interpretation: "L'identité des deux termes une fois posée permettait de les substituer à volonté l'un à l'autre."⁶⁸ The correspondences are seen as identifications, which are used as means to replace — within the mechanically functioning sacrificial system — one object with another. Lévi summarises his view of the *brāhmaṇa* sacrificial system succinctly in one sentence:

⁶⁵ E.g. the works of J. C. Heesterman and Frits Staal represent important research done on the Vedic world-view, but they do not deal primarily with the nature of the correspondences. For a general history of Vedic research, consult Gonda, 1960a, pp. 1–6; Gonda (with a focus on *Rgveda*), 1975, pp. 55–63; Göhler, 1990, pp. 14–18, 37–40. For a presentation of former surveys of Vedic research and a presentation of the research done in the period 1961–1971, see Dandekar, 1997, pp. 68–98.

⁶⁶ Lévi, 1966, p. 8ff.

⁶⁷ For the *iḍā* (*iḷā*) ceremony in the context of new and full moon sacrifices see Hillebrandt, 1977, p. 122ff. See further, *iḍā* as sacrificial meal, goddess, and cow, Oldenberg, 1993, pp. 37, 121, 190; Keith, 1925, Vol. 2, pp. 62, 200; Heesterman, 1985, p. 64f., 1993, p. 201f.

⁶⁸ Lévi, 1966, p. 115.

Le sacrifice a donc tous les caractères d'une opération magique, indépendante des divinités, efficace par sa seule énergie et susceptible de produire le mal comme le bien.⁶⁹

In 1919, twenty-one years after Lévi's pioneering work, another study was published, *Vorwissenschaftliche Wissenschaft, Die Weltanschauung der Brāhmaṇa-texte*. It was written by the prolific scholar Hermann Oldenberg, who treated the *brāhmaṇa* world-view in more detail than Lévi, and who made the correspondences, or "*Identifikationen*" as he called them, a major topic of his study. As is clear from the word chosen to denote the correspondences (*Identifikation*), Oldenberg interprets them (in accordance with Lévi) as expressing identity, and also he thinks that the purpose of the equivalencies was to acquire power over the objects identified.

Indem der Kundige die eine der unter einander identischen Wesenheiten faßt, gewinnt er Macht über die andre, die eben keine andre ist.⁷⁰

Nevertheless, Oldenberg notes different ways of connecting entities in the *brāhmaṇas*, as the use of the words *rūpa* "form" and *pratimā* "representation".⁷¹ On page 116, he lists different types of relations that are used parallel with the identifications, e.g. one entity is born from another, or is a picture of the other, or is master over the other entity. These alternative expressions do not lead Oldenberg to the conclusion that the form of an identification — A is B — could encompass other relations than total identity. In this respect, he agrees with Lévi, and also in that he sees the *brāhmaṇa* world-view as mechanical and magic in character. Another point — important for the line of further studies — is his evaluation of the systematic and non-systematic character of the correspondences (*Identifikationen*). He notes that some correspondences are more fixed than others, e.g. the one between Bṛhaspati and *brahman*.⁷² However, he does not elaborate on this subject, and at the end of his book he states that "Die Anschauungsweise primitiven Zauberwesens ließ die Umrise der Dinge

⁶⁹ Lévi, 1966, p. 129.

⁷⁰ Oldenberg, 1919, p. 110.

⁷¹ Oldenberg (1919, p. 114) translates *pratimā* with *Abbild* and *Gegenbild*. Brian K. Smith (1998, p. 73.) connects *pratimā* with *pramā* (as they are connected in RV 10.130.3) and translates them as 'counterpart' and 'prototype'. See also Schayer, 1925, p. 275.

⁷² Oldenberg, 1919, p. 112.

verschwimmen. Das steigern die Brāhmanas zum Äußersten. Sie entwickeln jene für sie so charakteristische Manie des Identifizierens von allem mit allem.”⁷³

In 1925, Stanislav Schayer published an article in *Zeitschrift für Buddhismus* with the name “Die Struktur der magischen Weltanschauung nach dem Atharva-Veda und den Brāhmaṇa-Texten”. He characterises the world-view of the *brāhmaṇas* briefly in the first line of his work as “...eine magische Umdeutung der ṛgvedischen Götterverehrung...”⁷⁴ The universe of the theistic Ṛgveda was thus transformed into a cosmos inhabited by impersonal forces, which could be controlled through sacrificial rituals. The basis for the magical system of the *brāhmaṇas* was — according to Schayer — the equivalencies. They are products of minds which believe that one thing can be itself and, at the same time, another entity. The thinking that produced the *brāhmaṇas* is thus an example of what Lucien Lévy-Bruhl called *la mentalité primitive*.⁷⁵ In this, Schayer does not differ from earlier scholars. The more valuable contributions of his article are that he makes the first chart of correspondences, although on a small scale,⁷⁶ and that he analyses the technical terms used when expressing correspondences — a task that was begun by Oldenberg.

After the monograph of Oldenberg and until 1989, the nature of the correspondences was discussed in articles and in minor sections of books, which mainly concentrated on other subjects. Louis Renou, for example, wrote two articles in 1946 and 1953 which dealt respectively with the words *upaniṣad* and *nidāna*, and with the word *bandhu*, all denoting a

⁷³ Oldenberg, 1919, p. 241.

⁷⁴ Schayer, 1925, p. 260. He defines magic as dealing with impersonal powers, while religion is concerned with gods who have independent wills. According to this categorisation, both religion and magic have in common that they are founded upon the belief in the dependence of humans on supernatural powers.

⁷⁵ Schayer, 1925, p. 271; Lévy-Bruhl, 1985, esp. p. 76, which introduces the law of participation: “...in the collective representations of primitive mentality, objects, beings, phenomena can be, though in a way incomprehensible to us, both themselves and something other than themselves.” For a discussion (in Swedish) of the notion of ‘primitive’ identification, see Olsson, 1972, p. 72ff., and a summary (in English), p. 171f.

⁷⁶ Schayer, 1925, p. 274. It uses AiB 8.4 and concerns the relation between the social classes, *sāmans* and powers as *tejas*.

correspondence (*connexion*). Renou interprets the correspondences as sometimes meaning equivalence and sometimes an esoteric connection, and he writes in a comment to Schayer's translation of *upaniṣad* as *magische Äquivalenzformel* that:

Nous dirons plutôt: «connexion», car l'équivalence n'est que la traduction linéaire, très fréquente à vrai dire, mais non nécessaire, d'un type de «connexion» qui emprunte divers aspects.⁷⁷

Jan Gonda, who has written on almost all Vedic topics, has also dealt with the correspondences in a couple of articles. In “Bandhu- in the Brāhmaṇas” (Gonda, 1965a), he deals specifically with the word *bandhu*, but also with correspondences in general. He does not approve of Schayer's characterising of the correspondences as magical in character, while not rejecting it altogether.⁷⁸ Gonda recognises that the older interpretations of the correspondences were determined by theories of religion common at that time. He therefore sets out to make a new interpretation, according to the theories being used in the 1950s and the first half of the 1960s. The theoretical stance chosen as his point of departure is the phenomenology of religion, and he refers *inter alia* to the works of van der Leeuw and Mircea Eliade. Gonda thus defines the essence of religion in the following manner.

The conception of a transcendental order and a ritual technique aiming at establishing an efficacious contact with the source of all life and power is indeed the very essence of religion.⁷⁹

Gonda interprets the correspondences in accordance with the definition above: they are formulations of connections between mundane reality and the supernatural. The *bandhus* (correspondences) make the ritual efficacious, i.e. able to connect to the supernatural powers. He compares in this context the uses of the word *bandhu* with the evolution of the Greek word *symbolon* (symbol). Gonda argues that from the beginning *symbolon* referred to a closer relation between the symbol and the symbolised⁸⁰ than

⁷⁷ Renou, 1978, p. 150.

⁷⁸ Gonda, 1965a, pp. 3f. and 26.

⁷⁹ Gonda, 1965a, p. 6.

⁸⁰ For use of the terms *signifiant* and *signifié* in the context of correspondences, see Renou, 1978, p. 153, and Oguibénine, 1998, p. 153.

what the modern uses of the word ‘symbol’ indicate. He thus touches upon the question whether the correspondences express identity, or a connection between two separable objects. The previous scholars had almost all agreed that the correspondences express identity between two entities. This was explained as a result of a primitive way of thinking, according to which an object simultaneously can be itself and another. Gonda thought, however, that the relation was not of total identity, but that the two objects brought together as symbol and symbolised were considered to have a spiritual (i.e. unseen) quality in common — but, above all, the symbol brings the secular and sacred realms together. Gonda thus interprets the correspondences in the light of the sacred, as it sometimes was conceptualised within phenomenology of religion.⁸¹ He does not, however, try to map out the different correspondences, but comments on the making of correspondences in general, and the word *bandhu* in detail, illustrated with examples from the *brāhmaṇas*.⁸²

A totally new approach to the correspondences was used in the works of Klaus Mylius. In 1968, he made a study of the correspondences — or *Identifikationen* as he, and Oldenberg before him, called them — of the metres in the whole *ṛgvedic* corpus, i.e. *saṃhitā*, *brāhmaṇa*, *āraṇyaka* and *upaniṣad*. This was the first systematic collection of correspondences and the first attempt to show that they are not randomly made, i.e. everything could not be connected with everything. This interpretation was further substantiated in 1976 through Mylius’ analysis of all the correspondences in KB. He analyses here, in distinction to his study of the metres, the whole system of correspondences, and lists the correspondences under different headings such as *Götter* and *Ritualien*. He draws two major conclusions: first, the correspondences were made according to a system; second, the majority of the correspondences are between the ritual realm and man.

Die Hauptbeziehung dieses Kultus bestand zwischen dem Ritual und seinen Einrichtungen einerseits und den Menschen und ihrer biologischen Grundlage andererseits.⁸³

⁸¹ Foremost by Mircea Eliade.

⁸² Gonda’s other articles that treat fundamental notions related to the correspondences follow the same pattern, e.g. Gonda, 1969 and Gonda, 1975a.

⁸³ Mylius, 1976, p. 150.

This is in contrast with Gonda's conclusion that the correspondences primarily connect the sacred (supernatural) world with the mundane. Mylius does not accept such a theory, but is rather of the opposite opinion.⁸⁴

Das Ritual hat nicht so sehr ihnen [scil. the gods] oder gar irgendeiner Form kosmischer Ordnung als vielmehr den Interessen von Menschen zu dienen.⁸⁵

Mylius, however, did not question the interpretation of the correspondences as identifications.

In 1979, Asko Parpola wrote an article in which he analysed the different forms of the correspondences, as outlined earlier by Oldenberg and Schayer, with the question, "Should the verb 'to be' be taken in the sense literal identity? Or should one rather replace it by expressions such as 'is a kind of', 'stands for', 'represents', 'symbolises'?"⁸⁶ Parpola argues that it is not possible to give a straightforward answer, but that through comparing parallel expressions one can get a picture of the intended sense. He wants, though, the reader to keep in mind the temporal factor, as the *brāhmaṇa* texts constitute a transitional stage in the Vedic religious evolution, from the *saṃhitās* to the *upaniṣads*. Parpola considers the word *rūpa* (form) as one of the best clues to the sense of the correspondences, as it is used parallel with the more concise nominal sentences. He argues on the basis of a couple of examples from the *brāhmaṇas* that it is used "in a meaning fairly close to our 'symbol'."⁸⁷ In distinction to Gonda, who also used the word 'symbol', he does not try to evoke its ancient meanings in Greek. Nevertheless, Parpola, like Gonda, thinks that the primary purpose of the correspondences is to connect the transcendental entities with the mundane.

Two basic presuppositions were thus called into question through the works of Mylius and Parpola, i.e. the disordered system of correspondences, and that they express total identity. They showed that the correspondences were made according to a certain order and that the

⁸⁴ In this he was followed by Lars Göhler (1990) in his work on the methodology of the study of Vedic ritual; see esp. p. 8.

⁸⁵ Mylius, 1976, p. 150.

⁸⁶ Parpola, 1979, p. 142.

⁸⁷ Parpola, 1979, p. 143.

relation could perhaps be more of a symbolic character than total identity. Nevertheless, the same year as Parpola's article was published (1979), Michael Witzel's inaugural lecture as a teacher at Leiden University was also published.⁸⁸ Witzel shares the view of Mylius that the correspondences constitute a system, and he also follows Mylius (and Oldenberg) concerning the nature of the correspondences. Witzel's article is named *On Magical Thought in the Veda* and he argues that the correspondences express identity through the principle that "...partial identity, means complete identity."⁸⁹ The secret bond between the entities is thus founded on a common characteristic, which makes it possible to group them together, or rather to fuse them. Another thread in Witzel's article is his discussion of the history of the correspondences. He thinks that it would be possible, and fruitful, to trace the seemingly enigmatic correspondences back to the Atharvaveda and R̥gveda, and in that way discover the meanings (i.e. the partial identity) that made the identifications possible.⁹⁰

With Brian K. Smith's book, *Reflections on Resemblance, Ritual, and Religion* (1989) the correspondences became, for the first time, the principal subject of a larger monograph. Smith argues that previous scholars had misinterpreted the *bandhus* (i.e. correspondences) as identifications, while they actually express similarity between different entities.

I will maintain that to call these connections or *bandhus* equations or equivalences is to mistake the relation of *resemblance* for a relation of *identity*...⁹¹

Smith develops the doubts entertained by Renou and Parpola (and to some extent Gonda) about the relation of identity, and formulates a theory of how the *bandhus* were formed, and according to which principles the whole system worked. Resemblance is, according to Smith, the core

⁸⁸ He seems to have read the article of Parpola in a late stage of his work as it is referred to in the addendum of the bibliography.

⁸⁹ Witzel, 1979, p. 12.

⁹⁰ Not all correspondences are that old, but some were instead invented during the *brāhmaṇa* period. For the assumption that some correspondences in the extant YV *sāmhitās* have a prehistory in an older lost YV *brāhmaṇa*, see Witzel, 1997b, p. 298.

⁹¹ Smith, B., 1998, p. 47.

principle governing the correspondences. Things and living beings were ordered in vertical series with the perfect entity (the original) at the top. The inferior entities were related — to the top and to each other — through a lower or higher degree of likeness to the principal instance of the species. The different hierarchical series were also related to each other through horizontal connections. Objects on the same horizontal level, but in different species, could thus also be connected, and in this manner the whole universe became interconnected through a web of correspondences, from top to bottom, and from side to side.

Smith also argues that the ancient theologians of the Veda regarded Vedic ritual activity primarily as constructive. Through ritual action and the mediating correspondences, the Brahmins considered themselves as ordering and establishing aspects of the disintegrated or badly evolved creation — including human beings.

In his first book, Smith outlined the basic principles according to which the system of correspondences worked, but he did not enter into much detail of the actual individual correspondences. In a later book, *Classifying the Universe* (1994), he concentrates on the horizontal *bandhus*, and on the hierarchical structure which, he argues, is the basic structure according to which all other realms of existence were classified, namely, the *varṇa* scheme.

Varṇa furnished the Vedic ritualists with the only organizational concept capable of generating and negotiating connections of both the vertical and horizontal type; as such, *varṇa* might be regarded as the “root metaphor” or “master narrative” of Vedic thought.⁹²

Smith’s theoretical and methodological approach is of the type that is often called reductionistic, i.e. he maintains that the duty of the scholar of religion is to show that the transcendent claims of the religious are in fact determined and constructed by humans, often with their own interest in mind.⁹³ He therefore tries to show that the *varṇa* classification is a model of society made by, and in the interest of, the Brahmins.

⁹² Smith, B., 1994, p. 12.

⁹³ Smith, B., 1994, pp. 4, 7, 322ff. His reductionism in *Classifying the Universe*, however, is combined with a form of contextualism, which makes the scholarly claim to ‘truth’ — in opposition to the religious discourse — problematic. He writes,

The main thesis of Smith's second book is that the *varṇa* classification was invested with special authority through horizontal *bandhus*. Different hierarchically structured classes of beings, e.g. the gods, were connected to the *varṇa* scheme through correspondences. Some gods, e.g. Agni, were classified as Brahmin gods, others as warrior gods (foremost Indra) and some as belonging to the common people, e.g. Viśve devāḥ. Through the horizontal linkages the whole universe was structured according to the social classes — even the trees were regarded as Brahmin or warrior trees. The structure of class was thus made into a part of the nature of being, which was accordingly 'discovered' in different realms of existence.

Classifying the Universe is the first, and up to now the only, study that goes into the details of the correspondence system. Of special importance are the tables that Smith constructed to show how *varṇa* was connected to different realms. Smith could not work through all Vedic texts, but neither did he choose to analyse just one text; instead, he used thirteen cosmogonies located in the *brāhmaṇas* — especially the ŚB. Cosmogonies are of special importance, as the primordial situation is often regarded as paradigmatic and exemplary. They do therefore give us excellent condensed versions of the overall structure of the correspondence system.⁹⁴

In the same way as Gonda tried to interpret the correspondences according to the theories current within the study of religion at his time, Smith's works could be seen as reflecting the decline of the

"Knowledge is never disinterested" (Smith, B., 1994, p. 323), a statement which thus is valid also for scientific knowledge. The scholarly and the religious activities are according to Smith, "...often, and perhaps inevitably, fundamentally opposed enterprises." Nevertheless, on the other hand, through the 'interested' (cf. Habermas, 1994) character of knowledge, they become situated on the same level. (Cf. Bruce Lincoln's critique of the theory of Dumézil: Lincoln, 1998.) The problem is to establish a non-interested method for detecting the distortions made on ideological grounds, i.e. to constitute a meta-level. However, in an article concerning *Hindutva*, Smith clearly demands of the scholar to choose sides between the religious claims of the *Hindutva* and the humanism underlying the study of religion. He there condemns the post-modern trend of relativism: "Worse yet is the impulse to fall back on trendy and irresponsible conceptions of intellectual and cultural relativism." Smith, B., 1996a, p. 125. Cf. Habermas' position between objectivity and subjectivity (Widell, 1991, p. 270–274).

⁹⁴ The fact is, though, that some of the texts called cosmogonies by Smith in reality are cosmologies, i.e. concerned not with the creation of the universe but with its structure.

phenomenology of religion and the resurgence of reductionistic explanations in the study of religion.⁹⁵

Some scholars have favourably received the works of Smith,⁹⁶ but doubts have been expressed about the central principle which according to Smith is the basis of the correspondence system, viz. resemblance. In the article “Zu den sogenannten Identifikationen in den Brāhmaṇas”, Albrecht Wezler tries to develop the discussion on the nature of the correspondences through bringing the Indological research on the ‘identifications’ into contact with work done in philosophy of language and linguistics. One conclusion that Wezler emphasises is that the omitted verb “to be” could have different meanings in different contexts. ‘A (is) B’ could mean that A and B are two names for the same entity, thus expressing identity, but also that B is predicative of A, e.g. cattle are animals. Wezler analyses two nominal sentences from the *brāhmaṇas* that bring together, respectively, salty earth (*ūṣa*) and cattle (*paśu*), and salty earth (*ūṣa*) and food (*annādyā*). He argues, with Smith’s thesis in mind, that these nominal sentences do not express a likeness between salty earth and cattle, and between salty earth and food, but instead that “eine bestimmte kausale Beziehung ausgedrückt ist”, viz. that salt is necessary for cattle to thrive and propagate.⁹⁷

Wezler is therefore highly suspicious of attempts to reduce the number of relationships expressed through the Vedic nominal sentences to just one type. This is valid regardless of whether it is ‘identification’ or ‘resemblance’ that has been chosen.

Smith tried to rescue the correspondences from the interpretation of them as identifications and used the concept *resemblance* as his tool. He thereby brought theoretical assumptions from the social sciences into his work, a fact which points to his double academic abodes, viz. Indology and

⁹⁵ See e.g. the report from the conference in Turku concerned with method and theory in the study of religion, Anttonen, 1999. Moreover, Smith relates his investigation of Vedic classifications to “the new field of cognitive science” (Smith, B., 1994, p. 4).

⁹⁶ See e.g. the reviews by Robert J. Philips, 1992 and Asko Parpola, 1999.

⁹⁷ Wezler, 1996, p. 504. For more critique of the notion of resemblance, see Heesterman, 1991. Bodewitz, 2000a, p. 21f., rejects, like Gonda before him, the claim that the social triad is more basic than e.g. the cosmic triad of heaven, atmosphere and earth. Moreover, Michael Witzel (1997a, p. ix) criticises the whole project of Smith: “...shows little or no progress beyond what H. Oldenberg and Stanislav Schayer have written in the first two decades of the century.”

religious studies. Wezler, as has been noted, also brings with him discourses lying outside Indology to throw light on the correspondences. Both undertakings could thus be viewed as attempts to bring the Vedic correspondences into contact with something more generic, i.e. the way humans use religious concepts in classification and how they use, and refrain from using, a verb of the type ‘to be’.

What new areas of research are then open after one century of research done on the Vedic correspondences? Witzel remarked in 1979:

Furthermore, a thorough inventory of equations would also enable us to gain at least some part of the encyclopedic knowledge of a Vedic priest. This would allow us to argue from *inside* the Vedic system of thought (Polanyi, 1975), when trying to *explain* the texts, — a task which has, as it may be apparent by now, not really begun even today...⁹⁸

Since 1979, it is primarily Brian K. Smith that has challenged this lack of work, but as we have seen, he has not continued the listing of the correspondences that was begun by Mylius. I will therefore make an inventory of all the correspondences in AiB *pañcikā* 1–5 and the result of this work is presented in Appendix 1. In Chapter 4, only the more frequent correspondences are displayed and some recurrent patterns are analysed. In Chapter 5, the correspondences common to AiB and the other *brāhmaṇa*, which has been thoroughly worked through by Mylius, (KB) will be analysed. In Chapter 6, the recurrent correspondences to the ‘breaths’ — which are crucial for the understanding of the *brāhmaṇa* view on the efficacy of sacrifice — will be examined, and, in the final chapter, the discussion will return to a general theoretical level. Thereby, some of the insights that the analyses of the *brāhmaṇa* correspondences can provide for a scholarly theory of sacrifice will be evaluated.

To sum up, through this study, the work of making an inventory of all correspondences in the Vedic corpus will be brought a little step forward,

⁹⁸ Witzel, 1979, p. 20. The reference in the quotation to a work of Polanyi is not given in Witzel’s bibliography. The reference could be to Michael Polanyi’s book *Meaning*. The statement on the lack of adequate work was restated by Witzel in 1997 (“Introduction” p. ix).

and, at the same time, an analysis of the material hitherto mapped out in detail (i.e. the *ṛgvedic brāhmaṇas*) will be made.⁹⁹

Moreover, the concern of ritual efficacy often constitutes a common interest of the scholar of sacrificial rituals and his object of research. The progress, in this study, from scholarly theory to *brāhmaṇa* theory, and then back again to the scholarly level, will hopefully make it possible to see the question of the efficacy of sacrifice in a new light.

⁹⁹ The optimal situation, however, would be — as Mylius expresses — that all the correspondences were collected in a single digital database (Mylius, 1976, p. 155). The first step is to digitalise all *brāhmaṇa* texts, a work that is carried out within the larger project called TITUS (Thesaurus Indogermanischer Text- und Sprachmaterialien); see web page: <http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/>

CHAPTER TWO

Sacrificial Theory

The focus of this study is both upon how the efficacy of sacrifice was imagined in the Vedic *brāhmaṇas*, and upon how it has been, and could be, construed on a more general level. These two ways of investigating the efficacy of sacrifice reflect the traditional dichotomy between understanding and explanation, but there is, as was argued in the introduction, an interaction between these two approaches.¹ It is therefore necessary to state explicitly the theoretical underpinnings of the analyses of the correspondences, i.e. to make manifest the explanatory principles governing the interpretation of the Vedic material. Furthermore, these two perspectives are interconnected in this study, as one basic premise is that the world-view of a sacrificial tradition is of importance for the actual sacrificial practice. The interpretations of the Vedic sacrificial discourses become, in this way, partial explanations of the performance of Vedic sacrifices.

The following pages will comment on some approaches to sacrifice which have been used from the late 19th century onwards; this detour is made with the intention of delineating the reasons for the position chosen for this work, and, at the same time, to uncover some fundamental issues that are connected with the question of sacrificial efficacy.²

¹ This is of course not only true of scholarly interpretations, but of interpretation in general. One could furthermore argue that the dichotomy between understanding and explanation of actions is in some versions unnecessarily sharp, as understanding presupposes explanations, or is a sort of explanation — the motives of an agent being the causes of his action. See Bergström, 1990.

² For articles in encyclopaedias that try to present an overview of sacrificial theories and the different aspects of sacrifice, consult E. O. James' article from 1920 in *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, and the article written by Joseph Henninger in *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, published in 1987. For more recent developments, see Ivan Strenski's article "Between Theory and Speciality: Sacrifice in the 90s" (1996) and also John Milbank's "Stories of Sacrifice" (1996). For a collection of important texts see Carter, 2003.

2.1 Evolutionary theories of sacrifice

Within the discipline of history of religions and other disciplines that study religious phenomena, questions about the origin and nature of sacrifice have been important.³ This was especially conspicuous during the later half of the nineteenth century, when the evolutionist paradigm dominated the scholarly world and the quest for origins was a major impetus for the creation of new theories. Many assumed therefore that it was possible to gain knowledge about how our ancestors lived and thought through the study of ‘survivals’, i.e. people still living at a lower level on the evolutionary ladder.⁴ The aborigines of Australia were considered especially ‘primitive’ and their beliefs and practices became one of the main sources for scholars constructing theories of primitive religion. The concept of totemism, for instance, which was central for many evolutionists, was primarily exemplified with Australian material.

One of the first to create a theory of sacrifice was Edward B. Tylor (1832–1917), who is often regarded as one of the founding fathers of anthropology.⁵ He states in his famous work *Primitive Culture* (1871) that sacrifice initially was a gift (or bribe)⁶ to the deities for the purpose of securing their goodwill. Either the devotee receives something in return for his gift — as an answer to the petition accompanying the sacrifice — or the gift merely serves to propitiate the wrathful deity.

³ While the enterprise initiated by Max Müller (and others: see Bosch, 1999, p. 26) as science of religion has split into a number of different disciplines, all with their own theoretical and methodological approaches, there have also been attempts to unite them under an umbrella notion such as religious studies or comparative religion (see Smart, 1999; Sharpe, 1986, p. xiii f.). Henceforth, the notion of history of religions will be used as encompassing not only the historical study of religions, in the strict sense of the word, but also the comparative and phenomenological approaches, while at the same time excluding the sociology, psychology and philosophy of religion. For a similar demarcation, see Eliade, 1969a, p. 1.

⁴ E.g. Tylor, 1903, Vol. 1, p. 16. For a sympathetic evaluation of *survival* in Tylor’s theoretical system, consult the article “Survivals: Conceiving of Religious History in an Age of Development”, Kippenberg, 1998. For a short survey of the history of the concept of *survival*, from Tylor to Eliade, see Segal, 1990.

⁵ Cunningham, 1999, p. 17; Sharpe, 1986, p. 53.

⁶ Henninger, 1987, p. 550.

[S]acrifice is a gift made to a deity as if he were a man. ... The suppliant who bows before his chief, laying a gift at his feet and making his humble petition, displays the anthropomorphic model and origin at once of sacrifice and prayer.⁷

According to Tylor, the most primitive form of religion was animism (i.e. belief in spiritual beings), which was, in its first form, a belief in ghost-souls or apparition-souls. These beliefs emerged when people began reflecting, firstly, over the difference between a dead and a living body, and, secondly, over the identity of human beings that appear in dreams. Our forefathers drew the conclusion that there were two entities causing these phenomena, viz. a life-substance and a phantom — both of which were united to the body. When the life-substance left the body, death and decay set in, while the phantom — which was a subtle material replica of the body — could leave during sleep and trances to appear in dreams and visions and then return again. After having discovered these two ‘spiritual’ (thinly material) entities — the life-substance and the phantom — the ‘savage philosopher’ combined them into a ghost-soul that both animated the body and could live a life without it.⁸

From the notion of independent souls, the belief in the broader class of spirits developed. The spirits were, in the same way as souls, personified causes, i.e. explanations of natural phenomena, such as sickness demons or movers of the celestial spheres. The spirits also retained the anthropomorphic character of the soul, their *fons et origo*, a fact that becomes even more apparent with the emergence of the higher gods of polytheism. These governing gods were modelled on human rulers and had jurisdiction over hosts of spirits with more limited influence upon nature.⁹

The gift sacrifice, in the same manner as animism, went through some stages of development. Tylor distinguishes three, of which the later two should be seen as having developed from the first.

⁷ Tylor, 1903, Vol. 2, p. 375.

⁸ Tylor, 1903, Vol. 1, p. 425ff.

⁹ Tylor, 1903, Vol. 2, p. 247ff. For a discussion of Tylor’s anthropomorphic theory of religion in the context of the difference between science and religion, and with references to Robin Horton’s distinction between open and closed systems of thought, see Segal, 1995.

SACRIFICIAL THEORY

These ideas may be broadly distinguished as the gift-theory, the homage-theory, and the abnegation-theory.¹⁰

The homage-theory implies that it is not the value of the actual thing offered which is important, but that it is instead the honour given to a deity through the act of offering which is in focus — while according to the gift-theory, the substance of the offering is of value for the deity.

The abnegation-theory, on the other hand, concentrates on the abstention from something on the part of the worshipper. The value of sacrifice consists thus in depriving oneself of something, and the efficacy of sacrifice is, therefore, not dependent upon the actual object offered or upon the honour given to the deity in the course of the ritual, but the efficacy is relative to the loss inflicted upon the sacrificer. The greatest loss, naturally, is the passing away of the sacrificer's own life, but also the sacrifice of an only child is, according to such a theory, of utmost efficacy, even though the deity perhaps has no use for the human life sacrificed.

Another evolutionist theory was formulated in 1889 by William Robertson Smith (1846–1894) in his book *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites*. Smith, who was a philologist with Semitic languages as his speciality, constructed a theory about the early religious life of the Semitic tribes, but he supposed, nonetheless, that it would be valid for all ancient religions.¹¹ He directed his studies primarily towards rites and social structures, a focus different from Tylor's belief-oriented approach (so-called intellectualistic).¹²

¹⁰ Tylor, 1903, Vol. 2, p. 376.

¹¹ On p. 33 (Smith, R., 1997) Smith writes, "But though my facts and illustrations will be drawn from the Semitic sphere, a great part of what I shall have to say in the present lecture might be applied, with very trifling modifications, to the early religion of any other part of mankind." On pp. 197–198 when dealing with sacrifice he modifies this assertion, but maintains it in principle.

¹² For a modern positive view of the intellectualism of Tylor, although not without its critique, see Horton, 1993, "Neo-Tylorism: Sound Sense or Sinister Prejudice?".

But it is of the first importance to realise clearly from the outset that ritual and practical usage were, strictly speaking, the sum total of ancient religions. Religion in primitive times was not a system of belief with practical applications; it was a body of fixed traditional practices, to which every member of society conformed as a matter of course.¹³

According to Smith, the most primitive form of religion among the Semitic tribes was based upon a blood relationship between the deity and its worshippers; the deity together with the tribe constituted a single society, a community.¹⁴ The earliest form of sacrifice was a communal meal in which the deity and the tribe ate together of a sacred victim, viz. the totem animal that was not ordinarily to be killed, and which was related to the tribe in a similar manner as the deity.¹⁵ The sacrificial meal primarily strengthened the social bonds between the tribal members and their god. Smith's theory therefore stands in opposition to the gift theory proposed by Tylor, and Smith considers the gift sacrifice as a later development (or degeneration) from the more primitive sacrificial meal.¹⁶

To criticise the basis of the early evolutionary theories of sacrifice is easy, and in a sense unnecessary, as this has already been done for almost a century.¹⁷ A more fruitful approach is perhaps to focus upon the heuristic value of the evolutionary paradigm. The evolutionary sequences of ritual behaviour could be interpreted as statements about the primacy — not in a temporal, but in an explanatory sense — of certain aspects of man. Tylor argued that the thinking of early man was the central urge behind the sacrificial evolution, but this statement could be interpreted as meaning that religion is governed primarily by the conscious thinking of man. William Robertson Smith, on the other hand, decided for social life as the primary factor behind sacrifice and religion. Thus, according to this interpretation, the evolutionary sequences as formulated by Tylor and Smith function as historical renderings of causal explanations.

¹³ Smith, R., 1997, p. 21.

¹⁴ Smith, R., 1997, pp. 51–52.

¹⁵ Moreover, on pp. 424–425, Smith (Smith, R., 1997) argues that the totems easily develop into gods. This process is initiated when the tribal god is considered as the ancestor of the totem species. As a result he is pictured as theriomorphic, and in a second stage he becomes an anthropomorphic god.

¹⁶ Smith, R., 1997, pp. 375–377.

¹⁷ See e.g. Evans-Pritchard, 1956, p. 311ff.

Nevertheless, it is also important to remember that although the nineteenth-century obsession with origins receded in the twentieth century in favour of a focus upon synchronic features, mankind has a history, and so has sacrifice. It is hard, however, to reach back into the more remote periods of time, a fact which makes it tempting for scholars to project one aspect of sacrifice into a ‘mythical’ beginning.

2.2 Sociology of sacrifice

The evolutionist paradigm began to lose its central position around the turn of the century, a development that was reflected in the work *Essai sur la nature et la fonction du sacrifice* written by Henri Hubert (1872–1927) and Marcel Mauss (1872–1950) in 1898. They used the ancient Hebrew and Vedic sacrifices as their material, but did not search for the oldest form of sacrifice, or try to arrange the different sacrifices on an evolutionary ladder, as Robertson Smith and Tylor had done. They instead analysed the internal structure and logic of sacrifice.

Nous ne songeons donc pas à faire ici l’histoire et la genèse du sacrifice et, s’il nous arrive de parler d’antériorité, il s’agira d’antériorité logique et non d’antériorité historique.¹⁸

Still, they expected the structures in these two sacrificial systems (the Hebrew and Vedic) to be universally valid, and it was this common structure, or mechanism, that made it possible to speak of a unity behind the bewildering variety of sacrificial practices.¹⁹

They start their study with a definition of sacrifice which they subsequently use as a tool in the analysis of the Hebrew and Vedic sacrifices.

Le sacrifice est un acte religieux qui, par la consécration d’une victime, modifie l’état de la personne morale qui l’accomplit ou de certains objets auxquels elle s’intéresse.²⁰

The definition makes it clear that the consecration and the mediating character of the victim are central in a sacrifice. The sacralisation of the

¹⁸ Hubert, 1898, p. 35.

¹⁹ Hubert, 1898, p. 35.

²⁰ Hubert, 1898, p. 41.

victim (and the sacrificer) is made necessary through the divine nature of the god; if one is going to come into contact with the divine, one must leave the profane and enter the sacred and thus acquire a likeness to the god. The victim functions as a substitute for the sacrificer, as a link between the earth of men and the abode of gods. The victim assumes the sacred character of the divine and is killed at a dangerous and critical moment, and its spirit is dispatched from this world to the other. The whole sacrificial drama describes a curve, which begins with the preliminary rites and reaches its climax with the killing of the victim. The intensity then gradually diminishes and ends with the final rites, which make the transition from the sacred to the profane world possible. The participants then wash away the sacred and dangerous quality that the rite had conferred upon them. This is, however, not the case when the purpose of the sacrifice is an ordination, i.e. a heightening of the sacred quality of a person. The final rites are in such a case designed so that they do not remove all sacredness.²¹

In the discussion by Hubert and Mauss of the sacred, it is described as a blind force that has to be controlled, but is dangerous to deal with. This is parallel to Sylvain Lévi's interpretation of the *brāhmaṇa* view of sacrifice, which is not surprising as Lévi's work, *La doctrine du sacrifice dans les Brāhmaṇas*, is based upon lectures that Lévi especially designed for Mauss.²²

The use of the perspectives of the religious texts — which leads Hubert and Mauss to speak of the sacrifice as powerful through its connection with the world of the gods — is made possible through their explanation of the reality, and power, of the sacred as dependent upon the forces of the social world; that is, they translate the supernatural into the social.

On comprend dès lors ce que peut être la fonction du sacrifice, abstraction faite des symboles par lesquels le croyant se l'exprime à lui-même. C'est une fonction sociale parce que le sacrifice se rapporte à des choses sociales.²³

²¹ Hubert, 1898, p. 89f.

²² For a discussion of the influence of Sylvain Lévi on the scholarly works of Mauss, esp. his theory of sacrifice, see Strenski, 1997, pp. 526–537.

²³ Hubert, 1898, p. 137.

This conclusion, however, does not follow as an inference from the structural analysis of the Hebrew and Vedic sacrifices, but is instead based upon the theories of the French sociological school, founded by Émile Durkheim (1858–1917), of which Mauss was a member. Durkheim also published on the topic of religion and sacrifice, building upon the insights of William Robertson Smith, viz. that man's social life is fundamental for his religious beliefs and practices. In the classic *Les Formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse* (1912), one of the fundamental assumptions is that the totemism of the Australian aborigines represents the most primitive form of religious and social life.²⁴ A central conclusion, which he derives from his study of totemism, is that the totemic god is a hypostasis of the human community transposed to a supernatural scene.

Si donc il [sc. le totem] est, à la fois, le symbole du dieu et de la société, n'est-ce pas que le dieu et la société ne font qu'un? Comment l'emblème du groupe aurait-il pu devenir la figure de cette quasi divinité, si le groupe et la divinité étaient deux réalités distinctes? Le dieu du clan, le principe totémique, ne peut donc être autre chose que le clan lui-même, mais hypostasié et représenté aux imaginations sous les espèces sensibles du végétal ou de l'animal qui sert de totem.²⁵

Durkheim thus makes a sociological reduction of religious data: religious notions and rites are ways for a human community to speak about itself.²⁶ The nature of sacrifice is viewed in the same light, but he does not think (in

²⁴ Durkheim, 1912, p. 135. Durkheim wrote during a period when evolutionism began to be called into question. He worked, nevertheless, with apparent influences from evolutionary theories. See Belier, 1999.

²⁵ Durkheim, 1912, p. 294f.

²⁶ The being or not-being of reduction and reductionism in the study of religions has been much debated. The controversy is both about the causes of religion (explanation) and about the nature of religion (ontology). The discussion often centres on the transcendent or immanent nature of the sources of religious beliefs and actions. For a collection of articles that take different positions in this debate, see Idinopulos, 1994. Wouter Hanegraaff (1995) has formulated an alternative to the approaches of the two opposing parties (reductionists and religionists) in the context of the study of Esotericism. He draws attention to an empirical approach that remains agnostic concerning religious claims about the supernatural, and thus intends to steer clear of *a priori* standpoints. The question is, however, whether such an approach is possible in the sense of strict agnosticism; i.e. could a historical descriptive study really avoid ontology? Secondly, to give up the search for the "truth about religions(s)" (Hanegraaff, 1995, p. 108), and settle for the surface of phenomena, seems *a priori* to exclude the possibility of effective explanations of religious beliefs and practices.

contrast to Robertson Smith) that the gift sacrifice is a later development from a more primitive community meal. He instead considers the two forms of sacrifice as complementary and essential aspects of sacrifice.²⁷ Durkheim asserts, in accordance with his sociological explanation of religion, that the two aspects are expressions of transactions in society. The community aspect corresponds to what the individual gets from society, such as language, culture and ethics, while the gift aspect corresponds to what the individual gives to the community. Ritual life, like social life, moves in a circle; the individual gives to society and receives in return — in the same way people give gifts to the deities and unite with them in a community.²⁸

With the theories of Hubert-Mauss and Durkheim the historical sequence of sacrificial aspects is explicitly transformed into a causal or functional explanation, but Durkheim did not altogether escape from the heuristic allurements of evolution, i.e. the primacy of origin. His whole argumentation is thus based upon the special material provided by the 'primitive' tribes of Australia.

2.3 Psychology of sacrifice

Sigmund Freud (1856–1939) believed, similarly to Durkheim, that Australian totemism was the most primitive religion still practised in his time. He also thought that there was a similarity between the psyche of neurotics and primitive men, a fact which enabled him to bring psychoanalysis and anthropology together for the purpose of discovering the origin and nature of religion. In the book *Totem und Tabu* (1913),²⁹ Freud presents a theory of both religion and sacrifice. According to him, animism is one of the most ancient religions of mankind, but he does not search for the causes of animism in human consciousness, as Tylor did, but instead in the subconscious of primitive man.³⁰

²⁷ Durkheim, 1912, p. 489.

²⁸ Durkheim, 1912, p. 495f.

²⁹ First published in the journal *Imago*, 1912–13.

³⁰ Freud also believed in a period of animatism preceding animism, a thought propounded by R.R. Marett. See Freud, 1913, p. 84.

Die Geister und Dämonen sind, wie an anderer Stelle angedeutet wurde, nichts als die Projektionen seiner Gefühlsregungen; er macht seine Affektsbesetzungen zu Personen, bevölkert mit ihnen die Welt, und findet nun seine inneren seelischen Vorgänge außer seiner wieder...³¹

While Durkheim believed that the deity is a symbolic picture of the human community, Freud thus thinks that the deity is a projection of human emotions. Still he writes in the beginning of the chapter “Die infantile Wiederkehr des Totemismus” that only a synthesis of different sciences can determine what place psychology has in the investigation of religion. That reservation does not seem, though, to place any restrictions on Freud’s speculative imagination, and he thus writes in the same chapter that mankind in the beginning lived in hordes, in which only one male had access to all the females. The dominant male chased away all competitors, i.e. his own sons, who tried to challenge his monopoly. Totemism and sacrifice came into being the day the exiled brothers joined together, killed and ate the father, because, ”Daß sie den Getötenen auch verzehrten, ist für den kannibalen Wilden selbstverständlich.” They ate the hated father in what Freud calls “vielleicht das erste Fest der Menschheit”, but after the outburst of revenge they prohibited the eating of the totem animal, which was a substitute for the father.³² They even abstained from the women, i.e. their sisters, and thereby created the first two taboos. Religion in its totem form was born from the guilt felt by the brothers and from their attempts to reconcile themselves with the dead father. Sacrifice, in its most ancient form, was a communal meal during which an exemplar of the totem animal was eaten (cf. Robertson Smith); it was thus a repetition of the murder of the father. The brothers wanted to renew the qualities of the father in order to partake of them and, at the same time, to rehabilitate the murdered father. Freud thus places the origin and nature of sacrifice in psychological factors; sacrifice is a way to handle emotions of guilt, which were inherited from generation to generation, an idea perhaps modelled on the Christian idea of original sin.³³

³¹ Freud, 1913, p. 84.

³² Freud, 1913, p. 131.

³³ Freud, 1913, p. 132ff. On page 141, he reinterprets the redemptive death of Christ as the liberation from the guilt caused by the murder of the father by his sons, “Er ging hin und opferte sein eigenes Leben und dadurch erlöste er die Bruderschar von der Erbsünde.”

Freud's theory is, in a sense, easy to dismiss as he worked with material from sciences that he was not trained in, and also as he allowed himself to speculate about origins and primacy, thus using the evolutionary principle and treating mankind as a patient with dreadful experiences lingering on from childhood.³⁴ But it is also possible to discern a process of discovery similar to the one operating in the sociological theory of Durkheim. Another aspect of man, and of sacrifice, is delineated, perhaps not adequate in its essence, but pointing towards an important realm of causes in the explanation of human behaviour.³⁵

2.4 The discarding and reappearance of evolutionary explanations

As the theories presented above have shown, naturalism in combination with the theory of evolution gave birth, during the later half of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century, to a number of theories of religion and sacrifice.³⁶ These theories were reductionistic, i.e. they tried to explain sacrificial acts by indicating the non-religious causes lying behind them. They also focused on the early history of religion, as the authors of the theories assumed that the factors governing sacrificial practices were especially clearly seen at the birth of the

³⁴ Sharpe, 1986, pp. 198–203.

³⁵ For an attempt to use the Freudian theory of sacrifice, but without the evolutionary framework, see Rosolato, 1987. The religious traditions considered are the three monotheistic religions. The insights into the psychology of sacrifice are, moreover, seen as important for concrete psychoanalytic therapy. The problem of ritual efficacy is moreover addressed from a psychological viewpoint in Richard Payne's article concerning Shingon Buddhism, and he writes: "The question of ritual efficacy may be approached in two fashions, which in anthropological terms are called 'etic' and 'emic,' that is, from outside the tradition or from inside the tradition. Whereas both kinds of explanations are needed to understand rituals, this essay will focus on an etic explanation, specifically, that which can be developed from the perspective of analytic psychology." Payne, 1996, p. 72. See also DeMarinis, 1996, in the same volume.

³⁶ Definitions and subdivisions of Naturalism differ: see e.g. Lübecke, 1991b, p. 20f.; Stout, 1987, pp. 315–317; Drees, 1996, pp. 10–24. In this context, it refers to the methodological approaches (informed by the ontological stance of materialism) which assert that all aspects of reality can be explained by science. For a modern philosophical articulation and defence of Naturalism (physicalism), see Papineau, 1993.

sacrificial institution.³⁷ According to some scholars, labelled later as the intellectualists, the beliefs and practices of the different religions were results of misguided reasoning. To others it was primarily sociological factors that gave birth to sacrifice, while some maintained that it was psychological (subconscious) causes that played the major role.

An important conclusion which follows from this is that theories of sacrifice are dependent for the formulation of their premises on the theories of religion they are a part of.³⁸ This makes it necessary — if one wants to propose a new theory of sacrifice — to reconsider the foundations of earlier theories: to critically evaluate their most cherished premises. Such a major challenge to the foundations of evolutionism was the discovery that even the most ‘primitive’ tribes had a notion of a high god — the creator of the universe and guarantor of moral order — often in the form of a *Deus otiosus*. The idea of a development from the simple to the more complicated was thus thrown into question. Tylor’s scheme in which the high gods developed from lesser spirits, which in their turn were modelled on the human soul, could thereby not be based upon the beliefs of the technologically less developed peoples.

Andrew Lang (1844–1912) was the first to present these ideas in his book *The Making of Religion* in 1898. He proposed a degeneration hypothesis instead of the rectilinear evolutionary scheme of Tylor. The supreme god, according to Lang’s theory, was in the course of time neglected by early man and the god thus retreated into a high heaven, while the attention of man was directed instead towards lesser spirits and ghosts, whom could more easily be influenced by man. These minor spirits emerged and developed according to the animism theory of Tylor, i.e. from the belief in ghosts. Lang thus makes a distinction between two classes of gods: the primeval high gods and a later group of ghost (spirit) gods. The high gods did not receive any sacrifice, and the custom of presenting things to spirits grew, according to Lang, from the need to propitiate deceased ancestors.³⁹

³⁷ This could be compared with the special role that cosmogony plays in religious discourse. See e.g. Eliade, 1969b, esp. p. 41, footnote 2.

³⁸ Cf. Bell, 1992, p. 13f.

³⁹ Lang, 1997, pp. 206f, 287.

Wilhelm Schmidt (1868–1954) later built a theory upon Lang’s discovery of the belief in high gods among the most ‘primitive’ tribes. Schmidt thought, in accordance with Lang, that the development of beliefs in gods went through a process of degeneration from a primordial monotheism. He presented and elaborated these ideas in his monumental work in twelve volumes, *Ursprung des Gottesidee* (1912–55). Schmidt opposes the evolutionist theories of religious beliefs and practices which postulated a linear development from the simple to the complicated, a process that all cultures were supposed to go through. Instead, Schmidt uses a theory according to which mankind first had a common *Urkultur* that later developed in three separate places into what he called primary culture circles, which in their turn through mixture with each other developed into secondary and tertiary culture circles.⁴⁰ Schmidt thus opposes some of the foundations of evolutionism while at the same time sharing some of its concerns.⁴¹ The quest for the origin of religion is such a characteristic, and also the belief that the study of the technically less developed societies is a way to reach the primordial state of civilisation. However, Schmidt does not identify these ‘primitive’ cultures with the matrix of all cultures, the *Urkultur*.⁴²

After having built a new foundation for a theory of religion, Schmidt could on that basis propose a new theory of sacrifice. Lang was, according to him, partially wrong in making a distinction between high gods without sacrificial cult and spirits with such a cult. Schmidt points out that the anthropological evidence (i.e. rituals of peoples nearest to the *Urkultur*) supports the thesis that these high gods in reality received sacrifices. This earliest form of sacrifice was the firstling sacrifice, i.e. an offering of the

⁴⁰ Schmidt differentiated the cultural circles on the basis of social structure and means of subsistence, as e.g. matrilineal contra patrilineal, or pastoral in distinction to hunting cultures. For the fundamental theoretical discussion of this approach, see Schmidt, 1926, pp. 737–766, and Schmidt, 1937. For an English translation of some central passages of *Ursprung des Gottesidee*, with a commentary, see Brandewie, 1983, and concerning cultural circles see pp. 141–159, esp. the informative chart on p. 156.

⁴¹ For Schmidt’s own method of studying cultural evolution, see Schmidt, 1937, pp. 207–222. Cf. Brandewie, 1983, pp. 60–67.

⁴² Schmidt, 1929, p. 4.

first exemplar of the harvest, or the first-born of the animals, as an act of thanksgiving.⁴³

During the later half of the twentieth century new theories of religion generated sacrificial theories in accordance with the observation above: that a sacrificial theory often is embedded in a larger theoretical system. An interesting fact, though, is that the influential school of phenomenology of religion, as propounded by its best-known advocate, Mircea Eliade (1906–1986), has not focused primarily upon rituals, but has instead concentrated its analyses on myths.⁴⁴ Eliade, who was a stern critic of reductionism, interpreted ‘the sacred’ as something that shows itself to religious man rather than caused by psychological or sociological factors.⁴⁵ He seems to have been inclined toward the idea of a supernatural source of the *hierophany* (the manifestation of the sacred), something which is evinced by his insistence upon the irreducibility of the sacred.⁴⁶

Eliade explains, as mentioned above, the meaning and reason behind sacrifice through the myths that accompany it. To be more precise, he interprets sacrifices as imitations or repetitions of actions performed by the gods in primordial times; sacrifice makes the paradigmatic sacred actions of the gods present and efficacious. In *The Myth of the Eternal Return* (1949), Eliade exemplifies this *inter alia* with two examples taken from the Vedic *brāhmaṇas*, viz. ŚB 7.2.1.4 “We must do what the gods did in the beginning”⁴⁷ and TB 1.5.9.4 “Thus the gods did; thus men do”.⁴⁸ He

⁴³ Schmidt, e.g. 1926, pp. 199–204; 1933, pp. 61–76, pp. 245f., 259f.; 1935, pp. 277f., 445–454.

⁴⁴ For a thorough analysis of Eliade’s theory of myth, which however does not restrict itself to myth, since for Eliade religion in a sense is myth, see Allen, 1998.

⁴⁵ For comparisons between Eliade’s interpretation of the sacred/profane dichotomy and Durkheim’s (and Mauss’) approach, see Paden, 1994; Farace, Dominic, 1982.

⁴⁶ See e.g. Segal, 1999, for such an interpretation of Eliade’s position, and Paden, 1999, for an attempt to rescue the sacred from such critique through a “de-theologising”. For a discussion of the concept of hierophany see Barbosa da Silva, 1982, pp. 197–199. Moreover, in *Myth, Dreams and Mysteries* (1967, p. 87f), Eliade argues for the reality of the supernatural, or at least paranormal phenomena, even though he writes that this problem belongs to parapsychology, not primarily to the history of religions.

⁴⁷ The Sanskrit text is, however: *tad vā etat kriyate yad devā akurvan*, which is translated by Eggeling (ŚB, 1963) as “Now that same thing which the gods did, is done here.”

concludes with the statement that by these examples one “...summarizes all the theory underlying rituals in all countries.”⁴⁹ Sacrifice is, thus, not a special category, but only a subdivision of religious ritual, which in its turn is dependent upon stories of archetypal actions that a culture remembers and makes present in rituals.

Evolutionary explanations, nevertheless, were once again utilised for explaining sacrifice in the book *Homo Necans* (1972) by Walter Burkert, a philologist specialised in ancient Greek texts. He set out to accomplish a daring synthesis between different sciences such as philology, sociology, biology and psychology. The fundamental premise, which is reflected in the title of the book, *Homo Necans* (the killing man), is that “...alle Ordnungen und Herrschaftsformen menschlicher Gesellschaft auf institutionalisierter Gewalt beruhen...”.⁵⁰ He deduces from this axiom the conclusion that violence is therefore also at the core of religious traditions, and more specifically that the sacred is derived from sacrificial killing.

Burkert explains the emergence of (sacrificial) violence through its place in the evolution of man. At the time when man — through the invention of weapons and construction of male hunting organisations, *Männerbund* — became the ‘hunting ape’, the use of violence inside the human community (i.e. intraspecific) was a potential risk.⁵¹ Aggression therefore had to be turned towards animals outside the group, in order to ensure the unity and strength of the community. Burkert writes, furthermore, that the quarry became the sacrificial victim because of its resemblance to man, and the human character of the quarry, in its turn, was a result of the intraspecific violence projected upon the non-human animal. This made the hunters shocked when seeing the victim’s blood flowing, due to an innate instinct of preservation of (human) life. The feeling of guilt after having killed the quarry thus became the catalyst transforming the hunt into a sacrifice. Man had to hunt to be able to live, but at the same time he had to handle the anguish felt at the sight of the killed ‘brother’. This resembles to some

⁴⁸ The Sanskrit text is *iti devā akurvāt. ity u vai manuṣyāḥ kurvate.*

⁴⁹ Eliade, 1974, p. 21.

⁵⁰ Burkert, 1972, p. 8.

⁵¹ The thesis of man the hunter and his aggressive nature was, however, not invented by Burkert, but had been a recurrent theme in biology since the late 1950s, and its roots can be seen much earlier (Sussman, 1999).

extent Freud's theory of the primeval killing of the father, which was ritualised as the sons wanted to benefit from the deed as well as to reconcile themselves with the father.

Burkert thus traces the origin of sacrifice to the hunt, but he also has to explain the survival and the central place of sacrifice in the agricultural societies and the so-called high cultures, i.e. to explain why the sacrificial customs did not recede when hunting was not a primary way to procure food. His answer is that the sacrificial practices became ritualised, i.e. they became "...ein Verhaltensschema, das von seiner sachbezogenen Funktion /.../ abgelöst und trotzdem beibehalten ist in einer neuen Funktion..."⁵² Sacrifice acquired instead — after having lost the function of dealing with the anxieties of the hunter — the new function of communication, and became thereby a unit in the language of ritual. Its meaning seems, though, according to Burkert, to have remained centred upon violence, faithful to its origin.

We have, then, in the 1970s a theory that tries to put sacrifice into an evolutionary framework, an inclination which perhaps could be considered as an isolated return to the thought climate of the late nineteenth century, but this is not the case. There seem to have been some attempts at the end of the twentieth century to reintroduce evolutionary explanations of religious phenomena. Another example is Frits Staal's controversial book *Rules Without Meaning* (1989), which presented the thesis that ritual, and thus sacrifice, is essentially devoid of meaning.⁵³ Staal postulates that ritual and syntax are older than meaning, and that meaningless mantras are "a remnant or resurgence of a pre-linguistic stage of development, during which man or his ancestors used sound in a purely syntactic or ritual manner."⁵⁴ Staal's primary material is the Vedic *agnicayana* sacrifice, which was performed in Kerala in 1975, but the scope of his theoretical statements extends to the whole field of humanities, which he wants to

⁵² Burkert, 1972, p. 31f.

⁵³ For the debate aroused by Staal's theory, see e.g. Smith, B., 1991 and Staal's reply, 1993, and also Penner, 1985, which refers to an article of Staal written before *Rules Without Meaning*, but expressing the same ideas, and the three articles in *Religion* (21) in 1991 by Allen Grapard, Burton Mack and Ivan Strenski, which were answered by Staal in the same volume.

⁵⁴ Staal, 1989, p. 113.

espouse methods akin to those used in the natural sciences. His central thesis, though, viz. “Ritual is pure activity, without meaning or goal”, is primarily true about primeval rituals, which according to Staal were instances of pure action for its own sake.⁵⁵ Later the difference between rituals and the ordinary goal-centred activity of man became embarrassing, and man had to give the pure rituals a surface structure of appropriate meanings. Religion was the foremost meaning-producer, and therefore ritual became appropriated by religion and connected with religiously important occasions, such as the liminal phase of the New Year.⁵⁶ Hence, Staal combines a purely structural (syntactical) analysis of sacrificial action with an evolutionary hypothesis.

Evolution as a way to present the primacy of one aspect of sacrifice was thus discarded by some scholars motivated by both the rejection of its underlying naturalism and by the affirmation of the transcendent realm, which sacrifice is directed towards. Evolutionary explanations were, however, once again used by Staal and Burkert to present two new aspects of the efficacy of sacrifice, viz. its rule-governed and violent nature.

2.5 Sacrifice as dependent upon the mind

Claude Lévi-Strauss — the most famous spokesman for structuralism as applied to religious traditions — once wrote that “the human mind is everywhere the one and the same and /.../ it has the same capacities.”⁵⁷ From this central assumption, which is very different from assumptions underlying such concepts as *survivals* and *primitive religion*, he has tried, with inspiration drawn from linguistic theory, to disentangle the classificatory principles operating in the human mind — principles, such as the tendency to think in binary oppositions, which have accordingly formed the structure of myths in similar ways in different parts of the world.

Structuralist analysis was applied to sacrifice by the British social anthropologist Edmund Leach in his book *Culture and Communication*

⁵⁵ Staal, 1989, p. 131.

⁵⁶ Staal, 1989, p. 137.

⁵⁷ Lévi-Strauss, 1980, p. 19.

(1976).⁵⁸ The theory resembles to a great extent Hubert and Mauss's conclusions in that it pinpoints the mediating function between the natural and the supernatural worlds as sacrifice's central role.⁵⁹

...the purpose of religious performance is to provide a bridge, or channel of communication, through which the power of the gods may be made available to otherwise impotent men.⁶⁰

The mediator of sacrifice is above all the victim, whose soul is able to travel after the sacrificial killing to the powerful world of the gods, in order to establish a bridge between the world of being and the world of death (i.e. non-being). This structuralist interpretation is, as already mentioned, in a sense the same as the one made in 1898 by Hubert and Mauss, minus their sociological explanation. The question is, therefore, what the structuralist puts in the place of society. Does he leave the door of the sacred open, like the phenomenologist, thus not excluding a transcendent origin of the sacred? A tentative answer is that in the place, or function, occupied sometimes by society or the subconscious in other theories, the structuralist puts the logic of the human mind. The tracing of the origin of mythic and religious thinking to the mind resembles the approach of the intellectualists, who argued that it was faulty reasoning that caused the emergence of religion and sacrifice. Lévi-Strauss, however, argues that the mental processes that have produced myth and science are in fact rather similar, and it is better to "les mettre en parallèle, comme deux modes de connaissance...".⁶¹ Lévi-Strauss does, in this way, repudiate the views of

⁵⁸ His analysis of sacrifice largely resembles, of course, that propounded by Lévi-Strauss in *La pensée sauvage* (1962, p. 295ff.). What is characteristic of the Lévi-Straussian approach is, however, that he contrasts totemism with sacrifice, as respectively classification and a concern with efficacy. He furthermore values the former and denigrates the latter. "Plus exactement, les systèmes classificatoires se situent au niveau de la langue: ce sont des codes plus ou moins bien faits, mais toujours en vue d'exprimer des sens, tandis que le système du sacrifice représente un discours particulier, et dénué de bon sens quoiqu'il soit fréquemment proféré." Lévi-Strauss, 1962, p. 302.

⁵⁹ He does, however, present another model (Leach, 1989, p. 83) that focuses more on the time-aspect, i.e. the abnormal or liminal time period during which the rite is performed; but the connection between the ordinary (natural) world and the extraordinary (supernatural) world is central also in this model.

⁶⁰ Leach, 1989, p. 82.

⁶¹ Lévi-Strauss, 1962, p. 21.

Lévy-Bruhl, but at the same time he has to introduce some basic differences between mythic and scientific discourse, i.e. if he wants to prevent his analyses from becoming myths about myths. He therefore chooses, in the book *Myth and Meaning*, the opposition between holistic understanding (myth) and limited explanations (science), which in a way reintroduces the division between ‘primitive’ and scientific thought, albeit in a new form.⁶² The demarcation line, though, seems fuzzy; does not science aim at holistic understanding, and could not myths provide limited explanations? Lévi-Strauss presents another demarcation line between science and mythology in *La pensée sauvage* (1962), viz. the opposition between a concern with the concrete (myth) and a preoccupation with the abstract (science), even though he labels them both as “pensée scientifique”, i.e. as roads to knowledge.⁶³ His approach is in a sense parallel to Robin Horton’s insistence upon the will to explanation and the formulation of theory as basic drives in both science and religion, even though Lévi-Strauss, in contrast to Horton, extenuates the importance of abstract thinking in religious thought. The act of bringing science and religion together leads Horton, too, to draw a new boundary between the two kindred explanatory discourses, a line which he puts between open and closed systems of thought. The characteristic feature of the open system (or attitude) is to be aware of options to the prevailing paradigm, while closed systems are not aware of such competing alternatives.⁶⁴

It is possible to see the problem of differentiating between religious thought and science as the result of a twofold process. Firstly, religion and magic were considered as examples of mistaken or inferior science, but nevertheless an activity of man’s rational ability. Secondly, in order to rescue the primitive mind from this inferior position, scholars either put the factors governing religion outside consciousness, or they considered the mythic reasoning of primitive men as rational but with some minor characteristics that did not make it as successful as modern science (i.e. in

⁶² Lévi-Strauss, 1980, p. 17. The final argument, though, is that myth does not succeed in giving man mastery over nature. See also Lévi-Strauss, 1962, p. 21. Cf. Jarvie, 1995.

⁶³ Lévi-Strauss, 1962, p. 24.

⁶⁴ Horton, 1977, p. 153ff. For a synopsis of Horton’s project contrasted with the theories of Tylor and Lévi-Strauss, see Segal, 1993, esp. p. 187ff. concerning open and closed systems of thought.

acquiring knowledge about the world of the senses). This dilemma could be resolved if one does not view science and religion as aiming at the same knowledge, but instead considers that religion stretches reason to the realm of the supernatural, an inclination that is not shared with modern science; i.e. the opposition is not primarily between two different sorts of rationality, but between different levels of being toward which reason is primarily directed.

In this context, it could be helpful to reflect upon the distinction between rational belief and rational action as presented by C. Jarvie and Joseph Agassi.⁶⁵ The rationality of an action is, according to them, dependent upon its direction towards a goal, and the rationality of a belief consists in that it “satisfies some standard criterion of rationality”. A person who acts rationally is rational in the ‘weak’ sense of the word, and a person acting rationally on the basis of rational beliefs is rational in the ‘strong’ sense. They attribute the strong sense of rationality to science, while magic can merely be rational in the weak sense.⁶⁶ The problem with their theory is, however, that the standard criteria of the rationality of beliefs are not given any specific content. To be able to exclude magic from being based upon rational beliefs, the rules for counting a belief as rational have to be given, and also a definition of magic.

Mikael Stenmark gives such a list of standards in his dissertation *Rationality in Science, Religion and Everyday Life*.⁶⁷ He there defends the thesis that the opposition between religion and science does not introduce two sorts of rationality, but that the difference is instead based upon the fact that science is primarily directed towards prediction of events and religion towards existential problems, i.e. they have different goals but are both rational activities. The reduction of religion to a view of life that deals with existential questions seems, however, to sacrifice vital aspects of religion, such as the search for knowledge. Jesper Sørensen has therefore recently (2001) argued that both the views of rituals as symbolical communication and as rational instrumental action are mistaken, and that

⁶⁵ Jarvie, 1970.

⁶⁶ Jarvie, 1970, p. 173.

⁶⁷ Stenmark, 1994, p. 317.

ritualisation instead should be understood primarily as the condition for beliefs that superhuman agents possess efficacy.

The theory propounded by Robert McCauley and Thomas Lawson in their joint project *Rethinking Religion* (1990) reflects, like the work of Sørensen, the last trend within religious studies of the late twentieth century, viz. influences from cognitive science.⁶⁸ Cognitive science as applied to religion resembles the structuralist and intellectualist approaches, in that the central question for the cognitive approach is how humans acquire and transmit knowledge. Moreover, religion is seen as a system of beliefs and practices that are results of the ordinary ways human beings get to know and structure the material world. Religious knowledge, however, has some peculiar characteristics, viz. references to supernatural worlds and beings. This is e.g. explained by Pascal Boyer as a result of the advantages that violations of a restricted number of principles of common sense have in the selection of ideas for mnemonic procedures. A representation of a human as having all the ordinary qualities of a person, but not a concrete body (i.e. being a spirit), is more likely to be remembered than a person who does not violate any ontological premises in the basic, and to a great extent innate, common-sense theory of what a person is. Cognitive science is, in Boyer's version, heavily inclined towards evolutionary explanations of religious phenomena; but his theory is more applicable to religious ideas involving lower levels of abstraction, such as certain forms of mythology, than to e.g. metaphysics, which he quite remarkably considers as an epiphenomenon in the evolution of man.

The human mind is a complex set of functional capacities that were shaped by natural selection and evolved, not necessarily to build a coherent or true picture of the world and certainly not to answer metaphysical questions, but to solve a series of specific problems to do with survival and reproduction.⁶⁹

To give the evolutionary processes some inherent direction seems to violate the basic principles of evolution as opposed to creationism. Metaphysical thinking must have had, in some sense, an evolutionary

⁶⁸ See e.g. the attempt made by Jesper Sørensen (Sørensen, 2000) to characterise and define magic with the help of cognitive theories.

⁶⁹ Boyer, 1999, p. 53.

advantage as this capacity of man has been preserved through natural selection.⁷⁰

McCauley and Lawson's theory of ritual is intended to promote the use of the advances in cognitive science, mainly linguistics, for the benefit of religious studies. They present two metatheoretical theses in the beginning of their study: first, that interpretation and explanation are complementary; the opposition between the camps of the irreducibility of the sacred and of the reductionists is consequently unnecessary and unfruitful. Second, they choose as the model of their theory the generative linguistics of Noam Chomsky, i.e. the competence approach, whose application they stretch from the realm of language to the world of action.⁷¹ Their theory presents a set of formalised rules, which explain how the structures of religious rituals are generated from an ideal participant's implicit knowledge. They treat religious rituals as actions, with the important difference that among the eligible participants are so-called "culturally postulated superhuman agents", i.e. spirits and gods. These are central for the ritual scheme, and the positions of the superhuman agents in the ritual determine the importance and efficacy of the ritual. Lawson and McCauley's inspiration is drawn mainly from linguistics, in accordance with Staal and the structuralists, but they think — in contradistinction to Staal — that the conceptual schemes accompanying the rituals are important. They want, nevertheless, their generative rules to lay bare the universal structures of religious rituals, i.e. the universal grammar of ritual. Sacrifice is, in this

⁷⁰ A similar argumentation can be found in Robert Nozick's book *The Nature of Rationality* (Nozick, 1993) in which he puts rationality into an evolutionary framework, and states tentatively (Nozick, 1993, p. 176) that many of the thorny problems of philosophy are the results of rationality extended beyond its proper capacity: a capacity "...which was selected for and designed to work in tandem with enduring facts that held during the period of human evolution..." But the unrestricted nature of reason does, somehow, seem to be inherent in it and furthermore to fulfil important functions in human life. Why could this not have been an adaptive advantage? The argumentation above seems to be founded, like so many others, on the habit of projecting an ideal into primordial times; thus, a modern limited use of reason (see Kant, 1977, pp. 59, 73, but cf. Kant, 1977, p. 100ff.) is seen as the original primary function of reason, notwithstanding that this restriction of the scope of proper reason is a late development. For a discussion of rationality and evolutionism, see Nordgren, 1994, pp. 103–140.

⁷¹ Lawson, 1990, p. 2.

theory, only a subclass of rituals that contains the element of giving something to a superhuman agent, who is a passive receiver of the gift. This makes the efficacy of sacrifices weaker than the efficacy of other rituals, and thus sacrifices need to be repeated, because their effects are temporally limited. This explains why the sacrificial death of Christ has to be repeated in the ritual of the Eucharist, although the sacrifice on the cross is good for all times and need not be repeated.⁷² The limits of the universal grammar of ritual come, according to McCauley and Lawson, into conflict with the Christian conceptual scheme.

We have now come full circle, i.e. beginning and ending with a theory that views sacrifice as a gift and emphasises the dependence of religion on the mind. Evolutionary explanations of sacrifice and religion have also reappeared with force at the end of the twentieth century, as the *sui generis* approach of the phenomenology of religion lost momentum. It has moreover become apparent in the survey of sacrificial theories that they are dependent upon larger theoretical frameworks. This has the consequence that if a scholar begins by analysing theories of sacrifice, he quickly enters into the heart of the study of religion.

One of the important issues for the approaches proceeding from the basis of naturalism was the question of how to explain beliefs in supernatural beings and worlds. Different ways of explanation were attempted, and according e.g. to the intellectualists, it was indeed the faculty of reason that had produced beliefs in supernatural beings, but it was at the same time faulty reasoning. It was therefore thought that one of the tasks of science was to correct this pre-scientific stage in the development of human thought. However, Freud placed the origin and cause of sacrifice in the subconscious and thus outside the rational part of the human mind, while Durkheim and the sociologists looked instead for the causes of sacrifice in the world of human society. Staal and Burkert, in the later half of the twentieth century, also placed (using evolutionary explanations) the origin and nature of sacrifice outside reason, focusing on the rule-governed and violent nature of sacrifice. All these approaches reflect the tension between the naturalism that made them possible and the supernatural claims of different religions.

⁷² Lawson, 1990, p. 134.

The major reaction in the twentieth century against these approaches was the phenomenology of religion, which in the version of Eliade viewed religion instead as a response to the revelation of the sacred. The rational basis of religion was, however, given new support in the theories of the structuralists and such anthropologists as Robin Horton. But the question of differentiating between science and religion becomes somewhat problematic when one considers them as two paths to the same goal, and if, at the same time, one does not want to define religion as inferior. Lastly, cognitive science tries to solve this dilemma through the assumption that ordinary and religious knowledge are acquired with the help of the same cognitive processes, and explains e.g. beliefs in supernatural beings through the mnemonic advantages that supernatural qualities bring with them. Religion is seen, also in such an approach, as resulting from the shaping influence of principles lying outside reason, i.e. if a person wants to be rational he has to purge his thinking from these disruptions of the cognitive processes.

The question of the nature of rationality and the question of sacrificial efficacy thus seem to be interconnected. If human action is seen as being primarily controlled by causes lying outside the province of reason, then also the function, and efficacy, of sacrifice probably will be located in that direction. That is, if a scholar chooses e.g. to look for the causes and nature of religion in social facts, and therefore views the world of gods as a reflection of society, then sacrifice probably will be considered as fulfilling a social function and as deriving its efficacy from the social aspect of human life.

The stance chosen for this study is that sacrifice is a multifaceted phenomenon and it can and should be studied from different perspectives, e.g. social, psychological, aesthetic and hermeneutic, but these perspectives should not be closed upon themselves in such a way that they try to explain the whole spectrum of sacrifice. Their explanations should only extend so far as the actual perspective and data permit. Such a multiple approach to sacrifice creates a need for a unifying theory that can incorporate and interrelate the different aspects of man (e.g. biological, psychological, social and intellectual), and thus also the aspects of sacrifice, into a coherent 'anthropology'. One could, with this in mind, interpret the history of sacrificial theories as a gradual disclosure of new

aspects of sacrifice and, at the same time, of man. The path opened by a pioneering attempt has often enriched our view of sacrifice with a new dimension, even though some of the methods and perspectives have been abandoned. For example, even though the basis of Robertson Smith's theory of sacrifice is problematic, it has made the community aspect of sacrifice explicit, something that was developed further by French sociologists.

The formulation of a unifying metatheory of sacrifice will not be attempted here — even if it could be a useful counterweight to the fragmentation of perspectives. Gavin Flood, for instance, argues in his book *Beyond Phenomenology* that metatheory in religious studies is an important endeavour. He characterises metatheory primarily as an analytic project that elucidates implicit assumptions in theories of religion, or studies of religious traditions. However, he also wants this deconstructive project to be constructive, in the sense that it can provide a unifying language for the different approaches within religious studies: “Metatheory provides the only possibility of shared discourse.”⁷³ The fundamental problem with such an approach becomes manifest when metatheory is used to analyse itself; metatheory is not, to wit, merely a ‘neutral’ discourse in which different approaches can meet, but is in itself a theory, albeit a theory of theories. If it could be shown that a metatheory, for example in the version of Flood, is based upon specific basic theoretical assumptions (e.g. epistemological or ontological), then one could envisage a plurality of metatheories, and also metatheories of these metatheories, with the impending danger of an infinite regress. The conclusion is, thus, that a metatheory cannot be unifying without being a theory which encompasses and harmonises the different approaches of lower levels into a coherent theoretical system.

In this study, however, an emphasis will be put on the importance of ontological or ‘metaphysical’ thinking for sacrificial practices.⁷⁴ Religion

⁷³ Flood, 1999, p. 8.

⁷⁴ The word ‘metaphysical’ is used here for lack of a better word. Hopefully, it will be possible for the reader to temporarily detach himself from the pejorative use of this word in the modern era, and instead to regard it as merely an instrument of analysis. W. H. Walsh writes in “The Nature of Metaphysics” (1967, p. 300) that “Almost everything in metaphysics is controversial...” With this in mind, any attempt to

extends reason to spheres outside the realm of the senses, an aspiration that often comes into conflict with the naturalism underlying many theories of sacrifice. The difference between religion and science, in the realm of cognition, is thus here not defined as that between rational and non- or pre-rational, but between different levels of being toward which reason is primarily directed. It is important, though, to emphasise that what is argued here is not concerned with the question whether such disciplines as metaphysics or ontology are well founded, or if they constitute illegitimate uses of reason. The issue here is instead that the right use of reason as defined by science can become a grid, a model of the human mind, which does not correspond to the use of reason within certain religious traditions. This could lead to that the ontological reflections of the practitioners of a sacrificial cult are considered as having no great significance for the actual ritual practice. The approach in this study, therefore, tries to avoid a projection of a limited use of reason onto a culture that does not embrace such restraints. This is attempted mainly through the premise that the discourses of the cult practitioners on their own ritual performances, involving what could be called ontological or metaphysical questions, can be of importance for the actual ritual practice. That is, the point argued here is not whether certain ontological discourses of the ritual practitioners are well founded, but merely that such reflections may be of importance for the concrete practice of sacrifice.

The emphasis on the importance of basic philosophical questions in religion leads in the study of Vedic sacrifice to the choice of analysing the world-view in which these sacrifices were performed.⁷⁵ This choice of

pinpoint the meaning of ‘metaphysical thinking’ is bound to be called into question. Nevertheless, some points will be made. Firstly, it is called metaphysical thinking and not purely metaphysics, because it concerns not necessarily an ordered body of knowledge but, more often, attempts to deal with central metaphysical or ontological questions, e.g. ultimate causes or the relation between multiplicity and unity. Secondly, an important point is that such questions reach into the realm beyond the world of sense perception, both regarding the non-sensible qualities of sensible objects, and regarding objects not perceptible in a normal way, i.e. supernatural ones.

⁷⁵ When finishing this thesis a similar approach to Vedic ritualistic came to my attention. Jarrod Whitaker writes in his abstract of the lecture that he will hold at the Third International Vedic Workshop (Leiden, May 30 – June 2, 2002): “Therefore, the most fruitful way to approach Vedic magical thought and practices is to pay close attention to the ritual metaphysics and ontological categories that underlie the magical

perspective does not rule out biological, sociological and psychological explanations, but the intention is to supplement and experiment with another outlook, which perhaps can be important in a future unifying theory. Sacrifice is thus rule-governed and perhaps these rules are universal; it handles emotions of guilt and fulfils important social functions; it also mediates between the profane and sacred realms, irrespective of how these realms are established; and finally, sacrifice is embedded in a theory, or several theories, of how the natural and supernatural worlds are constituted, which defines and sets the limits for the aims and efficacy of the sacrifices.⁷⁶

The approach in this study is thus primarily influenced by the tradition which begins with the intellectualism of Tylor, which finds new support in the insistence on the will to explanation as a basic drive in religion, formulated by Robin Horton, and which finally is active in the cognitive approach, with its emphasis upon the ordinary ways of acquiring knowledge as operative also in religion. The differences between these approaches and the one chosen for this study are, however, also important, and the most central difference is the focus on ontological thinking in religion and thus also in the sacrificial world-view.

It is, moreover, important to state that this does not mean that the world-view, in which a specific sacrifice is embedded, is necessarily unchanging and monolithic. Rather, it is often in a state of transformation and composed of different parts, which are sometimes contradictory. This is e.g. partly the case with the sacrificial system of the *brāhmaṇas* that gave birth to the doctrines of the *upaniṣads*. The choice is therefore to concentrate on basic ontological questions that generate different solutions. Through such an approach, it is possible to focus upon the dynamic character of religious thinking. And, perhaps, some of these fundamental

rites and worldviews of the Atharvaveda and its priests. The main concern of this paper is how Atharvaveda magic was thought to work, that is, its internal laws and nature.” Whitaker, 2002, p. 53.

⁷⁶ For an attempt to use metaphysical notions as instruments in a cross-cultural interpretation of symbols, see Turner, 1962, pp. 82–96. Cf. the critique of this approach as formulated by Horton, 1964.

problems are universal, as the intuitive ontology laid bare by cognitive science seems to indicate.⁷⁷

⁷⁷ Boyer, 2000, pp. 196–199.

How the Correspondences are Expressed

3.1 Different ways of expressing correspondences

Before entering into the analysis of the system of correspondences, we will discuss the different ways the correspondences are expressed in the texts. The consideration of the formal aspects of the correspondences is of importance for their interpretation; the evaluation of the word order of nominal sentences is, for example, relevant to whether the correspondences primarily express identifications or other sorts of relations.

Some of the methods of expressing a correspondence are highly frequent in the AiB, while others are more seldom used. To give an approximation of how often the different ways of expressing a correspondence are used, a table of the frequencies in the first five *khaṇḍas* of *pañcikā* 1–4, and the first *khaṇḍa* of *pañcikā* 5 will be given below. *Khaṇḍa* 2–5 of the fifth *pañcikā* are not noted because of the character of the correspondences that are connected with the days in the *dvādaśāha*, which are treated in this part of the AiB.¹ The *dvādaśāha* system of correspondences is special because of its frequent and systematic use of the word *rūpa* (form), which explains the high frequency of *rūpa* in the table below, though from *pañcikā* 5 only the first *khaṇḍa* has been used.

The sample is thus limited to a few text passages, but it nevertheless gives an indication of the relative frequencies.

¹ See pp. 103, 143f.

Table 1. Different ways of expressing correspondences in AiB 1.1–5, 2.1–5, 3.1–5, 4.1–5 and 5.1

<i>Type of expression</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
Nominal sentence: with all nouns in nom.	57
Nominal sentence: with one noun in gen.	6
Nominal sentence: with a relative pronoun	11
Nominal sentence: with one word in <i>vṛddhi</i>	7
Verbal sentence: with dative (leading to)	1
The use of the word <i>āyatana</i> (have its abode in)	2
The use of the word <i>rūpa</i> (form, shape)	37
Myth and narrative	7
Analogy	11

The categories above are of quite different types; some are characterised by syntactical features, while others are classified on the basis of the concepts used, the genre of the text, or by semantic considerations. The first four categories are all variants of nominal sentences, which express the correspondences in a concise way. Three of these categories are characterised by special syntactic traits, such as case or the use of pronouns. The fourth category of nominal sentences, however, does not deviate from the preceding categories on the basis of syntax; its distinguishing feature is that the predicate is constituted by an adjective, which is formed through the *vṛddhi* form of a noun; e.g. instead of the noun *triṣṭubh*, the adjective *triṣṭubha* (*triṣṭubh*-like) is used.

The fifth category is distinguished from the nominal sentences in that it contains a verb and furthermore a noun in dative that expresses the endpoint or goal of the correspondence.

The two following categories are not characterised on the basis of syntax, but by the use of special concepts, viz. *āyatana* and *rūpa*. These correspondences can therefore be expressed in either a nominal or a verbal sentence, but here they are put in a special category, as these notions are of importance for the understanding of the nature of the correspondences.

The next category (*Myth and narrative*) is made up of those correspondences that are integrated into a narrative, for example when it is told how a god was assigned a special metre, which therefore stands in a close relation to the god.

The last category is made up of cases of analogy, i.e. entities that are connected on the basis of a common characteristic. The principle of analogy is also operative in the correspondences collected under the other headings, but the cases of analogy in the last category are not part of a myth or a narrative, and they are not expressed in the same concise way as many of the correspondences that are expressed through nominal sentences. The analogy in question here is a more elaborate linking of objects, for example when the different ways of analysing an arrow are linked to how many teats should be used when milking a cow. If the arrow is analysed as a unit, then only one teat is used, and when it is considered as composed of two parts, two teats are used.

3.2 Nominal Sentences

3.2.1 Introduction

According to the table above, the most frequent form of the correspondences is a nominal sentence, especially the variant with two or more nouns in nominative, plus, in most cases, an emphatic particle.² The interpretation of this type of sentences therefore becomes crucial for the

² The nominal sentences/clauses in which the predicate is an adjective will not primarily be considered in this context, as they are not directly relevant to the discussion of the correspondences. The *vrddhi* forms are, however, important exceptions to this restriction.

overall interpretation of the correspondences. One of the problematic features of nominal sentences is how one should analyse the ‘missing’ copula. When two nouns are juxtaposed, sometimes with an emphatic particle between them, and sometimes without it, should this be considered to mean that they are considered as identical, or that one of them qualifies the other? The indications of syntax are minimal in such sentences, and the situation is only slightly better in the variants with relative pronouns, while the sentences with a noun in *vṛddhi* or in the genitive could be expected to give more information on the relation between the nouns.

Another problem is how one should analyse the word order in a Vedic nominal sentence, i.e. whether there is a recurrent structure in the nominal sentences which could be used when identifying which of the nouns is subject and which is predicate in a specific sentence. If there are exceptions to this basic order, what are the criteria for deciding if a sentence follows the basic or the exceptional order?

To be able to answer these questions, it is helpful to widen the horizon of nominal predication, to include primarily the Indo-European context, but also to incorporate some approaches within general linguistics. The aim, however, is not to be comprehensive, as this would require a separate study, but to lay a foundation for the subsequent analysis. Some ideas and classifications expressed outside Vedic studies will therefore be used to discuss and elucidate the two issues mentioned above: the nature of nominal sentences in AiB and their word order.

3.2.2 The nature of nominal sentences

A pioneering work on the nominal sentence in the Indo-European context was made by A. Meillet in his article “La phrase nominale en Indo-européen”.³ He defined a pure nominal sentence/clause as containing no finite verbal form.⁴ In Indo-Iranian (i.e. in the Veda and the Avesta) and in ancient Greek, the pure nominal sentence (or clause) was used mainly in

³ Meillet, 1906–08. For a short survey of studies done on nominal sentences in the different Indo-European languages, see l’Hermitte, 1978, pp. 36–47. For studies of non-Indo-European languages, see e.g. Callender, 1984, *Studies in the Nominal Sentence in Egyptian and Coptic*.

⁴ Meillet, 1906–08, p. 1. But non-finite verbal forms qualify, as infinitives and participles.

the third person singular present indicative. A pure nominal sentence could, however, also be used in the first or second person, if the person is indicated through other means than a verbal form, e.g. a pronoun.⁵ The nominal sentence can thus, according to Meillet, be formulated with or without a copula, and the interpretation of the copula therefore becomes crucial for the consideration of the nature of the nominal sentence.

In the function of copula, a verb of the type ‘to be’ merely connects the predicate to the subject.⁶ This function is evident when an adjective is the predicate of a noun, but the correspondences in the *brāhmaṇas* are chiefly formulated between nouns, a fact which makes the analysis of predication more problematic. That is, when the predicate is e.g. ‘mixed’ the relation between subject and predicate is relatively clear,⁷ as in AiB 1.21.5 *vikṣudram iva vā antastyam*, “The entrails are [of different sizes] as it were”;⁸ but when the predicate is a noun, referring to a separate object, i.e. not an abstract noun, and the relation between the two objects is not evident from their respective natures, as in AiB 2.41.10 *vṛṣṭir vai yājyā vidyud eva*, “The offering verse is rain and lightning”, the mere connecting function of the omitted copula has to be understood as involving further functions, e.g. “The offering verse [is the same as] rain and lightning” or “The offering verse [is connected to] rain and lightning”.⁹

⁵ Meillet, 1906–08, pp. 5, 14.

⁶ It is therefore “semantically empty”, as Hengeveld writes (1992, p. 32). On that criterion, he differentiates between copula, semi-copula and pseudo-copula. An English example of semi-copula is the verb ‘become’ which cannot be left out without changing the meaning of the sentence, i.e. the semi-copula confers “aspects of being” (Hengeveld, 1992, p. 36). An example of pseudo-copula is the verb ‘seem’, which signals not only an aspect of being, like the semi-copula, but also an action; i.e. the verb not only connects a non-verbal predicate to the subject, but functions as a predicate. This question, however, is not only a grammatical issue, and perhaps a fruitful interaction with the analyses of ‘being’ performed within philosophy can be of importance in this context. Hengeveld, for example, remarks (1992, p. 74) that a notion he uses is “...taken from ontological philosophy”.

⁷ However, Cf. Gren-Eklund, 1978, pp. 37–41.

⁸ Keith translates, “The entrails are mixed as it were”, and Haug, “For the extremities of the (mystical) sacrificial body (to be restored by means of the Pravargya ceremony) vary as to magnitude and largeness”.

⁹ For a discussion of similar expressions in the religion of the Nuer people (in Africa), see Evans-Pritchard, 1956, p. 123ff.

Some aspects of Meillet’s conclusions were called into question by Benveniste (1950), who contrasted the Indo-European nominal sentences with verbal sentences, especially those that include a verb of existence (in Sanskrit \sqrt{as} or $\sqrt{bhū}$). Benveniste argues — mainly with the help of ancient Greek material¹⁰ — that it is wrong to postulate a zero copula, and thus categorise the nominal sentence without copula as a sort of ellipse. The nominal sentence is instead used, in contrast to the verbal sentence, to express timeless and permanent truths.¹¹ He thus discards the difference between pure and ‘impure’ nominal sentences, and categorises the sentences with copula as verbal sentences; in a nominal sentence, the predicate nominal has assumed the function otherwise held by the verb. He applies this *inter alia* to the Vedic context, and states, “La phrase nominale en védique est l’expression par excellence de la *définition* intemporelle.”¹²

The distinction made by Katarina Kupfer between ellipse and nominal sentence, in her article “Kopula- und Nominalsätze im Ṛgveda”, could be helpful in this context.

Im Falle einer Ellipse also, um das noch einmal festzuhalten, verändert sich weder die Konstruktion des Satzes noch der Status der einzelnen Konstituenten. Lediglich die lautliche Realisierung unterscheidet sich von der eines parallelen Satzes, bei dem keine Ellipse auftritt.¹³

The characteristic aspects of the nominal sentence, static timelessness and the absence of a controlling agent, are therefore not expressed by an ellipse.¹⁴ That is, two identical sentences without finite verbal forms can be categorised as respectively a nominal sentence and an ellipse, depending upon which context the sentences are placed in.

On the basis of Benveniste’s thesis, i.e. the atemporal aspect of the nominal sentence, the verbs of existence should be more frequent in a

¹⁰ The nominal sentence in Greek was studied later in more detail by Charles Guiraud (Guiraud, 1962).

¹¹ Benveniste, 1950, p. 27.

¹² Benveniste, 1950, p. 34.

¹³ Kupfer, 2000, p. 286.

¹⁴ Kupfer, 2000, p. 288. She bases her analysis upon the work of Hengeveld, 1992. Delbrück (1888, pp. 6–15) categorises both ‘Ellipse’ and ‘Sätze ohne *as* oder *bhū*’ as subcategories of “unvollständige Sätze”, and he also uses the expression “Ellipse der Copula” (Delbrück, 1888, p. 6).

narrative text that deals with concrete actions performed in a specific context. Whether this is true in AiB is most easily checked through the occurrences of the verb \sqrt{as} or $\sqrt{bhū}$. One example is given in the discourse on the sacrificer's symbolic regression to an embryonic state.

AiB 1.3.16–18 *ulbaṃ vā etad dīkṣitasya yad vāsa, ulbenaivainaṃ tat prorṇuvanti. kṛṣṇājinaṃ uttaram bhavaty. uttaraṃ vā ulbāj jarāyu, jarāyuṇaivainaṃ tat prorṇuvanti*

With a garment they cover him; the garment is the caul of the consecrated; verily thus they cover him with a caul. Above that is the black antelope skin; the placenta is above the caul; verily thus they cover him with the placenta.

First, a nominal relative construction is used to link a garment, covering the sacrificer, to the caul: *ulbaṃ vā etad dīkṣitasya yad vāsaḥ*, “The garment is the caul of the consecrated”. Then it is stated that the black antelope skin is above the garment, and also that the placenta is above the caul: *kṛṣṇājinaṃ uttaram bhavaty uttaraṃ vā ulbāj jarāyuh*, “Above that is the black antelope skin; the placenta is above the caul.” In this sentence, *bhavati* is utilised, in contrast to the nominal construction used for the correspondence between the garment and the caul. However, the analogy of position between the antelope skin and the placenta (both being above the garment/caul) establishes a correspondence between them, since the next sentence concludes this part of the discourse with the deduction that they (sc. the priests) thus cover the sacrificer with the placenta (*jarāyuṇaivainaṃ tat prorṇuvanti*).

For the direct expression of a correspondence between the garment and the caul, a ‘pure’ nominal construction is thus used; but for the statement that the black antelope skin is above the garment, *bhavati* is used. The copula is, however, not used in the immediately following nominal clause, which declares that the placenta is above the caul. The question is then whether this nominal clause has a more a-temporal, or extra-temporal, character than the preceding, or whether we can infer, at least in this case, an omitted copula.¹⁵

¹⁵ According to the principle formulated by Verpoorten, in his study of the word order in AiB (Verpoorten, 1977, p. 373), “...n’annoncer qu’une seule fois le verbe dans une séquence de phrases parallèles”. With the definitions supplied by Gonda (1960b) the omission of *bhavati* in the second clause is, however, not an ellipsis, but a sous-

An alternative, or amplification, is to take into consideration one of the meanings of *bhavati*. The verbs \sqrt{as} and $\sqrt{bhū}$, plus the nominal sentence (i.e. the absence of copula), do, as Saul Migron remarks, “exhibit a complex suppletive relationship, in which zero (the employment of a non-verbal or nominal sentence) also takes part”; \sqrt{as} denotes existence and $\sqrt{bhū}$ an initiated, and sometimes also a continued, existence.¹⁶ If we apply this to our example above, viz. the alternation between *bhavati* and a nominal clause, the result is that the black antelope skin is placed above the garment — i.e. it is put there by the priests, and its position has thus a beginning in time — while the placenta, in a more static way, is above the caul.

To be able to proceed with the analysis of the nature of nominal sentences in AiB, it is consequently necessary first to examine how the two verbs of existence are used. The first verbal form that we will consider is *asti* (the 3rd p. sing. pres. ind. of \sqrt{as}), which only occurs in eight places in AiB *pañcikā* 1-5.

AiB 1.3.21 tad āhur: na pūrvadīkṣiṇaḥ saṃsavo ‘sti, pariḡhīto vā etasya yajñāḥ,
pariḡhītā devatā, naitasyārtir asty aparadīkṣiṇa eva yathā tatheti

They say, ‘There is no competing pressing for him who is first consecrated; the sacrifice is grasped by him, the deities are grasped; no misfortune is his as there is of him who is not consecrated first.’

AiB 1.10.2 tāsu padam asti...

In them there is the line...

AiB 1.17.3 saiṣāgneyy atithimatī, na saumyātithimaty asti

(The verse) to Agni contains (the word) ‘guest’, not that to Soma.

AiB 2.40.2 mano vai dīdāya, manaso hi na kiṃ cana pūrvam asti

Mind is radiant, for there is nothing prior to the mind.

entendu. He defines an ellipsis (Gonda, 1960b, p. 6) as “...the phenomena that part of an expression which is current in normal usage or part of a construction which is, in a given milieu, usual, is omitted, because at the moment of speaking (or writing) it may dispensed with and inevitably and as a matter of course supplied by the audience or understood by them in the construction of the sentence.” His definition of sous-entendu (Gonda, 1960b, p. 7) is “...the non-repetition of an element which occurs in the same context...”.

¹⁶ Migron, 1999, p. 7. See also Biese, 1931.

AiB 2.41.4 asau vai dīdāya yo ‘sau tapaty, etasmād dhi na kiṃ cana pūrvam asti
He who yonder gives heat is radiant, for there is nothing that is before him.

AiB 3.1.9 na sārāsvato graho ‘sti, vāk tu sarasvatī
There is no cup for Sarasvatī, but Sarasvatī is speech.

AiB 3.46.6 taṃ yady eteṣāṃ trayāṇāṃ ekaṃcid akāmam abhyābhavet, tasyāsti
vāmadevyasya stotre prāyaścittiḥ
If against his desire he should have one of these three, there is in the Stotra
of the Vāmadevya an expiation for it.

In the sentences above, *asti* is only once used as copula,¹⁷ and in the other occurrences it conveys instead the notion of existence, that ‘there is something’. It is, however, noteworthy that six of the eight passages are negative, i.e. they express that ‘there is not X’.

The third person plural can also be expressed with the help of a nominal sentence (the subject having a plural ending), and the occurrences of *santi* (‘they are’) should therefore be limited in a way similar to *asti*. There are only 8 occurrences of *santi* in the prose of AiB *pañcikā* 1–5, and in all the passages *santi* seems to denote existence.¹⁸

To express other moods than indicative, or different tenses than present, such as optative and future, a nominal sentence is not normally used, as it does not convey information about mood or tense.¹⁹ We therefore, for example, find more examples of *syāt* (3rd p. sing. opt.) than of *asti* or *santi*.

To make the complementary functions of the two verbs of existence (\sqrt{as} , $\sqrt{bhū}$) and nominal sentences more explicit, we also have to consider the other verb: $\sqrt{bhū}$. The form *bhavati* (3rd p. sing. pres. ind.) is much more numerous in AiB than the corresponding form of \sqrt{as} , i.e. *asti*, and we can only consider some characteristic examples.²⁰

¹⁷ That is, AiB 1.17.3; see Biese, 1931, p. 49.

¹⁸ That is, AiB 3.25.2; 4.27.9; 5.5.11; 5.5.17. In AiB 3.31.2–3, however, *santi* is used twice and is categorised by Biese (1931, p. 49) as copula. Nevertheless, in this context *santi* is perhaps best interpreted as the n. pl. nom. form of the pres. part. of \sqrt{as} .

¹⁹ However, cf. Delbrück, 1888, p. 14.

²⁰ There are 386 occurrences of $\sqrt{bhū}$ in the present tense and 32 of \sqrt{as} in the whole of AiB. Biese, 1931, p. 44.

AiB 1.2.7 hotā bhavati hotety enam ācakṣate ya evaṃ veda

A Hotṛ becomes he, a Hotṛ they call him who knows thus.

AiB 1.3.17 kṛṣṇājinam uttaram bhavati

Above that is the black antelope skin.

AiB 2.1.9 jyotiḥ sveṣu bhavati śreṣṭhaḥ svānām bhavati ya evaṃ veda

A light he becomes among his own people, he becomes the chief of his own people, who knows thus.

AiB 5.16.6 samudrād ūrmir madhumām̃ ud ārad²¹ iti saptamasyāhna ājyam bhavati

‘From the ocean the aroma of sweetness hath arisen’ is the *Ājya* of the seventh day...

Bhavati can often be translated with ‘becomes’, especially when a condition is expressed that has the potential of causing a specific effect; for instance, the construction with *ya evaṃ veda* often has *bhavati*.²² The translation of *bhavati* with ‘becomes’ is, however, not always adequate, as the examples above indicate. Biese in his article “Der Gebrauch von *As* und *Bhū* in Aitareyabrāhmaṇa” has tried to delineate the different senses of *bhavati*. Besides the basic meaning of ‘becomes’, he shows that it also expresses ‘it is’, and even has the meaning ‘to exist’ — characteristic for *asti* — but also that of ‘possession’²³ and ‘living’.²⁴ Nevertheless, he characterises the specific meaning of *bhavati* (in the sense of ‘it is’) as “etwas Dauerndes, Regelmässiges, Zuständliches und infolge davon in einigen Fällen auch eine Verstärkung ausdrückt.”²⁵

After having briefly examined the two verbs of existence, we can continue with the nominal sentences and the analysis of their functions. The examples considered until now have not included instances of

²¹ RV 4.58.1.

²² Cf. Verpoorten, 1977, p. 348 and Biese, 1931, p. 54.

²³ E.g. AiB 1.5.24.

²⁴ E.g. AiB 3.23.2–3.

²⁵ Biese, 1931, p. 52. For a discussion of $\sqrt{bhū}$ as meaning ‘being used’, see Gotō, 2001, p. 66 and also Witzel, 1996, p. 168, footnote 14. Martin Kümmel remarks in his study *Das Perfekt im Indoarischen* (Kümmel, 2000, p. 349) that “...in der *bháva-^{ti}* das situationsbezogene Sein bezeichnet, während das generelle Sein durch *ás-^{ti}* (bzw. Nominalsatz).”

complete identifications, a fact which indicates that this function could instead be fulfilled by a nominal sentence. However, as Albrecht Wezler has delineated in his article “Zu den sogenannten Identifikationen in den Brāhmaṇas”, it is likely that nominal sentences in the *brāhmaṇas* could express a range of different relations.²⁶ These are, nevertheless, not indicated in the actual nominal sentences, but could only be derived from the context, either that given in the actual text, or in other texts, or extratextually.²⁷ We therefore have to specify as many of these relations, which are expressed with nominal sentences, as possible, and discuss each relation separately.

The variants in which an adjective or an infinite verbal form is used will not be considered in the following classification, but only nominal sentences formulated between two or more nouns, with the important exception of the *vṛddhi* forms. First, a list of the different relations will be presented, and then they will be separately exemplified and discussed. The classification will, however, not be exhaustive, as that would require a thorough analysis that takes into consideration the whole *brāhmaṇa* corpus.²⁸ Many nominal sentences in AiB are also not possible to classify, because the context does not give the necessary information. This is especially characteristic of the well-established correspondences: they do not need explanations in the same high degree as the newly introduced or peripheral correspondences.

²⁶ For a discussion of Wezler’s article, see p. 31.

²⁷ Cf. the discussion of the *upaniṣad* formula *tat tvam asi*, by Brereton, 1986, p. 109, footnote 33.

²⁸ For a typological list see Hengeveld, 1992, p. 124.

Relations expressed by nominal sentences
in AiB *pañcikā* 1–5

- 1) Complete identification
- 2) The sharing of a common characteristic — partial identification
 - i) Quantitative concord
 - ii) Agreement in action
 - iii) Agreement in appearance
 - iv) Agreement in position
- 3) Inclusion in a class
- 4) Predication of a function or role
- 5) Causal relation

3.2.3 Complete identification

The first category is ‘complete identification’, a category in which, at the beginning of this century, all the Vedic correspondences were ranged. The question is, however, whether any nominal sentence in AiB is used unambiguously in this function, as in the classical example of the identity between the morning and evening star.²⁹ The first example below is a definition of a sacrifice, through the enumeration of its constituent oblations.

AiB 2.24.1 dhānāḥ karambhaḥ parivāpaḥ puroḷāśaḥ payasyety eṣa vai yajño
haviṣpaṅktiḥ

Fried³⁰ grains, mush, the pap, the cake, and the milk mess; this is the sacrifice of the five oblations.

²⁹ First introduced by Frege, 1892, to elucidate the difference between meaning and reference.

³⁰ Keith gives a more free translation, “The sacrifice of five oblations is made up of fried grains...”.

The statement above first enumerates five sacrificial materials and then it defines the sacrifice of five oblations (*haviṣpaṅktiḥ*) as that sacrifice which has these five materials. That is, this (*eṣaḥ*) and *yajño haviṣpaṅktiḥ* are identical: they refer to the same entity, which makes this an example of a complete identification, or, more accurately, a definition.

The next example is more straightforward in the sense that it is a complete identification of the type $A = A$, which is a necessary true statement: all objects are, to wit, identical with themselves.

AiB 2.13.2 *yā evaitā anvāhaitāḥ puronuvākya, yaḥ praiṣaḥ sa praiṣo, yā yājyā sā yājyā*
 These which he recites are the invitatory verses, the direction is the direction; the offering verse the offering verse.

Another example of a possible complete identification is the following passage, which identifies two pairs that are almost identical, but in which the first members of the pairs differ.

AiB 2.4.10 *ahorātre vā uṣāsānaktā*
 Dawn and night are day and night.

This statement is made as an explanation of the fact that the recitation to dawn and night can place the sacrificer in both day and night, i.e. put him in control over the entire unit of day and night. The example is important, as this correspondence, in the form of a nominal sentence, serves the same purpose — i.e. to make the ritual potent to achieve a certain goal — as many other correspondences between more clearly separate objects. Dawn, being the first appearance of light, is a part of the day, but at the same time it is a clearly perceptible liminal period, which was made into a separate goddess eulogised with several hymns in the ṚV. However, the second members of the two compounds, viz. *rātra-* and *nakt-*³¹ are synonyms,³² both meaning ‘night’.³³

³¹ See Mayrhofer, 1986, Vol. 2, p. 2f.

³² Gonda, however (1974, p. 130f.), writes that *rātri* is the period of night preceding the dawn.

³³ The objection could be raised that these compounds (*dvandva*) were regarded as units, and that they cannot be analysed as composed of two separate elements without losing the intended sense. The comparison of the two units, however, gives the same difference, viz. that between dawn–night and day–night. Furthermore, the individual members of the *dvandva uṣāsānaktā* were often separated in the ṚV, although there is

The passages considered above — together with the fact that *asti* is never used, in the AiB *pañcīkā* 1–5, in the function of identification — indicate that complete identification is expressed primarily, at least in the third person, with the help of a nominal sentence. We therefore have to explore whether this is an adequate way to read *all* the correspondences expressed with the help of nominal sentences, or whether there are also other ways to analyse the statements made without a copula.

These questions have been addressed in general linguistics in the context of nominal predication, and e.g. Leon Stassen (1997) has used a typological method to be able to reach conclusions about the universal features of intransitive predication, i.e. words or clauses that predicate something of the subject, but which are not construed with an object. Stassen analyses three main ‘strategies’, viz. the verbal, prepositional and nominal strategies. For our purposes, only the nominal strategy is relevant, and in the section devoted to this subject, Stassen first makes a distinction between zero strategies and full strategies; the difference between them consists in the presence or absence of a copula. The copula can be constituted by a verb like the English verb ‘to be’, but also non-verbal copulas are discussed, such as pronouns.³⁴

It is, however, his discussion of ‘identity statements’ that is of foremost importance in the present context. He presents two meanings of the word identity, viz. the characteristics that make an object “stand out”, that is, its identity, and the relation of identity, which is formulated between two objects sufficiently or completely “alike in their defining features.”³⁵ These two meanings of ‘identity’ are matched in natural languages by two types of identity statements, viz. the presentational, which associates a description with an object, and the equational, which states that two meanings refer to the same object. The trouble for Stassen, however, is to make a clear dividing line between identity statements and predication. He remarks that “many languages allow sentences to be systematically ambiguous between the two functions.” He gives the example “Warsaw is the capital of Poland” which can be interpreted in two different contexts as

within the RV an evolution towards the unification of the compound. Macdonell, 1995, p. 269.

³⁴ Stassen, 1997, p. 76–91. He mentions Altaic languages as an example.

³⁵ Stassen, 1997, p. 101.

either an identity statement, or as a predicative statement. In the first instance, the purpose of the statement is to point out that two designations — one being a proper noun and the other a specific description — both refer to the same object. In the second instance, when the sentence is interpreted as predicative, content is added to the name Warsaw, i.e. the purpose is not to fuse two meanings, but to give more information about the city of Warsaw. The conclusion of Stassen is formulated as what he calls ‘the Principle of Identity Pressure’, as follows:

Languages with a unique encoding strategy for predicative nominals derive this strategy from the encoding of identity statements.³⁶

Stassen uses a metaphor called ‘the Predicate Nominal Battle’, when presenting his explanation of why predicate nominals are encoded by e.g. either an identificational strategy or a verbal strategy. The strategies are depicted as engaged in constant warfare over the encoding of nominal predication, and the present situation in a specific language is therefore only the temporary outcome of the ongoing battle; in the next period of time, the positions on the battlefield may have changed, and if, for example, the identificational strategy is the winner, some characteristics will be displayed, as the use of a zero strategy or a non-verbal copula strategy.³⁷

The question is, however, how useful these generic statements are in the analysis of the nominal sentences in AiB. We will consider two points that seem to be of importance for the Vedic material: firstly, that identification is not a form of predication, although they cannot always easily be differentiated. That is, if two objects such as Gāyatrī and Agni are juxtaposed in a nominal sentence, then either the sentence could be interpreted as expressing identification, i.e. that Gāyatrī and Agni refer to the same object, or else one of them could be interpreted as predicative of the other.³⁸ The choice of interpretation is therefore dependent upon the context.

³⁶ Stassen, 1997, p. 111.

³⁷ Stassen, 1997, p. 112.

³⁸ One could perhaps also argue that a verb has been left out and that the range of possible relations between the two entities may therefore be more extensive.

Secondly, Stassen paints — through his battle metaphor — a dynamic picture of the relation between identification and predication, an insight that could be of use when analysing the correspondences expressed through nominal sentences. Perhaps these two poles, predication and identification, are active at the same time, and we do not have to choose one of them as the explanation covering all the occurrences; the correspondences may be situated in between these two functions, both of which are expressed with the same grammatical form, viz. a nominal sentence/clause.

Also Kees Hengeveld (1992) addresses the problems of predication and identification in his book devoted to non-verbal predication, a phenomenon that, nevertheless, includes clauses containing a verb of existence in the function of copula. Hengeveld introduces two terms: specification and characterisation. In specification, the subject and the predicate are coextensive, as in the example, “The capital of France is Paris”, but if the subject and predicate of the sentence are reversed, i.e. “Paris is the capital of France”, only one of the many characterisations of Paris is given. Specification answers the question “What is X”, while the characterisation answers “What can you tell me about X”.³⁹ The example considered above is almost the same as that provided by Stassen, and Stassen actually uses the words specification and characterisation to elucidate the difference between identification and predication, but Hengeveld mentions examples of both specificational and characterisational identity statements, and he thus classifies both variants of the Paris example as identifications. Classification statements (another category used by Hengeveld) can, in the same way, be either specificational or characterisational: “A bachelor is an unmarried man” (specificational) and “A cat is an animal” (characterisational).⁴⁰ In the second example only one of the many characterisations of a cat is given, while ‘a bachelor’ and ‘an unmarried man’ are coextensive. The most important point for our purposes is,

³⁹ Hengeveld, 1992, p. 82ff.

⁴⁰ Identification forms a subcategory in Hengeveld’s (1992, p. 124) classification of non-verbal predications, together with other categories such as Possession and Classification.

however, the observation that: “Specificational sentences are reversible, whereas characterizational are not...”⁴¹

That is, the sentence “An animal is a cat” is nonsensical, while “An unmarried man is a bachelor” is not, and the inversion of the characterisational statement, “Paris is the capital of France” to “The capital of France is Paris” changes it into a specificational statement.⁴² We are here given a tool which perhaps can be of use in the evaluation of the correspondences in AiB: if the statements are specificational then it should be possible to formally reverse them. This seems to be the case, as both *brahma vai bṛhaspatiḥ* and *bṛhaspatir vai brahma* are grammatically correct and semantically possible. But we should also encounter actual examples of inversions in the text; and on the other hand, the absence of such occurrences could imply that the correspondences, in the form of nominal sentences, are primarily characterisations, in which one noun functions as subject and the other as predicate.

3.2.4 The sharing of characteristics — partial identification

3.2.4.1 *Quantitative concord*

The expression of complete identification seems to be handled in the AiB primarily through nominal sentences. Equation is, however, not the only relation expressed with the help of a nominal sentence. Partial identification, i.e. the sharing of a common quality, is also a recurrent relation, e.g. in the case of the correspondence between the wind (god) and breath, a relation which is based upon the movements of air on both the micro and macro levels, i.e. those of the human body and the cosmos.

⁴¹ Hengeveld, 1992, p. 88.

⁴² Hengeveld, however, has to allow the inversion of the specificational statement “The capital of France is Paris” to “Paris is the capital of France” and it should still be specificational, which seems to contradict the classification of this statement earlier as characterisational. The argument given (the same as Stassen provided later in 1997) is that the interpretation, in this case, depends on the context. The question is how much doubt this casts upon the conclusion about the irreversibility of characterisational statements.

There are different types of partial identification that are expressed with nominal sentences, and the first type that we will consider is ‘quantitative concord’.

The nominal sentence below opens a discourse on the relation between the breaths and the *praüga* recitation. The relation between them is constituted by the fact that both are composed of seven parts: seven gods in the recitation and seven breaths in the head.

AiB 3.3.1 prāṇānāṃ vā etad ukthaṃ yat praügaṃ. sapta devatāḥ śaṃsati. sapta vai śīrṣan prāṇāḥ, śīrṣann eva tat prāṇān dadhāti

The Praüga is a litany of the breaths; seven deities he celebrates; seven are the breaths in the head; verily thus he places the breaths in the head.

A correspondence could also be the conclusion of a discourse on the quantitative concord between two or more objects. In AiB 1.1.7, for example, three nominal sentences are given which establish an argumentation of why the offering to Agni should be on eight potsherds.⁴³

AiB 1.1.7 aṣṭākapaḷā āgneyo, ‘ṣṭākṣarā vai gāyatrī, gāyatram agneś chandaḥ

That for Agni is on eight potsherds; the Gāyatrī has eight syllables; [thus] the metre of Agni is the Gāyatrī.

The question is, though, whether the god Agni is eightfold, or whether the number eight inheres in Agni, or whether Agni simply functions as the mediator between the potsherds and the metre, both being objects divided into eight parts. The last alternative seems to be the most reasonable in this context, as it is not mentioned explicitly that Agni himself is eightfold.⁴⁴

3.2.4.2 Agreement in action

The most conspicuous example of two entities brought together in a nominal sentence on the basis of a common activity is the correspondence between Vāyu, the wind god, and breath. This correspondence is, however, so well established already in the *brāhmaṇas* that it does not require any commentary in the text, but is simply introduced as a fact.

AiB 2.26.6 vāyur hi prāṇaḥ

For breath is Vāyu

⁴³ The total number of potsherds is eleven: eight for Agni and three for Viṣṇu.

⁴⁴ Cf. TS 2.3.3.4 & 11.1.

AiB 3.2.4 vāyuh prāṇaḥ...

The breath is Vāyu...

Another example, also including breath, is the correspondence postulated between the kindling sticks and breath.

AiB 2.4.4 prāṇā vai samidhaḥ, prāṇā hīdaṃ sarvaṃ samindhate yad idaṃ kiṃca

The kindling sticks are the breaths, for the breaths enkindle all that there is here.

It seems, though, that correspondences based upon similarity in action are more often expressed by other means than mere juxtaposition,⁴⁵ e.g. with the word *rūpa* in AiB 3.4.3 *sa yad agniḥ pravān iva dahati, tad asya vāyavyaṃ rūpam*, “In that Agni burns forward as it were that is his form as Vāyu.”

3.2.4.3 Agreement in appearance

A special case of this category is phonetic concord. The ritual exclamation *vauṣaṭ* for example is analysed in two parts: *vau* + *ṣaṭ*, and as the second syllable is the Sanskrit word for ‘six’, the conclusion is that (*ṣaṭ*) ‘six’ is the seasons; the reference of *ṣaṭ* is simultaneously to the second syllable of *vau-ṣaṭ* and to the numeral (*ṣaṭ*).⁴⁶

AiB 3.6.5 vauṣaṭ iti vaṣaṭkaroty. asau vāva vāv, ṛtavaḥ ṣaṭ

He says vauṣaṭ as the vaṣaṭ call; *vau* is yonder (sun) *ṣaṭ* (six) the seasons.

The next example consists of a nominal sentence with one word in nominative and one in genitive. The connecting quality between the two entities is freshness, i.e. being new.

AiB 1.3.5 ...navanītaṃ garbhāṇām

... fresh butter [is for] embryos.

3.2.4.4 Agreement in position

An entity that occupies a specific position in a structure can be made to correspond to another entity that has the same position in a similar

⁴⁵ There is often, however, as above, an emphatic particle.

⁴⁶ Cf. KB 3.7.

structure.⁴⁷ The three parts of the universe (earth, atmosphere and heaven) can, for example, be linked to a set that contains three members. In the example below, it is the recitation of three different sets of verses called *mahānāmnī* that are correlated to the three worlds.⁴⁸

AiB 4.4.2 *ayaṃ vai lokaḥ prathamā mahānāmny antarikṣaloko dvitīyāsau lokas tṛtīyā*
 The first Mahānāmnī is this world, the second the world of the atmosphere,
 the third yonder world.

3.2.5 Inclusion in a class

The nominal sentence is also used to situate an object within a class of beings, e.g. in the passage below, where the plural of *iḍ* (*iḷas*), mostly meaning libation — but which perhaps, in this context, carries the special meaning of “objects of devotion”⁴⁹ — is classified as food, a fact that has the important consequence that the offering verse can ensure that the sacrificer is provided with food.

AiB 2.4.7 *iḷo yajaty. annaṃ vā iḷo; ‘nnaṃ eva tat prīṇāty, annaṃ yajamāne dadhāti*
 He says the offering verse for the sacrificial food; the sacrificial food is
 food; verily thus he delights food; food he confers upon the sacrificer.

Another example is given below which also classifies an oblation as food.

AiB 2.24.9 *annaṃ eva parivāpa*
 Mush is food.

The next example contains the enumeration of correspondences to certain ritual objects, and the intention is clearly to link them to the generic categories that they are members of.

⁴⁷ Cf. Bodewitz, 2000a, p. 19.

⁴⁸ For a presentation of the formal characteristics of the three *mahānāmnī*, see PB, 1931, p. 317f.

⁴⁹ According to MW, 1995, p. 164, *iḷas* is, in the context of the *āpri* hymn RV 1.13, to be translated as “the objects of devotion” which is a special form of Agni. But perhaps the *brāhmaṇa* text views *iḍ* as connected with *iḍā* (*iḷā*), which is a rite in which the priests ritually consume parts of the oblation; see AiB 2.9.11. For the other meanings of *iḍā*, see p. 139.

AiB 5.28.1 ...oṣadhayo barhir, vanaspataya idhmā, āpaḥ prokṣaṇyaḥ...

...the strew the plants, the kindling wood the trees, the sprinkling waters
the waters...⁵⁰

3.2.6 Predication of a function or role

The first two examples below reflect the ambiguity that both Stassen and Hengeveld ascribed to definitions, i.e. the blurred lines between predication and complete identification. The function of *hotṛ* does not exhaust the characteristics of Agni, but is perhaps his most central function.

AiB 1.28.29 agnir vai devānām hotā

The Hotṛ of the gods is Agni.

However, in the same *khaṇḍa* (AiB 1.28.39) the phrase *agnir vai devānām gopāḥ*, “Agni is the guardian of the gods”⁵¹ is used as an explication of an Ṛgveda verse, a fact which indicates that these roles of Agni are mentioned, not with the intention of providing the reader with a definition of the god Agni, but to explain the relevance of certain verses used in the ritual.

In the passage below, however, the role of physician of sacrifice could be seen as a definition of what the *brahman* priest is, as it is the answer supplied by the text to the question of what action the *brahman* priest actually performs during the ritual.

AiB 5.34.2 yajñasya haiṣa bhiṣag yad brahmā

The Brahman is the physician of the sacrifice.

⁵⁰ The other correspondences in the list of AiB 5.28 are not based upon the same principle. Nevertheless, through the list of correspondences, the basic elements of the Vedic cosmos are enumerated; e.g. the sacrificial post is correlated with the sun, and the altar with the earth.

⁵¹ Keith thus treats Agni as comment in the first passage *agnir vai devānām hotā*, and as topic in the second *agnir vai devānām gopāḥ*, although the syntax is exactly the same. The difference is probably due to the context. In the first passage, Agni is not mentioned in the recitation that is commented on, while he is in the second. Nevertheless, the whole *khaṇḍa* is a discussion of the recitations accompanying the carrying forward of the fire (*agni*) and *soma*.

The two examples above ascribe a special function to a person; in the next example the goddess Aditi is given the roles of mother, father and son. The consequence is that all these three roles are correlated with earth, according to the implicit correspondence between Aditi and earth.

AiB 3.31.10 aditir mātā sa pitā sa putra⁵² itīyaṃ vai māteyam piteyam
putraḥ

‘Aditi is mother, is father, is son’ (he says); the mother is this (earth), the father this (earth), the son this (earth).

3.2.7 Causal relation

Albrecht Wezler has discussed the causal relation in some detail, using the example of the relation between cattle and salt.⁵³ Most of his examples are from ŚB, but also in AiB this relation is referred to.

AiB 4.27.9 ūṣān asāv asyāṃ.⁵⁴ tad dhāpi turaḥ kāvaṣeya uvācoṣaḥ poṣo⁵⁵
janamejayaketi. tasmād dhāpy etarhi gavyam mīmāṃsamānāḥ pṛchanti:
santi tatroṣāḥ iti

Yonder (sky) placed salt in the (earth); as to this Tura Kāvaṣeya said ‘Salt is nutriment, O my dear Janamejaya.’ Therefore here also men considering a place for cattle ask ‘Are there salts here?’

Also the relation between the ritually prolonged o-sound called *nyūṅkha* and food (*anna*) is explained in the *brāhmaṇa* text as causal, viz. when the ‘farmers’ utter this sound they cause the existence of the food (lit. the food is born *prajāyate*).

AiB 5.3.5 annaṃ vai nyūṅkho. yadelavā abhigeṣṇāś caranty, athānnādyam prajāyate.
tad yac caturtham ahar nyūṅkhayanty, annam eva tat prajāyanty
annādyasya prajātyai

The sound *o* is food; when the farmers run about shouting thus does food come into existence; in that on the fourth day they say the sound *o*, verily thus they produce food; (it serves) for the production of food.⁵⁶

⁵² This is a quotation from RV 1.89.10. Brereton comments (1981, p. 248f.) that it is very difficult to interpret, but he nevertheless provides some plausible interpretations.

⁵³ Wezler, Albrecht, 1996, p. 502–505.

⁵⁴ *adadhāt* is elided, according to the pattern of AiB 4.27.6–7 *devayajanam eveyam amuṣyām adadhāt, paśūn asāv asyām*.

⁵⁵ The word order here is S-P and T-C (see next heading), and it is interesting that this sentence is one of the examples of direct speech in AiB.

3.2.8 Word order

The question of word order is important for the interpretation of both equational and predicational nominal sentences. In a complete identification, the word order could indicate which noun is the identifier and which is the identified,⁵⁷ and in a predicative sentence, which of the nouns is subject and which is predicate. It seems that there are recurrent patterns of word order in the *brāhmaṇa* nominal sentences, but the problem is that there are also exceptions to the regularities, and there have been different opinions on which method to use for evaluating a specific passage, i.e. whether it agrees or disagrees with the ‘rule’.

Delbrück formulated (1879) a general rule regarding basic word order in Vedic Sanskrit, viz. that the subject opens the sentence and the verb closes it, and that the other words (e.g. in accusative, dative etc.) are situated in between these two poles of the sentence.⁵⁸ This he calls the traditional word order, but sometimes it is not observed, and then the word order is ‘occasional’. The exceptions to the traditional (or basic) word order are caused, according to Delbrück, by emphasis. The emphasised word tends to move towards the beginning of the sentence; hence there are sentences in which the verb occupies the initial position, and an interesting fact is that these verbal forms are often followed by an emphatic particle, as in the following example.⁵⁹

AiB 3.32.2 ghnanti vā etat somam yad abhiṣuṅvanti
They slay the Soma in that they press it.

⁵⁶ Bernhard Weber-Brosamer, however, interprets this passage in a different way in his book *Annam* (1988, p. 202). The word *ilava*, according to Weber-Brosamer, does not refer in this context to farmers, but to *sāmavedic* singers. His translation is as follows: “Das Rezitieren dunkler o-Laute bedeutet Speise, [denn] wenn die ‘lärmenden’ [Sāmasänger mit dunklen o-Lauten] anzusingen pflegen, dann entstehen Nahrungsmittel.”

⁵⁷ Tikkanen, 1999, p. 72f. In an unmarked active sentence the identified is subject and the identifier the predicate; but in a passive sentence, the identified is predicate.

⁵⁸ Delbrück, 1878, p. 13.

⁵⁹ However, the sentence initial position of the verb is not only caused by emphasis, as demonstrated by Verpoorten, 1977, pp. 38–48. E.g. in the sentence *āñjanty enam* the cause of the initial position is the enclitic.

However, Delbrück considers the occasional word order as the normal option in the nominal sentences which are used for expressing correspondences,⁶⁰ i.e. the predicative noun opens the sentence and the subject closes it. This is caused by the fact that the subject is already known and the predicate brings forth something new in the argumentation, and this new information is emphasised through the initial position, and as in the verbal sentences, emphatic particles, especially *vai*, are used. But if the principle that brings the predicate to the first position is emphasis, then it is possible that there are nominal sentences in which the subject is emphasised and accordingly occupies the first position in the sentence.⁶¹ Delbrück presents one such example (1878, p. 27) and he also writes that there are examples in which there are difficulties in deciding which noun is subject and which is predicate.

The principles used by Delbrück are then: first, the distinction between what has been mentioned earlier in the text and what is new in the sentence; second, the evaluation of the reasonable relation between the entities, i.e. an argumentation from the meaning of the concepts and the world-view they are part of;⁶² third, the parallel with the use of emphatic particles in verbal sentences.

Delbrück's material was primarily the ŚB, on which his research of word order (1878) was based; but through the study made by Verpoorten in 1977, we have a detailed analysis of word order in AiB. His conclusions are in the main in accordance with Delbrück's, and Verpoorten comments that when the predicate is an adjective it mostly precedes the subject, and when the predicate is a noun, or noun phrase, the same order seems to be the normal option; in some cases, however, it is the other way around. He mentions some special categories of nominal sentences that often take the subject–predicate order: sentences containing a name of a god,⁶³ the

⁶⁰ Named *Identifikationen* by Delbrück, (1878, p. 26).

⁶¹ An example of a verbal sentence with traditional order and two emphatic particles is AiB 2.31.1 *devā vai yad eva yajñe 'kurvaṃs tad asurā akurvan*, “What the gods did at the sacrifice, that the Asuras did.”

⁶² Delbrück remarks concerning the translation of TS 5.5.4.1, *āpo varuṇasya patnaya āsan* that “Soll man nicht vielleicht übersetzen: Varuṇas Frauen waren die Āpas, indem man selbstverständlich voraussetzt, dass Varuṇa Frauen hatte.” Delbrück, 1878, p. 28.

⁶³ E.g., AiB 1.1.1 *agnir vai devānām avamaḥ*. Verpoorten, 1977, p. 59

anaphoric pronoun *sa/ta-*,⁶⁴ *eṣa/eta-*⁶⁵ and the demonstrative pronoun *ayam*.⁶⁶ The principles for deciding what is subject and what is predicate are, according to Verpoorten, mainly the nature of the words, the internal logic of the statement, and the context.⁶⁷ The nominal sentences construed with a relative pronoun (*ya- ...ta-*) are, however, more unambiguous in their structure: the relative pronoun *ya-* indicates the subject and *ta-* the predicate.⁶⁸

The difficulties involved in the syntactical analysis of Vedic nominal sentences led Gunilla Gren-Eklund (1978) to avoid the level of subject and predicate, and instead to apply the conceptual pair ‘topic–comment’. These two pairs of notions (S-P, T-C) refer to different levels of the sentence, viz. the grammatical (subject–predicate) and the communicative (topic–comment). According to Gren-Eklund, the subject is typically nominal and the predicate verbal, and the question is therefore whether the grammatical categories subject–predicate — defined with the verbal sentence as a model — can be applied to a sentence which contains no verbal items. Gren-Eklund’s answer is that the grammatical level of the Vedic nominal sentences is not accessible to us, and that, consequently, “Not until some linguistic phenomenon that accounts for the logical ranking of the concepts is added can S and P emerge in an analysis.”⁶⁹ She therefore proposes an

⁶⁴ E.g. AiB 1.29.4 *te u evādyāpi havirdhāne*. Verpoorten, 1977, p. 61.

⁶⁵ E.g. AiB 1.14.6 *eṣa vai somarājā, yo yajate*. Verpoorten, 1977, p. 61.

⁶⁶ E.g. AiB 3.22.1 *te devā abruvann: iyaṃ vā indrasya priyā jāyā vāvātā, prāsahā nāma...iti*. Verpoorten, 1977, p. 61.

⁶⁷ Verpoorten, 1977, p. 56f.

⁶⁸ This construction “énonçant une équivalence mystique” and is called by Verpoorten “*yat* ‘appositif’” (Verpoorten, 1977, p. 332) which, according to Verpoorten, has to be differentiated from the “équivalence relative” (Verpoorten, 1977, p. 344) in which the pronouns are inflected. In the former the normal order is predicate–subject and in the latter subject–predicate.

⁶⁹ Gren-Eklund, 1978, p. 131. Topic and comment are, however, not the only notions used for denoting these functions. Alternative notional pairs are topic and focus; theme and rheme. For the problems in defining the concepts topic and comment (focus) in the context of word order, see Scorniola, 1994, esp. 4639f. For an attempt to resolve the dilemma of terminology (in the context of Arabic word order) through reserving topic–focus for the sentence level, and theme–rheme for its context, the discourse, see Dahlgren, 1996, esp. p. 91. Another complication is provided by the introduction of a secondary topic, which is defined as “a referent such that the utterance is construed to be about the relationship between it and the referent of the primary topic” (Nikolaeva,

analysis of the nominal sentences into topic and comment, which are defined, in the introduction of her study, as signifying the already known (topic) and the new information (comment) presented in the sentence (cf. Delbrück) — but topic and comment also point to the “linearity of realized language, forming a contextual chain.”⁷⁰ In the conclusion, she elaborates the second aspect of her working definition, and characterises the topic as the initiation of an assertion and the comment as the conclusion; that is, it is not necessary that the topic has been mentioned previously in the text.⁷¹ It is natural that an initiation (topic) should be the first element in a sentence, and her conclusion regarding word order is accordingly: “As regards the arrangement of T/C, an unmarked order of the kind T-C must so far be accepted as predominating in the nominal sentences of Sanskrit.”⁷² She accepts the possibility of a marked order of C/T, but believes that there are no adequate methods for detecting when it occurs.⁷³

There are, however, apart from the similarities, also differences between the *upaniṣad* material, which Gren-Eklund used for the exemplification of her theoretical considerations, and the *brāhmaṇa* correspondences. One such difference seems to be implied by the classification made in the previous section of this chapter, viz. the different relations expressed through nominal sentences in the AiB. Gren-Eklund narrows the relations possible to express with a nominal sentence to just one, the equational,⁷⁴ which is, perhaps, more suited to the teachings of the *upaniṣads* than to their *brāhmaṇa* precursors.⁷⁵

2001, p. 39). For an overview of the terminological confusion, see Gundel, 1977, pp. 19–30; Prince, 1981, p. 225ff.

⁷⁰ Gren-Eklund, 1978, p. 10.

⁷¹ Gren-Eklund, 1978, p. 137.

⁷² Gren-Eklund, 1978, p. 137. For the refutation of a similar claim on a more generic level, see Gundel, 1977, p. 30ff.

⁷³ Gren-Eklund, 1978, p. 138.

⁷⁴ Gren-Eklund, 1978, p. 13, 141. However, she makes a survey on pp. 139–141 of the theories of different scholars who have proposed subcategories of equation or ascribed predicative functions to the nominal sentences. Nevertheless, she settles for the category of equation.

⁷⁵ Because the *brāhmaṇas* belong to a transitional phase in the evolution of Vedic thought, it is important to have a dynamic picture of the status of the correspondences; too rigid an exclusion of identification could conceal the link with the thoughts emerging in the *upaniṣads*.

The hypothesis that the relations between the nominal items are not exclusively of the equative type, combined with a distinction between discourse and sentence topic, gives a somewhat different picture of the word order of the correspondences which are expressed with nominal sentences.⁷⁶ This is due to the fact that many of the correspondences in AiB are formulas repeated verbatim, or with small variations, and the order of the nouns is therefore not primarily dependent upon what is the topic of the discourse. Some formulas consist of only one sentence, but others are whole argumentations of a syllogistic type, with several premises and a conclusion. This formular character of many of the correspondences could be a result of the oral composition of the text: the author had a stock of ready-made formulas and argumentations that could be applied to specific contexts, if there was something in the commented ritual — often constituted by *ṛgvedic* recitations — that triggered the appropriate formula.⁷⁷

These different levels at which a topic may occur (sentence/formula and discourse) are perhaps reflected in the tension between the two characterisations of T-C, namely: known and new; initiating and concluding an argumentation. An example is the correspondence between Bṛhaspati and *brahman*, which occurs seven times in AiB in exactly the same form, apart from *sandhi*, viz. *brahma vai bṛhaspatiḥ*, irrespective of the context. In 1.13.4 the correspondence is a gloss on a recitation containing the word *bṛhaspati*, and in 1.19.1 a gloss on a recitation containing *brahman*. In both cases, the result of the recitation involves *brahman*, so the logic of the reasoning proceeds from Bṛhaspati to *brahman*, but the known, or the trigger of the correspondence, is different in the two passages.

⁷⁶ See Brown, Gillian, 1983, p. 70ff.; Dik, 1989, p. 266ff; Kuppevelt, 1994, p. 4632.

⁷⁷ The theories and methods of the so-called Oral-Formulaic Theory could provide a starting point for a research of these features in the *brāhmaṇas*, even though the theory has mostly been applied to epics, poetry and folktales. For an overview of the basic tenets of the theory and its history, see Foley, 1988; and for a general perspective on the relation between orality and formulas, see Ong, 1989, pp. 33–36.

AiB 1.13.4 bṛhaspatiḥ puraetā te astv iti. brahma vai bṛhaspatir, brahmaivāsmā etat purogavam akar, ṇa vai brahmaṇvad riṣyati

‘Let Bṛhaspati be thy harbinger’ (he says); Bṛhaspati is the holy power; verily thus he makes the holy power precede him; what has the holy power come to no harm.

AiB 1.19.1 brahma jajñānam prathamam purastād iti pratipadyate. brahma vai bṛhaspatir, brahmaṇaivainam tad bhiṣajyati

With ‘The holy power born first in the east’ he begins; Bṛhaspati is the holy power; verily thus with the holy power he heals him.

If, however, we turn to another correspondence involving *brahman* (viz. speech and *brahman*), the form is not fixed in the same way. In the first example, speech is at the centre of the argumentation preceding the correspondence, and also occupies the first position in the nominal sentence, which expresses the correspondence; and the order seems to be, in this case, T-C. The goal of the argumentation, i.e. the desired effect, is nevertheless (in contrast to the two preceding examples) connected to both speech and *brahman*.

AiB 2.15.15 yadā vā adhvaryur upākaroti, vācaivopākaroti, vācā hotānvāha; vāg ghi brahma. tatra sa kāma upāpto yo vāci ca brahmaṇi ca

When the Adhvaryu begins, verily with speech he begins, at [with] speech the Hotṛ recites, for speech is the holy power. Herein is the desire obtained which is in speech and in the holy power.

In the next passage, there are three correspondences, the first between the difficult mounting and the heavenly world, the second between the call (*āhāva*) and speech, and the third between speech and *brahman*.

AiB 4.21.1 āhūya dūrohaṇam rohati, svargo vai loko dūrohaṇam. vāg āhāvo, brahma vai vāk. sa yad āhvayate, tad brahmaṇāhāvena svargaṇ lokam rohati

Having uttered the call, he mounts the difficult mounting; the difficult mounting is the world of heaven; the call is speech; speech is the holy power; in that he calls, thus with the call as the holy power he mounts the world of heaven.

In the second correspondence (*vāg āhāvah*) speech occupies the first position and seems to be a comment upon the call, which is referred to in the preceding argumentation. In the third correspondence, which is between speech and *brahman*, speech occupies the second position. The purpose of this correspondence seems to be to merely link the call to

brahman through the mediating entity of speech, thereby enabling the effect that he (the *hotṛ* or the sacrificer) can mount the world of heaven through the call and *brahman*. The logical structure of the whole argumentation is therefore best analysed according to the word order proposed by Delbrück (P-S), or in the terms of topic and comment. C-T, C-T.

1. The call = speech
2. Speech = *brahman*
3. Thus, the call = *brahman*

The stock of correspondences that was memorised by the *brāhmaṇa* theologians was probably not a closed collection of correspondences and argumentations, but there were also dynamic principles that allowed the ritual theologian to construct an appropriate correspondence for a recitation or any other type of material that was commented on.⁷⁸ This hypothesis is helpful for explaining the *ad hoc* correspondences, and, in those, the order of the words was perhaps not fixed independently of the context, as in the case of the formulas, but followed in most cases a pattern more suited to the context. The two examples below display a recurrent structure, which has the order predicate–subject and/or comment–topic.⁷⁹

AiB 2.4.5 tanūnapātaṃ yajati. prāṇo vai tanūnapāt, sa hi tanvaḥ pāti; prāṇam eva tat prīṇāti, prāṇaṃ yajamāne dadhāti

He says the offering verse for Tanūnapāt; Tanūnapāt is the breath, for he protects bodies; verily thus he delights the breath, he places the breath in the sacrificer.

AiB 2.4.6 narāśaṃsaṃ yajati. prajā vai naro, vāk śaṃsaḥ, prajāṃ caiva tad vācaṃ ca prīṇāti, prajāṃ ca vācaṃ ca yajamāne dadhāti

He says the offering verse for Narāśaṃsa; men are offspring; praise is speech; verily thus he delights offspring and speech; offspring and speech he confers upon the sacrificer.

Still, there are also uncertain or difficult cases, and the correspondences will therefore be analysed on an individual basis, taking into consideration factors such as the argumentation they are part of, the character of the

⁷⁸ The earlier classification of the relations expressed through nominal sentences may give a hint of the character of these principles. See also Chapter 6.2.1.

⁷⁹ Verpoorten, 1977, p. 57.

corresponding entities, and the other occurrences of the same correspondence. Nevertheless, the notions of topic and comment will be used, as they bring together within one terminology the different ways the correspondences are expressed. For example, a myth can express a certain correspondence, but the grammatical categories of subject and predicate are not always adequate in such a context, while the notions of topic and comment can be used for analysing the flow of the argumentation. However, in the nominal sentences which are relevant for the correspondences, the notions of sentence topic and comment will be used as coinciding with subject and predicate.⁸⁰ The fact that the criteria of the new and the already known has been used to identify both the S-P (Delbrück and Verpoorten) and T-C (Gren-Eklund), in Vedic nominal sentences, indicates that this is a reasonable working hypothesis.⁸¹

3.2.9 Variants of nominal sentences in AiB

3.2.9.1 Introduction

After the general discussion of the nature of nominal sentences and their word order, we can enter into the details of the different variants of nominal sentences. Firstly, we will consider the type that consists of nouns, or noun phrases, and which also, but not always, contains emphatic particles. Secondly, the type with relative and demonstrative pronouns will be considered. Finally, before the discussion moves on to verbal sentences, another important feature of many nominal sentences expressing correspondences will be dealt with briefly, viz. the construction with one word in *vṛddhi*. Within the two first categories (i.e. those without adjectives), there are also several subdivisions. Not all of them are of equal

⁸⁰ For the close connection between subject and topic, see e.g. Beck, David, 2000, in the context of Lushootseed; from a more generic perspective Siewierska, 1994, p. 4998. Tikkanen (1999, p. 73), however, points out that there is no necessary connection between subject and topic, and that it depends upon the interpretation of the sentence, i.e. the question it is imagined as answering. See also the contributions in the edited volume *Subject and Topic* (Li, 1976).

⁸¹ Verpoorten (1981, p. 45), furthermore, remarks in his review of Gren-Eklund's dissertation that "...l'approche de G. GE et la mienne, pour éloignées qu'elles soient au point de départ, aboutissent à des convergences nombreuses et frappantes."

importance for the correspondences, and therefore only the directly relevant variants will be treated below.⁸²

3.2.9.2 Nominal sentences with only nouns (or noun phrases)

3.2.9.2.1 With two words in nominative

The nominal sentences with two words in nominative very often have an emphatic particle, such as *vai* or *eva*, but sometimes a correspondence is also expressed without particle. This makes it relevant to ask whether there is some distinguishing feature between the cases when the particle is used and when it is not. The most natural explanation seems to be that the particle is used when extra emphasis is needed and, when this is not the case, then the nominal items in the sentence are left merely juxtaposed. A complication, however, is that the particle *vai* is mostly used only in the first correspondence of an argumentation. One explanation of this feature is that *vai* underscores the whole argumentation; another explanation is that emphasis is merely given to the first correspondence in the argumentation. The following example is a formula that is repeated seven times in AiB (*pañcikā* 1–5). Two statements involving Prajāpati are mentioned here; one opens the formula and the second closes it, and only the first has *vai*.

AiB 1.1.14 saptadaśo vai prajāpatir: dvādaśa māsāḥ pañcartavo hemantaśisīrayoḥ
samāsenā. tāvān samvatsaraḥ, samvatsaraḥ prajāpatiḥ

Prajāpati is seventeenfold; the months are twelve, the seasons five through the union of winter and the cool season; so great is the year; Prajāpati is the year.

It is, however, more difficult to explain why the correspondence in AiB 1.8.12 *prāṇāpānāv agniṣomau*, “Agni and Soma are expiration and inspiration” is not constructed with an emphatic particle, when almost all the other sentences in this *khaṇḍa* have either *vai*, *vāva* or *eva*, as in the following example.⁸³

⁸² For a detailed treatment of all the different variants of nominal sentences in AiB, e.g. those with instrumentals, ablatives, and locatives, see Verpoorten, 1977.

⁸³ For the use of *eva*, see Delbrück, 1888, p. 489f.; Verpoorten, 1977, p. 280. The main difference between *vai* and *eva* seems to be that *vai* underscores the whole utterance, and *eva* mainly a single word.

AiB 1.8.14 cakṣuṣī evāgnīṣomau

Agni and Soma are the eyes.

3.2.9.2.2 *With three or more words in nominative*

There are also correspondences with more than two nouns. In the following example three powers are characteristically connected with the metre *triṣṭubh*, but they are also implicitly connected with Indra and the warrior class; for both *triṣṭubh* and the powers are linked in other passages directly to Indra.⁸⁴ Together they constitute a group of entities appropriate to the *kṣatriyas*.

AiB 1.5.17 ojo vā indriyaṃ vīryaṃ triṣṭup

The Triṣṭubh is force, power, and strength.⁸⁵

3.2.9.2.3 *With one word in genitive*

In some nominal sentences one of the two nouns is in the genitive case. The most relevant construction, in the context of the correspondences, is that which Migron calls the ‘*belong-construction*’.⁸⁶ It expresses, as its name indicates, that one entity belongs to another. The word in genitive often occupies the final position and is used to signal a comment on the preceding noun, as in the following example.

AiB 1.3.4–5 navanītenābhyañjanty ājyaṃ vai devānām, surabhi ghṛtam manuṣyāṇām,
āyutam pitṛṇām navanītaṃ garbhāṇām

With fresh butter they anoint; melted butter is for the gods, fragrant ghee for men, slightly melted butter for the fathers, fresh butter for embryos.

[My translation]⁸⁷

But the inverted order is also used.

⁸⁴ See AiB 3.2.8 and 3.13.1.

⁸⁵ This is an example of how the intended relation between the signified entities is not given in the syntax of the phrase, but the relation has, therefore, to be provided through resort to the world-view of the text.

⁸⁶ Migron, 1999, p. 13. See also Delbrück, 1878, p. 44f. Verpoorten, 1977, p. 131: *génitif d'appartenance*.

⁸⁷ The main difference between this translation and Keith's is that the word order of the first two nominal sentences is, in my translation, read as subject–predicate. In this respect, I follow the translation made by Verpoorten, 1977, p. 131, which considers the genitive as predicate.

AiB 5.26.6 agneḥ pūrvāhutiḥ, prajāpater uttaraindraṃ hutam⁸⁸

The first libation is for Agni; the next for Prajāpati; the offering is Indra's.

Delbrück explains the initial position of the genitive as caused by emphasis, and this is especially common in the opening sentence of a narrative.⁸⁹ Migron, however, stresses that the example presented by Delbrück is not of the *belong*-construction, but of the *have*-construction, (i.e. TS 2.6.6.1 *agnes trayo jyāyāṃso bhrātara āsan*, Agni had three elder brothers) and that the demarcation between these two sorts of genitive constructions (rhematic and thematic) is not possible to establish solely on the grounds of word order.⁹⁰ This conclusion seems to be correct, as the previous examples indicate.

There are also nominal sentences in which the second noun is modified by a genitive. In this type of sentence, it is not easy to identify the predicate and the subject, and an analysis into topic and comment could perhaps be more fruitful.⁹¹ Keith, for example, in both of the following examples, treats Agni as subject, or as modifier of the subject, although in the first example Agni (AiB 1.1.1) is in nominative and occupies the first position, while in the next example it is in genitive and functions there as the modifier of the noun which is in the final position.

AiB 1.1.1 Agnir vai devānām avamaḥ

Agni is the lowest of the gods.

AiB 1.1.7 gāyatram agneś chandaḥ

The metre of Agni is the Gāyatrī.

The translation of the second example follows the order of predicate–subject that is normal for nominal sentences, but perhaps Keith translated

⁸⁸ The use of genitive in this context is special as the three quoted phrases are part of a longer list of the different phases of the *agnihotra* milk and the different gods with which the phases are connected. In the first thirteen correspondences the construction with *vṛddhi* is used, but in two of the last three correspondences which are quoted above, the construction with genitive is used. The question is whether this change in the way of expressing the correspondences has any significance, or whether it is merely a way of avoiding monotony in the presentation.

⁸⁹ Delbrück, 1878, p. 45.

⁹⁰ Migron, 1999, p. 13.

⁹¹ See p. 128.

the first example according to the principle that “lorsque la phrase commence par un nom divin, on est tenté de voir en lui le sujet plutôt que le predicat.”⁹²

3.2.9.2.4 *With one word in dative*

Through the use of the dative case, the connection between an entity and its characteristic effect can be expressed. In the following example two gods are connected to nouns derived from the verbs that denote the characteristic activities of the gods.

AiB 1.8.14 prasavāya savitā pratiṣṭhityā aditiḥ
Savitṛ (serves) for instigation, Aditi for support.

3.2.9.3 *Nominal sentences with pronouns*

Other forms of nominal sentences, which are utilised to express correspondences, have the relative pronoun *ya-* with a demonstrative pronoun as a correlate, as in the following example:

AiB 1.3.7 tejo vā etad akṣyor yad āñjanam
Ointment is the brilliance in the eyes.

The relative pronoun *ya-* indicates the topic/subject, which is placed in the final position, but there are also examples in which it is fronted.

AiB 4.23.5 tasya yāv abhito ‘tirātrau tau pakṣau
The two Atirātras on either side [of it] are the wings.

Verpoorten, who considers these constructions as expressing identifications, distinguishes between two types of constructions: *yat appositif*, which expresses an *équivalence mystique*, and *équivalences*

⁹² Verpoorten, 1977, p. 59. Haug translates in the same way, “Agni, among the gods, has the lowest, Vishnu the highest place.” AiB, 1863, Vol. 2, p. 1.

It seems that this is due to the interpretation of the statement as an instance of predication, i.e. one supplies information about the god Agni. However, in an interpretation of the phrase as an identification, the concept of the god occupying the lowest position and the name Agni is given a common reference. The translation according to such an interpretation could thus be “The lowest of the gods is Agni”.

relatives, which also express identification, but in which the pronouns are inflected, in contradistinction to the first category.⁹³

3.2.9.4 Nominal sentences with adjectives

If the nominal sentences hitherto considered have been of the type with two or more nouns, there is one important category of nominal sentences which include adjectives, viz. adjectives made through the heightening of the vowel grade of one the nouns onto the highest level called *vr̥ddhi*. A man belonging to a *viṣṇu* sect is accordingly called a *vaiṣṇava*. In the same manner, an entity in the *brāhmaṇas* could be linked to another entity by using the latter's name strengthened to *vr̥ddhi*. In AiB 1.28.4–5, for example, the text prescribes the recitation of *triṣṭubh* verses for a *rājanya*, because *traīṣṭubho vai rājanya*, “The Rājanya is connected with the Triṣṭubh.”⁹⁴

3.3 Verbal sentences

3.3.1 Introduction

Correspondences are expressed not only through (pure) nominal sentences, but also through verbal sentences, which here include those with copula. In the following example, two entities, a recitation and seed, are brought together in a correspondence based upon the similarity of the respective activities, which are both performed without sound.

AiB 2.38.1 hotṛjapam japati, retas tat siṅcaty. upāṃśu japaty, upāṃśv iva vai retasah siktiḥ

He mutters the muttering of the Hotṛ; [thereby] he pours seed; inaudibly he mutters; inaudible as it were is the pouring of seed.

⁹³ Verpoorten, 1977, p. 332, 344.

⁹⁴ There is also another sort of construction with an adjective that functions as an correspondence, viz. AiB 1.6.7 *satyasamhitā vai devā, anṛtasamhitā manuṣyāḥ*, i.e. the composition of X+*samhitā*, which expresses ‘composed of X’. The truth is thus something that is an integral part of the gods, while untruth of men.

3.3.2 Sentences with copula

There are sentences with a copula that seem to express correspondences. They are, however, not many, and there is a possibility that this construction is used for a different purpose than nominal sentences without copula — an interpretation which is especially tempting when the two constructions are juxtaposed, which is reflected in the translation of Keith below.

AiB 1.15.4 vaiṣṇavo bhavati. viṣṇur vai yajñāḥ, svayaivainam tad devatayā svena chandasā samardhayati

It [sc. the oblation of the guest reception] is for Viṣṇu; the sacrifice is Viṣṇu; verily thus with his own deity, his own metre, he makes him successful.⁹⁵

An alternative translation, which brings forth the correspondence character of the first sentence, is: “It is connected to Viṣṇu; the sacrifice is Viṣṇu .”

There are a few cases in which a form of \sqrt{as} but not *asti* is used, viz. when tense or person have to be given, as in the formula *caturhoṭr*.⁹⁶

AiB 5.25.5 vāg vedir āsī3t

(Their) altar was speech.

Another interesting passage changes between past time (*āstām* imperfect dual 3 p. of \sqrt{as}) and the a-temporal aspect (or perhaps present) of the nominal sentence.

AiB 4.28.1 bṛhac ca vā idam agre ratham̐taram cāstām. vāk ca vai tan manaś cāstām, vāg vai ratham̐taram mano bṛhat.

In the beginning there were here the Bṛhat and the Rathantara; they were speech and mind; the Rathantara [is] speech, the Bṛhat mind.

Also $\sqrt{bhū}$ is used to express past time, in what seems to be a correspondence; it then indicates that a change took place, e.g. that something became another thing, as in 4.22.9 where both Indra and

⁹⁵ Cf. AiB 1.25.1, 1.26.1.

⁹⁶ See Mylius, 1993, pp. 120–123.

Prajāpati became Viśvakarman — both after having performed their most prominent action.⁹⁷

AiB 4.22.9 indro vai vṛtraṃ hatvā viśvakarmābhavat, prajāpatiḥ prajāḥ sṛṣṭvā
viśvakarmābhavat
Indra having slain Vṛtra became Viśvakarman; Prajāpati having created
offspring became Viśvakarman.

3.3.3 Dative

The dative could also be used in a verbal sentence to express a correspondence between two entities. In the following example the relation is causal: one uses *triṣṭubh* verses with the intention of obtaining power.

AiB 1.4.11 triṣṭubhau bhavataḥ sendriyatvāya
[Two *triṣṭubh* verses are used] to secure power.⁹⁸

This is expressed in other places through a nominal sentence, as in 1.5.17 and 1.28.5, *ojo vā indriyaṃ vīryaṃ triṣṭup*, “The Triṣṭubh is force, power, and strength.”⁹⁹

3.3.4 Instrumental

In the passage below, the correspondence between ghee and *vajra* is expressed through the imperfect of ‘to strike, to kill’ and two instrumentals, which conveys the meaning that the deed was accomplished with ghee as the *vajra*.

AiB 1.26.3 ghṛtena hi vajreṇdro vṛtram ahan¹⁰⁰
...for by ghee as a thunderbolt Indra slew Vṛtra.

⁹⁷ The Viśvakarman is a creator god and two hymns of the ṚV are dedicated to him. Keith, 1925, Vol. 1, p. 206f.

⁹⁸ This formula is repeated verbatim in 1.17.11. Keith translates “They are Triṣṭubh verses, to secure power”. For the translation of *bhavati* as ‘is used’, see Gotō, 2001, p. 66.

⁹⁹ Once more, we can see how classification and efficacy are interconnected.

¹⁰⁰ This phrase is repeated in AiB 2.23.6.

3.4 Words that indicate correspondences

3.4.1 Introduction

Some special words indicate that the proposition contained in the sentence is a correspondence. They occur in both nominal and verbal sentences, but will receive separate treatment below, as they are important for the understanding of the ways correspondence is expressed.

3.4.2 Bandhu

Brian Smith has chosen *bandhu* as the word denoting Vedic correspondences in general. MW gives among other meanings of *bandhu*: ‘connection’, ‘relation’ and ‘association’, but also ‘resemblance’ and ‘kinship’. According to Louis Renou (1953), the primary meaning of *bandhu* was kinship, maybe with reference to the umbilical cord as a bond. The concept also includes relations of a more spiritual character (*parenté spirituelle*), such as the Vedic poets’ relations with some special gods, who were looked upon as their relatives.¹⁰¹ Renou, who analyses *bandhu* primarily in the ṚV, notes that *bandhu* meaning symbolical relation (*connexion symbolique*) evolved within the ṚV from the primary meaning of kinship. This secondary meaning of *bandhu* reached its mature stage first in the *brāhmaṇas* and especially in ŚB.¹⁰² Jan Gonda — in his article “Bandhu in the Brāhmaṇa-s” — does not agree with Renou.

In contradistinction to Renou I am neither sure about the secondary character of this "meaning" of this word, nor of its original use to denote blood-relationship only. There are other places in the Ṛgveda in which the typically brāhmaṇa use of *bandhu* — may more or less clearly be recognized.¹⁰³

In spite of the importance given to *bandhu* by some Indologists, the word *bandhu* is not used more than twice in AiB *pañcikā* 1–5, and then in the form *bandhutā*.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰¹ Renou, 1953, p. 171ff.

¹⁰² Renou, 1953, p. 174.

¹⁰³ Gonda, 1965a, p. 29.

¹⁰⁴ The suffix *-tā* is used to create an abstract substantive, thus *bandhu* ‘relation’ and *bandhutā* ‘relationship’; see Macdonell, 1995, p. 262.

AiB 2.4.16 tābhir yatharṣy āprīṇīyād. yad yatharṣy āprīṇāti. yajamānam eva tad
bandhutāyā notsrjati

For these should he use (verses) by the ancestral seer; in that he uses
(verses) by the seer, verily thus he does not set loose the sacrificer from his
connection [*bandhutā*].

The meaning of *bandhu(-tā)* in this context seems to be the primary meaning according to Renou, i.e. kinship, real or symbolic (the *yajamāna* is thus related to the *ṛṣis*); however, if the sense of spiritual kinship was believed to establish an efficacious link between the sacrificer and the ancient seers, it comes close to the sense of a correspondence.

The other passage is in AiB 4.30.6.

iheha vo manasā bandhutā nara iti

‘Here, here, in mind is your relationship, O heroes.’¹⁰⁵

This is actually the first verse of ṚV 3.60, which is quoted in AiB, due to the fact that this hymn should be recited on the first day of the *prṣṭhya śadhā*.¹⁰⁶ Geldner translates *bandhutā* as *Familienbeziehung*, but ṚV 3.60.1 is perhaps, as Gonda notes, one of the passages in the ṚV where the *brāhmaṇa* meaning of *bandhu* seems plausible.¹⁰⁷

To sum up, *bandhu(-tā)* occurs only once in the prose of AiB (*pañcikā* 1–5) and there it is not a question of a clear-cut correspondence. *Bandhu* as a technical term for correspondences becomes prominent first in the ŚB, which is a late *brāhmaṇa* bordering on the period (genre) of the Upaniṣads.

¹⁰⁵ *Bandhutā* could be nom. or instr. Grassman (1996) and Keith (*Rig-Veda Brāhmaṇas*, 1920, p. 220) think it is a nom., while Geldner (ṚV, 1951, Vol. 33, p. 407) interprets it as instr., ”durch Familienbeziehung”. The whole first stanza is as follows with Geldner’s translation, *iheha vo manasā bandhutā nara usījo jagmur abhi tāni vedasā | yābhir māyābhiḥ pratijūtivarpassaḥ saudhanvanā yajñīyam bhāgam ānaśa*, “Da und dort, durch Nachdenken, durch Familienbeziehung, durch Wissenschaft haben die Uśij diese Dinge von euch erfahren, ihr Herren, durch welche Zauberkünste ihr je nach dem Anstoß eine andere Gestalt annehmend, ihr Söhne des Sudhanvan einen Opferanteil erlangt habt.”

¹⁰⁶ In AiB, the Ṛgvedic hymns are normally referred to with the help of the first verse.

¹⁰⁷ ṚV, 1951, Vol. 33, p. 407; Gonda, 1965a, p. 28.

3.4.3 Rūpa

A word that in contrast to *bandhu* figures frequently in AiB is *rūpa*, which has connotations such as form, shape and outer appearance. In the text passage below, the *rūpa* of Agni — which connects him to Vāyu — is presented.

AiB 3.4.3 sa yad agniḥ pravān iva dahati tad asya vāyavyam rūpam

In that Agni burns forward as it were that is his form as Vāyu.

The fire burns horizontally and assumes in this way the form of Vāyu, the wind. The characteristic movement of the wind is its horizontal motion, and since the fire and the wind share this *rūpa*, they could be connected in a correspondence. In AiB 3.4, it is not only the wind (god) that is connected to Agni through a shared *rūpa*; all the major gods of the Vedic pantheon such as Varuṇa, Mitra and Indra are connected with Agni in a similar way. The correspondences become possible through special qualities that are common, at a particular moment, to the fire and a certain god.

Asko Parpola argues in his article “On the Symbol Concept of the Vedic Ritualists” that “the word *rūpa* is used in the *brāhmaṇa* texts in a meaning fairly close to our ‘symbol’.”¹⁰⁸ He also writes that the correspondences with *rūpa* alternate with the more terse nominal sentences of the type: *A vai B*. In other words, the word *rūpa* is a key to the understanding and interpretation of the correspondences that appear in the form of nominal sentences. Brian Smith does not agree fully with ‘symbol’ as the translation of *rūpa*: “It is not at all certain, however, that *symbol* adequately captures the usage here.”¹⁰⁹ Smith opposes the conclusion of Oldenberg to which Parpola adheres, namely that the relation implied by the notion *rūpa* is “the distinction between a Platonic sort of idea and its physical manifestations.”¹¹⁰ Smith emphasises that the ‘counterform’ (*pratirūpa*) is not merely a passive reflection of the *rūpa* but “is constructed and made to *conform* to its model.”¹¹¹ The question is, however, whether the Platonic

¹⁰⁸ Parpola, 1979, p. 143.

¹⁰⁹ Smith, B., 1998, p. 76.

¹¹⁰ Parpola, 1979, p. 148.

¹¹¹ Smith, Brian, 1989, p. 77.

model, or the emphasis upon the construction of the (counter)form, reflects the use of *rūpa* in AiB. The word *pratirūpa* is not even used in AiB, and when Agni and the wind are brought together in a correspondence based upon a *rūpa*, the stress is not upon the construction, or manipulation, of the fire (at least not explicitly), but on the multifaceted performance of the fire and its capacity to encompass a multitude of forms in its repertoire.¹¹²

An extensive and systematic use of *rūpa* is found in the correspondences given to the different days in the *pr̥ṣṭhya ṣaḍaha*.¹¹³ Each day has a long list containing gods, metres, *sāmans*, characteristic words etc., and all these entities are said to be *rūpas* of that day. Some of the *rūpas* have a quality in common with the day they are *rūpas* of; the word *anta* ‘the end’ is evidently fitting for the third day, which ends the first set of three days. Many *rūpas*, however, are not related to their day in such a direct way.¹¹⁴ Therefore, it could be concluded that *rūpa* not only denotes correspondences based upon an apparent similarity, but that — at least in the context of the *pr̥ṣṭhya ṣaḍaha* — it covers a wider sphere of relations. The word *rūpa* is thus the emic notion of AiB nearest to the etic notion of ‘correspondence’.¹¹⁵

3.4.4 Āyatana

Already in the first *khaṇḍa* of AiB the word *āyatana* is used to stress the dependence of one entity upon another in a correspondence. The text mentions that, in the beginning of the *soma* sacrifice, seventeen *sāmīdhenī* verses are recited. These verses correspond to the seventeenfold Prajāpati, who is constituted by twelve months and five seasons, and thus correlated

¹¹² A similar tendency to unite the whole pantheon in one substance can be seen in AiB 5.26, where the *agnihotra* milk is connected — through its different positions, qualities and actions — to all the important Vedic gods.

¹¹³ AiB 4.29–5.15.

¹¹⁴ E.g. the connection between the third day of the *pr̥ṣṭhya ṣaḍaha* and those verses that have the same endings (*samānodarka*).

¹¹⁵ Etic/emic is a notional pair coined by Kenneth Pike and defined as follows: “The etic viewpoint studies behavior as from outside of a particular system, and as an essential initial approach to an alien system. The emic viewpoint results from studying behavior as from inside the system.” Pike, 1999, p. 28.

to the year.¹¹⁶ The conclusive statement ending the *khaṇḍa* is: *prajāpatyāyatanābhir evābhī rādhnoti ya evaṃ veda*, “With these (verses) which abide in Prajāpati does he prosper who knows thus.”¹¹⁷

Āyatana is a noun derived from the verbal root \sqrt{yat} ‘stretch’ with the prefix *ā* and means, among other things, according to MW: resting-place, support, seat, place, home, house, abode. Gonda, who places *āyatana* in the context of the Vedic correspondences, gives to *ā* \sqrt{yat} the meaning ‘arriving at one’s destination’ and to *āyatana*, among other contextual meanings of the word, ‘natural position’ and ‘place in which an object properly and regularly ought to be’.¹¹⁸ The seventeen verses thus find their natural *locus* in Prajāpati due to the fact that both the god and the recitation are seventeenfold. In this way, *āyatana* signals the comment of the correspondence, and as Gonda remarks:

Here again an entity which in the system of correspondences and correlations is identifiable with another entity is also the latter's *āyatana*.¹¹⁹

But already Schayer noted the place of *āyatana* as a signifier of the predicative entity in a correspondence: “*āyatana* ist im gewissen Sinne (sic!), ein Korrelationsbegriff zu *nidāna* und bedeutet das „Gebiet“, an das eine Substanz durch das *nidāna* gebunden ist.”¹²⁰

However, in e.g. AiB 2.36 the non-technical meaning of ‘abode’ is the more natural interpretation of *āyatana*. This passage constitutes the opening

¹¹⁶ A very frequent correspondence in the *brāhmaṇa* literature; see Gonda, 1984. In AiB 1.30 a correspondence between 21 verses and the twenty-onefold Prajāpati is formulated (12 months, five seasons, three worlds and the sun); but in this context, it is said that *tat prajāpater āyatanam*, “...this the abode of Prajāpati...”. That is, the cosmos is connected to Prajāpati.

¹¹⁷ Haug (AiB, 1863, Vol. 2, p. 6) translates *prajāpatyāyatanābhir* with “by these verses (just mentioned) which reside in Prajāpati.”

¹¹⁸ Gonda, 1969, pp. 28, 54. He distinguishes between *pratiṣṭhā* “foundation” and *āyatana* “natural position” on p. 25ff.

¹¹⁹ Gonda, 1969, p. 43f.

¹²⁰ Schayer, 1925, p. 279. *Nidāna* originally meant a bond, just as *bandhu* did. In the correspondences, it signifies the connection between entities. It is, however, used only once in AiB *pañcīkā* 1–5, viz. AiB 2.11.5 *yajamāno vā eṣa nidānena yat paśuḥ*, “The victim is in essence the sacrificer”, or [The victim is, through the *nidāna*, the sacrificer].

of one of the many *brāhmaṇa* tales about the ritual fight between the *asuras* and *devas*.

AiB 2.36.1 devāsūrā vā eṣu lokeṣu samayatanta. te vai devaḥ sada evāyatanam akurvata, tān sadaso ‘jayan.

The gods and the Asuras fought over these worlds; the gods made the Sadas their refuge; they conquered them from the Sadas.

In 2.39 the meaning of *āyatana* is more ambivalent: Jātavedas has its abode in the morning pressing, which therefore indicates that this pressing is connected to Jātavedas.

AiB 2.39.10 tad āhur: yat tṛtīyasavanam eva jātavedasa āyatanam, atha kasmāt prātaḥsavane jātavedasyām purorucaṃ śaṃsaṭīti

They say ‘Since the [evening]¹²¹ pressing is the abode of Jātavedas, then why at the morning pressing does he recite a Puroruc to Jātavedas?’

In another passage (3.27.1), *gāyatrī* in the shape of a bird takes up her dwelling in the morning *soma*-pressing, and the connection between the metre and the pressing is thereby also established, *tad gāyatrī svam āyatanam akuruta*, “...the Gāyatrī made it [sc. the morning pressing] her own abode.” In 4.27.1 it is, moreover, written that the metres desired one another’s abode, *chandāṃsi vā anyonyasyāyatanam abhyadhyāyan*. The personified metres thus inhabit one of the three *soma*-pressings and are consequently connected to their ‘abodes’. This threefold structure is in its turn connected, in other *brāhmaṇa* text passages, to other structures with three elements such as the three worlds (earth, atmosphere and sky) or the social classes.¹²²

3.5 Myth

Correspondences are also expressed through myths, e.g. in AiB 2.1 where it is told that when the gods won the world of heaven, they used a sacrificial post of *khadira* wood — a man desirous of heaven should therefore also use a post of *khadira* wood. Hence the myth establishes a connection between the *khadira* and heaven. A similar type of connection is expressed in the same *khaṇḍa* with the help of a nominal sentence, viz.

¹²¹ Keith translates *tṛtīyasavanam* as ‘morning pressing’ which must be a mistake.

¹²² Smith, B., 1994, pp. 60–65.

the correspondence between *bilva* wood and light (*bilvaṃ jyotiḥ*); consequently if a man uses *bilva* wood (instead of *khadira*) then he becomes a light among his own people.¹²³ To state a connection between a ritual entity and some desired object, and thereby make the ritual efficacious, a nominal sentence could thus alternate with a myth. This, however, is not the only type of connection established by myths. For example, in AiB 3.13, it is told how Prajāpati allotted different metres and *soma*-pressings to the gods: e.g. Agni together with the Vasu gods were given the morning pressing and the Gāyatrī metre. The same correspondence is expressed in other text passages with the help of a nominal sentence — e.g. in AiB 1.1.7, *gāyatram agneś chandas*, “The metre of Agni is the Gāyatrī.”

The notional pair topic and comment will be used, as was stated earlier, for analysing also the correspondences expressed with myths. This is a way of analysing the flow of the argumentation in the myth; e.g. the gods used a certain type of wood and, thereby, they attained heaven. The movement seems to be from the wood to heaven, but one could also identify the topic through the question the myth is supposed to answer. If for example the question is posed as: ‘he who desires heaven, what wood should he use?’, then the topic is heaven, and the type of wood required the comment. Another way is to look upon the structure of the Sanskrit sentences and see where the emphasis is put. If we follow Delbrück and consider the basic word order to be that the subject opens the sentence, the verb ends it, and the remaining words come in between, we get a somewhat different picture of what the topic is. The first sentence — in the discourse centred upon the question of what material the *yūpa* should be made of — opens with the object first, and is then followed by the verb, and finally by the subject, an order which is reproduced in the translation made by Keith, *khādiram yūpaṃ kurvīta svargakāmaḥ*, “Of Khadira wood should he make the post who desires heaven.” Also the next sentence has *khādira* (meaning, connected to *khadira*) fronted, although now in instrumental. Noteworthy here is the use of the emphatic/argumentative particle *vai*; this sentence, namely, presents the reason why the *khadira* should be used.

¹²³ The effect caused by the *bilva* wood is thus manifested in this world, which is in contrast to the heavenly desire satisfied by the *khadira* wood.

AiB 2.1.5 *khādireṇa vai yūpena devāḥ svargam lokam ajayan*

By means of a post of Khadira the gods won the world of heaven.

The final sentence, however, has the basic word order, and it states the result of the use of the *khādiro yūpaḥ*. The structure of the *khadira* discourse is thus: first the prescription is presented, then the reason behind it, and finally the result of the prescribed ritual action is given, which in a sense is a rephrasing of the prescription, but with another emphasis. The emphasis of the prescription was on the material prescribed; in the conclusion, however, no emphasis is marked, but the basic word order is followed.

AiB 2.1.5 *tathaivaitad yajamānaḥ khādireṇa yūpena svargaṃ lokam jayati*

Thus verily also the sacrificer by a post of Khadira wins the world of heaven.

The three sentences devoted to *khadira* are part of a larger discourse (AiB 2.1) on the different woods to be used for the *yūpa*; this theme is in its turn part of the larger discourse on the *yūpa* (2.1–2.3), which is the first part of the section devoted to the animal sacrifice. In the text there are thus several levels of topics or themes, which are hierarchically ordered.¹²⁴

3.6 Analogy

Analogy establishes connections on the basis of similarity, but in this context we do not focus upon the analogies expressed with nominal sentences, or those marked with the word *rūpa*, nor on those that are incorporated in myths. The examples remaining after this exclusion are e.g. the correspondences formulated between parts or phases of an object and the corresponding entities. In 1.25, e.g., it is told how the gods — in their struggle against the asuras — made an arrow, constituted by the gods themselves, in the sense that the point was Agni, the socket Soma, etc. However, the next sentences are more interesting in the present context.

¹²⁴ Cf. Kuppevelt, 1994, p. 4632.

AiB 1.25.4 *caturō 'gre stanān vratam upaity upasatsu, catuḥsamdhir hīṣur: anīkaṃ śalyas tejanam paṇṇāni. trīn stanān vratam upaity upasatsu, triṣamdhir hīṣur: anīkam, śalyas, tejanam.*

At the Upasads he has first recourse to four teats for the fast milk, for the arrow is composed of four elements, point, socket, shaft, and feathers; three teats he has recourse to for the fast milk in the Upasads, for the arrow is composed of three elements, point, socket, and shaft.

The passage then goes on to consider the divine arrow as composed of two parts, viz. the socket and the shaft, which are correlated to the use of two teats, and finally the arrow as a unit, which is, in the same manner, connected to the use of one teat. The way of milking the cow for the ritual are thus correlated to different ways of analysing an arrow. This is a recurrent feature, namely that an entity can be correlated to different sets of objects depending on which aspect it is considered under. The correspondences therefore do not always bring the essential properties of the objects together; the accidental qualities can also constitute sufficient ground for a correspondence, qualities which are thus manifested only under specific circumstances.

Another example of 'analysing' is the cutting up of the sacrificial victim. After its vital powers such as breath, sight, life and so forth have departed to the corresponding cosmological entities such as the wind and the sun, the actual dismemberment of the victim is referred to as a making of the bodily parts into e.g. an eagle, or tortoises.¹²⁵ The use of *iva* in this context signals, perhaps, that the function of the correlation is not an ordinary correspondence, i.e. to link the bodily parts in a causal relation with an object from another sphere, but to cover up the fact that it is an actual dismemberment of an animal. The example below is thus perhaps primarily a ritual transformation of something uncanny and potentially dangerous, into something more neutral and manageable.

AiB 2.6.15 *śyenam asya vakṣaḥ kṛṇutāt, praśasā bāhū, śalā doṣaṇī, kāśyapevāṃsāchidre śroṇī...*

Make its breast an eagle, its two front legs hatchets, its two fore feet spikes, its shoulders two tortoises as it were, its loins uncut...

¹²⁵ Cf. the discussion of Smith's emphasis upon the construction of the *pratirūpa*, p. 102.

The final example of analogy is based upon the position in a structure. A verse having the twenty-first position in a series of recitals is connected to the sun, which is (cf. AiB 1.30) the twenty-first entity in the structure of the Vedic cosmos — after the twelve months, five seasons, and three worlds.

AiB 3.41.4 tasya saṁstutasya navatiśataṁ stotriyāḥ. sā yā navatis te daśa trivṛto, ‘tha yā navatis te daśātha yā daśa tāsām ekā stotriyodeti trivṛt pariśiṣyate: so ‘sāv ekaviṁso ‘dhyāhitas tapati

Of it, taking the Stotras together, in all there are a hundred and ninety Stotriya verses. The ninety corresponds to ten Trivṛt (Stomas); then the (next) ninety to ten more; of the ten (that remain) one Stotriya verse is in excess, a Trivṛt is left over; it yonder gives heat as the twenty-first placed over (the rest).

3.7 Conclusion

The most frequent way of expressing a correspondence is through a (pure) nominal sentence, and it has variously been looked upon as an ellipsis (the elimination of the copula) or as expressing a special aspect of a-temporality. The correspondences have moreover often been labelled as identifications, but we have argued that this is only one of the many relations that can be expressed through a nominal sentence in the *brāhmaṇas*. It seems also that the relationship between identification and predication in the nominal sentences is more dynamic and ambiguous than static and clear-cut.

The question of the difference in meaning between the nominal sentences with and those without copula becomes acute when AiB uses both of these ways of expressing correspondences in the same text passage. The general pattern seems to be that when a correspondence is located in a specific time, as in the beginning of time, then a copula is used, and when the relation is beyond time, in the sense of eternally valid, a nominal sentence without copula is used.

The word order of the nominal sentences has been a controversial question due to the fact that this issue cannot be settled without reference to either the relationship between the entities, to which the nouns refer, as this was imagined in the *brāhmaṇa* world-view, or the actual textual

context. This makes it, therefore, more promising to use notions such as topic and comment, which was done by Gunilla Gren-Eklund, than to rely on the grammatical notions of subject and predicate. Topic and comment are also of use in the analysis of other ways of expressing correspondence as verbal sentences and myths.

The question of word order is complicated further by the use of formulas in the text. The order of the words seems in such cases to be independent of what entity has been mentioned in the context preceding the instantiation of the formula. This makes it necessary first to make a distinction between sentence and discourse topic, and in addition to consider the text as built up of a hierarchy of topics.

Of the words used for expressing correspondences, *rūpa* is the most frequent; it is mainly used to pinpoint analogy, but in the context of the *sattra* sacrifices, it also seems to signal correspondence in general, and is therefore the emic concept coming closest to the meaning of correspondence.

The System of Correspondences in AiB

4.1 Introductory remarks

The scholarly interpretations of the *brāhmaṇa* correspondences have changed during the later part of this century — as was indicated in the introduction. The systematic character of some of the correspondences has thus been highlighted through the studies of Klaus Mylius and Brian K. Smith. Mylius has argued that there are consistent patterns in the use of correspondences in KB, and also that the correspondences to the metres given in the whole *ṛgvedic* corpus (i.e. ṚV, AiB, KB, AĀ, ŚĀ, AU and KU) follow a system. Building primarily upon the work done by Mylius, this chapter is intended to complement his investigations into the *Identifikationen* of the *ṛgvedic* corpus, through an analysis of the systematic character of the correspondences in the *pañcikā* 1–5 of AiB. The purpose of this detailed mapping of the correspondences is to lay bare the complicated pattern of correlations that, according to the *brāhmaṇa* author(s), constituted the foundation of the efficacy of Vedic sacrifices.

The basic material that will be discussed in this chapter is presented below in the form of a list (list 1). It contains all the correspondences that occur at least twice in AiB *pañcikā* 1–5, and the purpose is to display the more frequent correspondences, and thereby sort them out from the *ad hoc* correspondences and the ones that occur only once. Still, when the comparison is made with KB in the next chapter, it could be that a correspondence which occurs only once in AiB may also be found in KB. This correspondence in AiB is thus relevant for the comparison between the two *brāhmaṇa* texts. The composition of the list of shared correspondences between the two texts (AiB and KB) will therefore not be made with the help of the list below, but with the Appendix, where all the correspondences in AiB *pañcikā* 1–5 are listed.

List 1 will follow the use of categories in the comprehensive list in Appendix 1, in which the categories are *Animals*; *Cosmos*; *Gods, demons and their belongings*; *Man*; *Metres*; *Ritual entities* with the subdivision *Sattra*; and finally *Varṇa* and *Miscellaneous*.

In the Appendix, where all the correspondences in AiB *pañcikā* 1–5 are listed, the reciprocal character of the correspondences is not taken into consideration. The correspondences are arranged there according to the entity that seems to be the topic. For example, the line, “Agni — Gāyatrī (1.1.7, 2.5.2—2)” gives the information that the god Agni is connected with the metre *gāyatrī* in AiB 1.1.7 and 2.5.2. However, it is important to emphasise that this line does not exhaust the total number of correspondences between Agni and the *gāyatrī* metre. In another text passage the metre is topic and the god comment, which is accounted for in the Appendix as “Gāyatrī — Agni and the Vasus (3.13.1—1).” This correspondence is listed in the Appendix under the heading *Metres*, instead of under *Gods* as the previous correspondence was. Therefore, to be able to produce a list that displays all the occurrences of a correspondence in a way that is easy to grasp, it is necessary to bring together the correspondences where an entity functions as topic and when it is the comment. This will be done through adding the number of inverted correspondences to the sum in the parenthesis. For example, with Agni and *gāyatrī*, this is represented as follows: “Agni — Gāyatrī (1.1.7, 2.5.2—2+1).” Agni is, in the function of topic, connected to *gāyatrī* twice, and in the function of comment once: 2+1. The topic is underlined to make it easier to distinguish from the comment.

Another complication is that it would be convenient to find all the frequent correspondences in which an entity occurs under that entity’s name, including the correspondences where the entity in question appears only as comment. The god Agni could be used frequently as comment to various entities, and this will not be perceptible in the category *Gods* at Agni; one would have to browse through the whole list to get all correspondences in which Agni occurs. These correspondences — in which Agni functions only as comment — will therefore be included, in a smaller font size, after the ones where Agni functions as topic:

Agni — Gāyatrī (1.1.7, 2.5.2—2+1); Upasad, the first — Agni (3.18.7, 3.32.4—2)

Consequently the correspondences will be displayed twice but, at the same time, it will be easier to find them. This justifies the extra space used.

Some entities never function as topic, but only as comment. These will, however, also be displayed under both topic and comment, and in both cases the topic will be underlined. For example, the *anurūpa* is connected twice to offspring (*prajā*), and this will first be displayed in the category of *Ritual entities*, in the following manner.

Anurūpa — Offspring *prajā* (3.23.7, 3.24.3—2)

In the category of *Man* this correspondence will also be given, but in a smaller font size.

Offspring *prajā* — Anurūpa (3.23.7, 3.24.3—2)

Notice that in both cases Anurūpa is topic, as indicated through underlining, even though it appears in both the right and the left position.

4.2 List 1. The frequent correspondences in AiB pañcikā 1–5

ANIMALS

Cattle (*paśu*) — Jagatī (1.5.20, 1.21.15, 1.28.11, 3.18.14, 3.25.2, 4.3.4—6), Pairing *mithuna* (4.21.6, 5.16.19, 5.17.5, 5.18.18, 5.19.5, 5.20.18, 5.21.8—7), Food *anna* (5.19.7, 5.21.8—2); Litanies (*uktha*) — Cattle *paśu* (4.1.3, 4.12.5—2); Pragātha — Cattle *paśu* (3.19.1, 3.23.7, 3.24.9—3); Sacrificial food (*ilā*) — Cattle *paśu* (2.9.11, 2.10.11, 2.30.1—3); Chandomas — Cattle *paśu* (5.16.19, 5.17.5 & 10, 5.18.18 & 20, 5.19.5 & 6 & 7 & 12, 5.20.18 & 19, 5.21.8 & 8 & 8 & 13—15)

That which is a symbol of cattle *paśurūpa* — Prsthya Sadaha, fifth day (5.6.5 & 6, 5.7.8, 5.8.4 & 8 & 9 & 10 & 14—8)

Fivefold cattle *paśu* — Fivefold sacrifice (*pāñkta*) (3.23.5, 5.4.4, 5.18.20, 5.19.6, 5.20.19, 5.21.8—6)

The word: horse *aśva* — Prsthya Sadaha, third day (5.1.3 & 10—2)

The Victim's (*paśu*) Offal (*ūvadhya*) — Plants *ośadhi* (2.6.16, 2.11.9—2)

COSMOS

Brilliance *tejas* — Gāyatrī (1.5.2, 1.28.3—2)

Earth *iyam* — Aditi (1.8.16, 3.31.9—2)

This world *ayam lokaḥ* — Iyotis day (4.15.1 & 4—2)

The heavenly world *svargo lokaḥ* — Āhavanīya (5.24.12, 5.26.3—2), Dūrohana (4.20.1, 4.21.1—2)

Month *māsa* (3.41.1, 4.12.6—2) — Ukthya

South *dakṣiṇā dik* — Agni (1.7.4, 1.8.3—2)

The year (*saṃvatsara*) — Agni Vaiśvānara (3.41.1 & 2—2); Prajāpati — The year *saṃvatsara* (1.1.14, 1.13.33, 1.16.44, 1.28.41, 1.29.24, 2.17.2, 2.39.7—7), Agnistoma — The year *saṃvatsara* (3.39.6, 4.12.8—2)

GODS, DEMONS AND THEIR BELONGINGS

Aditi — Earth *iyam* (1.8.16, 3.31.9—2)

Agni — Gāyatrī (1.1.7, 2.5.2—2+1), South *dakṣiṇā dik* (1.7.4, 1.8.3—2); Agnistoma — Agni (3.41.1 & 2, 3.43.1—3); All Gods (*sarvā devatāḥ*) — Agni (1.1.4, 2.3.9—2); Upasad, the first — Agni (3.18.7, 3.32.4—2)

Agni Vaiśvānara — The year saṃvatsara (3.41.1 & 2—2)

All-Gods (*viśve devāḥ*) — Limbs aṅga (3.2.9, 3.3.8—2); Prsthya Sadaha, third day — The All-gods *viśve devāḥ* (5.1.1, 5.2.6—2)

All Gods (*sarvā devatāḥ*) — Agni (1.1.4, 2.3.9—2); Butter, drops (*stoka*) — All gods *sarvadevatya* (2.12.2 & 18—2)

Āśvins — Ear *śrotra* (3.2.7, 3.3.6—2)

Brhaspati — Brahman (1.13.4, 1.19.1 & 3, 1.21.1, 1.30.5, 2.38.9, 4.11.1—7)

The deity is mentioned in the first pada *yat prathame pade devatā nirucyate* — Prsthya Sadaha, first day (4.29.3 & 8 & 10, 4.30.7 & 10—5)

Indra — Strength *vīrya* (3.2.8, 3.3.7—2), Triṣṭubh (3.21.2—1+1)

— ‘s vajra — Triṣṭubh (2.16.4, 2.2.33—2), Speech vāc (2.16.4, 4.1.4—2+1); Anustubh — Vajra (4.3. 1 & 2 & 3 & 4—4); Butter (*ghṛta*) — Vajra (1.26.3, 2.23.6—2); Sacrificial post (*yūpa*) — Vajra (2.1.3 & 4; 2.3.3—3); Sodaśin — Vajra (4.1.2 & 3 & 4—3); Vasatkāra — Vajra (3.6.1, 3.7.2, 3.8.2—3)

— ‘s power *indriya* — Tristubh (1.4.11, 1.5.17, 1.17.11, 1.28.5—4)

100 powers *indriya* — Verses with 100 padas (2.17.1, 4.19.7—2)

Indra-Vāyu — Expiration and inhalation *prāṇāpāna* (3.2.5, 3.3.4—2)

Mitrāvarunau — Sight (eye) *caḥsus* (3.2.6, 3.3.5—2)

Prajāpati — The year *saṃvatsara* (1.1.14, 1.13.33, 1.16.44, 1.28.41, 1.29.24, 2.17.2, 2.39.7—7), 17 *sāmidhenī* verses (1.1.14, 4.26.5—2); Sacrifice (*yajña*) — Prajāpati (2.17.2, 4.26.11—2)

Sarasvatī — Speech *vāc* (2.24.8, 3.1.10, 3.2.10, 3.3.9—4)

Savitr — Instigation *prasava* (1.8.12 & 14, 1.30.3—3), Breath prāṇa (1.19.4, 3.29.4—2)

“Seers, divine, guardians of the body, born of fervour” (*ṛṣayo daivayāsas tanūpāvānas tanvas tapojāḥ*) — Breaths prāṇa (2.27.5 & 6 & 7—3)

Soma — Upasad, the second (3.18.7, 3.32.4—2)

Vāyu — Breath *prāṇa* (3.3.3—1+2)
Viṣṇu — Upasad, the third (3.18.7, 3.32.4—2)

MAN

Breath (*prāṇa*) — Vāyu (2.26.6, 3.2.4—2+1); Savitr — Breath *prāṇa* (1.19.4, 3.29.4—2), Vanaspati — Breath *prāṇa* (2.4.14, 2.10.8—2)
Breaths *prāṇāḥ* — “Seers, divine, guardians of the body, born of fervour” (*ṛṣayo daivayāsas tanūpāvānas tanvas tapojāḥ*) (2.27.5 & 6 & 7—3); Brhatī (3.14.2 & 2, 4.10.1—3); Libations, for two deities (*dvidevatya*) (2.26.1, 2.27.1, 2.28.1 & 2 & 5, 2.30.1—6); Sacrifice (*medha*) to the seasons (*ṛtuyāja*) (2.29.1 & 6—2)
Breaths below (*prāṇāḥ avāñcaḥ*) — Seed, urine and excrement *retas, mūtra, purīṣa* (1.20.4—1+3 correspondences between seed and breath)
Breaths: expiration and inhalation *prāṇāpāna* — Indra-Vāyu (3.2.5, 3.3.4—2)
Ear śrotra — Aśvins (3.2.7, 3.3.6—2)
Force ojas — Tristubh (1.5.17, 1.28.5—2)
Head (*śiras*) — Prosperity śriyā (4.13.2 & 3—2); Caturvimśa day — The head *śiras* (4.13.2 & 3—2)
Life consisting of 100 years āyus — Verses with 100 padas (2.17.1, 4.19.7—2)
Man puruṣa — Verses with 2 padas *dvīpadā* (4.10.18, 5.17.10, 5.19.12, 5.21.13—4)
Limbs aṅga — All-Gods (*viśve devāḥ*) (3.2.9, 3.3.8—2)
The word: manly vṛṣan — Prsthya Sadaha, second day (4.31.3 & 10, 4.32.1 & 5 & 6 & 8 & 9—7); Prsthya Sadaha, fifth day (5.6.4, 5.7.5—2)
Offspring prajā — Anurūpa (3.23.7, 3.24.3—2); Web (*tantu*) (3.11.19, 3.38.5—2)
Seed (*retas*) — Breath *prāṇa* (2.38.6 & 13, 3.2.4—3 + one correspondence between a breath below and seed)
The self ātman — Stotriya (3.23.7, 3.24.1—2)
Sight (eye) cakṣus — Mitrāvarunau (3.2.6, 3.3.5—2)
Speech (*vāc*) — Brahman (2.15.15, 4.21.1—2), Vajra (2.21.1—1+2 Indra’s vajra); Sarasvatī — Speech *vāc* (2.24.8, 3.1.10, 3.2.10, 3.3.9—4), Anuṣṭubh — Speech *vāc* (1.28.15, 3.15.1, 4.3.1 & 2 & 3 & 4—6); Prsthya Sadaha, fourth day — Speech *vāc* (5.4.3, 5.4.4—2)
Strength vīrya — Indra (3.2.8, 3.3.7—2), Tristubh — (1.5.17, 1.21.10,12; 1.28.5, 4.3.3, 4.11.15 — 6)
100 strengths vīrya — Verses with 100 padas (2.17.1, 4.19.7—2)
The wife patnī — Inserted verses (*dhāyyā*) (3.23.7, 3.24.5—2)

METRES

Aticchandas — Prsthya Sadaha, sixth day (5.12.1 & 4 & 5 & 8, 5.13.1 & 7—6)
Anuṣṭubh — Speech *vāc* (1.28.15, 3.15.1, 4.3.1 & 2 & 3 & 4—6), Vajra (4.3. 1 & 2 & 3 & 4—4); Prsthya Sadaha, fourth day — Anuṣṭubh (5.4.1 & 6—2)
Brhatī — Breaths prāṇa (3.14.2 & 2, 4.10.1—3)

Gāyatrī — Brilliance *tejas* (1.5.2, 1.28.3—2), Brahma-splendour *brahmavarcasa* (1.5.2, 1.28.3—2), The first soma-pressing *prātaḥsavana* (3.12.2, 3.13.1, 3.27.1—3), Agni and the Vasus (3.13.1—1+2), Brahman (3.34.10, 4.11.15 & 18—3); Chandoma, the second — Gāyatrī (5.19.14 & 19—2); Chandoma, the third — Gāyatrī (5.21.15 & 21—2), Prsthya Sadaha, fourth day — Gāyatrī (5.4.7 & 17, 5.5.5—3); Prsthya Sadaha, fifth day — Gāyatrī (5.6.14, 5.8.5—2); Prsthya Sadaha, sixth day — Gāyatrī (5.12.13, 5.13.6—2)

Jagatī — The third soma-pressing *tr̥tīyasavana* (3.12.4, 3.13.1—2); Cattle (paśu) — Jagatī (1.21.15, 1.5.20, 1.28.11, 3.18.14, 3.25.2, 4.3.4—6), Chandoma, the second — Jagatī (5.18.17, 5.19.4—2); Chandoma, the third — Jagatī (5.20.17, 5.21.7—2); Prsthya Sadaha, fifth day — Jagatī (5.6.5 & 6—2)

Pañkti — Prsthya Sadaha, fifth day (5.6.1 & 5 & 5 & 10 & 11, 5.8.1 & 2—7)

Trīṣṭubh — Force *ojas* (1.5.17, 1.28.5—2), Power *indriya* (1.4.11, 1.5.17, 1.17.11, 1.28.5—4), Strength *vīrya* (1.5.17, 1.21.10, 12; 1.28.5, 4.3.3, 4.11.15—6), Second soma-pressing *madhyam̐dina* (3.12.3, 3.13.1—2), Indra and the Rudras (3.13.1—1+1 only Indra); Indra's vajra — Trīṣṭubh (2.16.4, 2.2.33—2); the first Chandoma — Trīṣṭubh (5.16.10 & 11 & 16, 5.17.2—4); Chandoma, the second — Trīṣṭubh (5.18.7 & 9 & 15, 5.19.2—4); Chandoma, third — Trīṣṭubh (5.20.7 & 9 & 15, 5.21.5—4)

That which has various metres *vichandas* — Prsthya Sadaha, fourth day (5.4.2, 5.5.11 & 14 & 17—4)

Verses,

——— with 2 padas *dvipadā* — Man *puruṣa* (4.10.18, 5.17.10, 5.19.12, 5.21.13—4)

——— 100 — Life consisting of 100 years *āyus* (2.17.1, 4.19.7—2), 100 strengths *vīrya* (2.17.1, 4.19.7—2), 100 powers *indriya* (2.17.1, 4.19.7—2)

Having five padas *pañcapada* — Prsthya Sadaha, fifth day (5.6.11, 5.8.1 & 2—3)

——— seven padas *saptapada* — Prsthya Sadaha, sixth day (5.12.3 & 4 & 5 & 8, 5.13.1—5)

Virāj — Food *anna* (1.5.23, 4.11.18, 5.19.7, 5.21.8—4+1)

RITUAL ENTITIES

Agnistoma — The year *saṃvatsara* (3.39.6, 4.12.8—2), Agni (3.41.1 & 2, 3.43.1—3)

Āhavanīya — Sacrifice *yajña* (5.24.12, 5.26.3—2), The heavenly world *svargo lokaḥ* (5.24.12, 5.26.3—2)

Anurūpa — Offspring *prajā* (3.23.7, 3.24.3—2)

Bṛhat sāman — Prsthya Sadaha, second day (4.31.1 & 11 & 12, 4.32.2—4); Prsthya Sadaha, fourth day (5.4.19 & 21—2); Prsthya Sadaha, fifth day (5.6.5 & 7—2)

Butter (*ghṛta*) — Vajra (1.26.3, 2.23.6—2)

Butter, drops (*stoka*) — All gods *sarvadevatya* (2.12.2 & 18—2)

Dūrohana — Heaven *svargo lokaḥ* (4.20.1, 4.21.1—2)

Guest reception with seven padas (ātithya) — The head of sacrifice with seven breaths *śiro yajñasya, sapta prāṇāḥ* (1.17.9, 1.25.1—2)

Hotr — The speech of sacrifice *vāg yajñasya* (2.5.9, 2.28.6—2)

Hymn (sūkta) — The people *viś* (2.33.1 & 1 & 2 & 3, 3.19.8 & 9—6+1 correspondence between the inside of the peoples and the inside of the hymns), Houses *grha* (3.23.7, 3.24.13—2)

Inserted verses (dhāyyā) — The wife *patnī* (3.23.7, 3.24.5—2)

Invocation, double *dvihūta* — Chandoma, the second (5.18.4 & 8—2)

Libations, for two deities (dvidevatya) — Breaths *prāṇa* (2.26.1, 2.27.1, 2.28.1 & 2 & 5, 2.30.1—6)

Litanies (uktha) — Cattle *paśu* (4.1.3, 4.12.5—2)

Maitrāvaruṇa priest — The mind of the sacrifice *mano yajñasya* (2.5.9, 2.28.6—2)

The Nārāsaṃsa — Prsthya Sadaha, sixth day (5.12.3, 5.13.11—2)

Nivid — The lordly power *kṣatra* (2.33.1 & 1 & 2 & 3, 3.19.8 & 9—6)

The word: oblation *havis* — Prsthya Sadaha, fifth day (5.6.5, 5.8.11—2)

Pragātha — Cattle *paśu* (3.19.1, 3.23.7, 3.24.9—3)

Raivata sāman — Prsthya Sadaha, sixth day (5.12.1 & 14—2)

Rathaṃtara sāman — Prsthya Sadaha, first day (4.29.1 & 13, 4.30.3—3); Prsthya Sadaha, fifth day (5.7.7, 5.8.6—2)

Sacrifice (yajña) — Prajāpati (2.17.2, 4.26.11—2); Āhavanīya — Sacrifice *yajña* (5.24.12, 5.26.3—2)

— fivefold (pañkta) — Fivefold cattle *paśu* (3.23.5, 5.4.4, 5.18.20, 5.19.6, 5.20.19, 5.21.8—6)

The head of sacrifice with seven breaths *śiro yajñasya, sapta prāṇāḥ* — Guest reception with seven padas (ātithya) (1.17.9, 1.25.1—2)

The mind of the sacrifice *mano yajñasya* — Maitrāvaruṇa priest (2.5.9, 2.28.6—2)

The speech of sacrifice *vāg yajñasya* — Hotr (2.5.9, 2.28.6—2)

Sacrifice (medha) to the seasons (rtuyāja) — Breaths *prāṇa* (2.29.1 & 6—2)

Sacrificial food (ilā) — Cattle *paśu* (2.9.11, 2.10.11, 2.30.1—3)

Sacrificial post (yūpa) — Vajra (2.1.3 & 4; 2.3.3—3)

— under the name of Vanaspati — Breath *prāṇa* (2.4.14, 2.10.8—2)

Śākvara sāman — Prsthya Sadaha, fifth day (5.5.1, 5.7.1—2)

17 sāmīdhenī verses — Prajāpati (1.1.14, 4.26.5—2)

Sodaśin — Vajra (4.1.2 & 3 & 4—3)

Soma-pressing, the first *prātaḥsavana* — Gāyatrī (3.12.2, 3.13.1, 3.27.1—3)

Soma-pressing, the second *madhyamdaya* — Tristubh (3.12.3, 3.13.1—2)

Soma-pressing, the third — The word: to be drunk \sqrt{mad} (3.29.2 & 4, 4.4.11—3); Jagatī — The third soma pressing *trītyasavana* (3.12.4, 3.13.1—2)

Stotriya — The self *ātman* (3.23.7, 3.24.1—2)

Ukthya — Month *māsa* (3.41.1, 4.12.6—2)

Upasad, the first — Agni (3.18.7, 3.32.4—2)

Upasad, the second — Soma (3.18.7, 3.32.4—2)

Upasad, the third — Viṣṇu (3.18.7, 3.32.4—2)

Vasatkāra — Vajra (3.6.1, 3.7.2, 3.8.2—3)

— the second (*anuvaṣatkāra*) — Conclusion *saṁsthā* (2.28.3, 2.29.7, 3.29.3 & .4—4)

SATTRA

Caturvimśa day — The head *śiras* (4.13.2 & 3—2)

Chandoma, the first, occupying position seven after the six days of a *prṣṭhya ṣaḍaha* within a *daśarātra* — The word: hither *ā* (5.16.1 & 11, 5.17.11—3), The word: forward *pra* (5.16.1 & 11, 5.17.1 & 3 & 7 & 8 & 14—7), The word: wagon *ratha* (5.16.3 & 17—2), The word: drink *piba* (5.16.3 & 28—2), The word: born *jāta* (5.16.4 & 13, 5.17.9—3), That which is unexpressed *anirukta* (5.16.4, 5.17.16—2), That which is a symbol of the first day of the *prṣṭhya ṣaḍaha* *prathamasyāhno rūpam* (5.16.5 & 12—2), Triṣṭubh (5.16.10 & 11 & 16, 5.17.2—4)

Chandoma, the second, eighth day in *daśarātra* — The word: upright *ūrdhva* (5.18.3 & 8, 5.19.9—3), The word: towards *prati* (5.18.3 & 8—2), The word: between *antar* (5.18.3 & 8—2), The word: grow *vr̥dhan* (5.18.3, 5.19.16—2), That which has Agni twice *dvyagni* (5.18.4 & 6—2), The word: great *mahat* (5.18.4 & 12 & 13 & 14 & 16, 5.19.1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 10 & 13 & 15 & 18—14), Double invocation *dvihūta* (5.18.4 & 8—2), The word: again *punar* (5.18.4, 5.19.11—2), That which is a symbol of the second day in the *prṣṭhya ṣaḍaha* *dvitīyasyāhno rūpam* (5.18.5 & 10—2), Triṣṭubh (5.18.7 & 9 & 15, 5.19.2—4), Jagatī (5.18.17, 5.19.4—2), Gāyatrī (5.19.14 & 19—2)

Chandoma, the third, ninth day in *daśarātra* — That which has the same endings *samānodarka* (5.20.1 & 16, 5.21.19—2), The word: three *tri* (5.20.3, 5.21.12 & 14—3), That which is a symbol of the end *antarūpa* (5.20.3 & 11 & 13, 5.21.2 & 4 & 6 & 10 & 16—8), The word: pure *śuci* (5.20.4 & 8, 5.21.11—3), The word: truth *satya* (5.20.4 & 8, 5.21.3—3), The word: to dwell $\sqrt{kṣi}$ (5.20.4 & 8, 5.21.2 & 17—4), The word: gone *gata* (5.20.4 & 6 & 8, 5.21.1—4), The word: dwelling *okas* (5.20.4 & 8—2), That which is a symbol of the third day *tr̥tīyasyāhno rūpam* (5.20.5 & 10—2), Triṣṭubh (5.20.7 & 9 & 15, 5.21.5—4), Jagatī (5.20.17, 5.21.7—2), Gāyatrī (5.21.15 & 21—2)

Chandomāh — Cattle *paśu* (5.16.19, 5.17.5 & 10, 5.18.18 & 20, 5.19.5 & 6 & 7 & 12, 5.20.18 & 19, 5.21.8 & 8 & 8 & 13—15)

Jyotis day — This world *ayam lokaḥ* (4.15.1 & 4—2)

Prsthya Sadaha, first day — Ratham̐tara s̐aman (4.29.1 & 13, 4.30.3—3), The word: hither *ā* (4.29.3 & 6 & 12 & 14, 4.30.1 & .6—6), The word: forward *pra* (4.29.3 & 5 & 9 & 11, 4.30.5 & 6 & 11 & 14—8), The word: yoked *yukta* (4.29.3, 4.30.4—2), The word: wagon *ratha* (4.29.3 & 7—2), The word: drink *piba* (4.29.3 & 7 & 15—3), The deity is mentioned in the first pada *yat prathame pade devatā nirucyate* (4.29.3 & 8 & 10, 4.30.7 & 10—5); Chandoma, the first — That which is a symbol of the first day of the pṛṣṭhya ṣaḍaha *prathamasyāhno rūpam* (5.16.5 & 12—2); Prsthya Sadaha, fourth day — That which is a symbol of the first day *prathamasyāhno rūpam* (5.4.2 & 12—2)

Prsthya Sadaha, second day — Bṛhat s̐aman (4.31.1 & 11 & 12, 4.32.2—4), The word: upright *ūrdhva* (4.31.3 & 7, 4.32.3—3), The word: between *antar* (4.31.3 & 6, 4.32.4—3), The word: manly *vīṣan* (4.31.3 & 10, 4.32.1 & 5 & 6 & 8 & 9—7), The word: grow *vṛdhan* (4.31.3 & 5 & 6 & 9, 4.32.11—5), The present tense *kurvat* (4.31.3, 4.31.4—2); Chandoma, the second — That which is a symbol of the second day in the pṛṣṭhya ṣaḍaha *dviṭīyasyāhno rūpam* (5.18.5 & 10—2); Prsthya Sadaha, fifth day — That which is a symbol of the second day *dviṭīyasyāhno rūpam* (5.6.5 & 9—2)

Prsthya Sadaha, third day — The All-gods *viśve devāḥ* (5.1.1, 5.2.6—2), That which has the same endings *samānodarka* (5.1.3 & 12, 5.2.1 & 17—4), The word: horse *aśva* (5.1.3 & 10—2), The word: end *anta* (5.1.3, 5.2.8 & 11 & 14 & 15—5), That which is alliterated *punarninṛtta* (5.1.3 & 13 & 14, 5.2.9—4), The word: thrown around *paryasta* (5.1.3 & 16—2), The word: three *tri* (5.1.3 & 13 & 17 & 21—4); Chandoma, the third — That which is a symbol of the third day *trīṭīyasyāhno rūpam* (5.20.5 & 10—2); Prsthya Sadaha, sixth day — That which is a symbol of the third day *trīṭīyasyāhno rūpam* (5.12.3 & 7—2)

Prsthya Sadaha, fourth day — Speech *vāc* (5.4.1, 5.4.2—2), Anuṣṭubh (5.4.1 & 6—2), The word: hither *ā* (5.4.2 & 10, 5.5.7—3), The word: forward *pra* (5.4.2 & 10, 5.5.8 & 9 & 10—5), The word: born *jāta* (5.4.2 & 22, 5.5.2 & 12 & 16—5), The word: call *hava* (5.4.2 & 13 & 14 & 16—4), The word: bright *śukra* (5.4.2 & 10, 5.5.10—3), That which is by Vimada *vaimada* (5.4.2 & 3, 5.5.1—3), That which is sounded *viriphita* (5.4.2 & 3, 5.5.1—2), That which has various metres *vichandas* (5.4.2, 5.5.11 & 14 & 17—4), That which is a symbol of the first day *prathamasyāhno rūpam* (5.4.2 & 12—2), Gāyatrī (5.4.7 & 17, 5.5.5—3), Bṛhat (5.4.19 & 21—2)

Prsthya Sadaha, fifth day — Śākvara s̐aman (5.5.1, 5.7.1—2), Pañkti (5.6.1 & 5 & 5 & 10 & 11, 5.8.1 & 2—7), Not having the word: forward, or the word:

hither *neti na preti*¹ (5.6.2 & 13—2), The word: manly *vṛṣan* (5.6.4, 5.7.5—2), The word: grow *vṛdhan* (5.6.4, 5.7.5—2), The word: dappled *prṣṇi* (5.6.5, 5.7.5—2), The word: to be drunk \sqrt{mad} (5.6.5 & 10 & 11 & 12, 5.7.5, 5.8.2 & 3—7), That which is a symbol of cattle *paśūrūpa* (5.6.5 & 6, 5.7.8, 5.8.4 & 8 & 9 & 10 & 14—8), That which has an addition *adhyāsa* (5.6.5 & 6, 5.7.8, 5.8.10 & 14—5), Jagatī (5.6.5 & 6—2), Bṛhat (5.6.5 & 7—2), That which is beautiful *vāma* (5.6.5, 5.8.7—2), The word: oblation *havis* (5.6.5, 5.8.11—2), The word: form *vapus* (5.6.5, 5.8.12—2), That which is a symbol of the second day *dvitīyasyāhno rūpam* (5.6.5 & 9—2), Gāyatrī (5.6.14, 5.8.5—2), Having five padas *pañcapada* (5.6.11, 5.8.1 & 2—3), Rathantara (5.7.7, 5.8.6—2)

Prsthya Sadaha, sixth day — Raivata sāman (5.12.1 & 14—2), Aticchandas (5.12.1 & 4 & 5 & 8, 5.13.1 & 7—6), That which has the same endings *samānodarka* (5.12.2 & 9, 5.13.2 & 5 & 10, 5.15.8—6), The word: end *anta* (5.12.2 & 6 & 10 & 12, 5.13.3 & 8—6), That which is repeated *punarāvṛtta* (5.12.2, 5.15.5—2), That which is alliterated *punarninṛtta* (5.12.2 & 17, 5.15.5—3), The word: three *tri* (5.12.2, 5.13.11—2), Connected with Parucchepa *pārucchepa* (5.12.3 & 4 & 5 & 8, 5.13.1—5), What has seven padas *saptapada* (5.12.3 & 4 & 5 & 8, 5.13.1—5), The Nārāsaṃsa (5.12.3, 5.13.11—2), That which is a symbol of the third day *ṛtīyasyāhno rūpam* (5.12.3 & 7—2), Gāyatrī (5.12.13, 5.13.6—2)

VARṆA

Brahman — Speech (vāc) (2.15.15, 4.21.1—2), Gāyatrī (3.34.10, 4.11.15 & 18—3), Brhaspati (1.13.4, 1.19.1 & 3, 1.21.1, 1.30.5, 2.38.9, 4.11.1—7)
 Brahma-splendour *brahmavarcasa* — Gāyatrī (1.5.2, 1.28.3—2)
 The lordly power *kṣatra* — Nivid (2.33.1 & 1 & 2 & 3, 3.19.8 & 9—6)
Within the peoples (*antaram janatāḥ*) — Inside the hymns *sūkta* (3.31.2—1+6 correspondences between the hymn and the people)

MISCELLANEOUS

That which has an addition *adhyāsa* — Prsthya Sadaha, fifth day (5.6.5 & 6, 5.7.8, 5.8.10 & 14—5)
 The word: again *punar* — Chandoma, the second (5.18.4, 5.19.11—2)
 That which has Agni twice *dvyagni* — Chandoma, the second (5.18.4 & 6—2)
 That which is alliterated *punarninṛtta* — Prsthya Sadaha, third day (5.1.3 & 13 & 14, 5.2.9—4); Prsthya Sadaha, sixth day (5.12.2 & 17, 5.15.6—3)

¹ That is, *na+ā+iti*, *na pra+iti*.

- That which is beautiful *vāma* — Prsthya Sadaha, fifth day (5.6.5, 5.8.7—2),
 The word: between *antar* — Chandoma, the second (5.18.3 & 8—2); Prsthya Sadaha, second day (4.31.3 & 6, 4.32.4—3)
 The word: born *jāta* — Chandoma, the first (5.16.4 & 13, 5.17.9—3); Prsthya Sadaha, fourth day (5.4.2 & 22, 5.5.2 & 12 & 16—5)
 The word: bright *śukra* — Prsthya Sadaha, fourth day (5.4.2 & 10, 5.5.10—3)
 The word: call *hava* — Prsthya Sadaha, fourth day (5.4.2 & 13 & 14 & 16—4)
 Conclusion *saṁsthā* — The second Vasatkāra (anuvaṣatkāra) (2.28.3, 2.29.7, 3.29.3 & .4—4); Eating (bhakṣa) (3.29.3 & 4—2)
 The word: dappled *prṣṇi* — Prsthya Sadaha, fifth day (5.6.5, 5.7.5—2)
 ‘Distance’ (*parāvāt*) — The end anta (5.2.11, 5.21.16—2)
 The word: drink *piba* — Chandoma, the first (5.16.3 & 28—2); Prsthya Sadaha, first day (4.29.3 & 7 & 15—3)
 The word: to be drunk \sqrt{mad} — Soma-pressing, the third (3.29.2 & 4, 4.4.11—3); Prsthya Sadaha, fifth day (5.6.5 & 10 & 11 & 12, 5.7.5, 5.8.2 & 3—7)
 The word: to dwell $\sqrt{kṣi}$ — Chandoma, the third (5.20.4 & 8, 5.21.2 & 17—4)
 The word: dwelling *okas* — Chandoma, the third (5.20.4 & 8—2)
Eating (bhakṣa) — Conclusion saṁsthā (3.29.3 & 4—2)
 The word: end *anta* — Prsthya Sadaha, third day (5.1.3, 5.2.8 & 11 & 14 & 15—5); Prsthya Sadaha, sixth day (5.12.2 & 6 & 10 & 12, 5.13.3 & 8—6); ‘Distance’ (*parāvāt*) (5.2.11, 5.21.16—2); ‘Gone’ (*gata*) (5.13.8, 5.21.10—2); ‘Greatness’ (*mahat*) (5.2.8, 5.12.6—2); ‘Much’ (*bahu*) (5.2.15, 5.15.6—2); ‘Standing’ (*sthita*) (5.13.3 & 9, 5.20.13—3); ‘Won’ (*jita*) (5.12.12, 5.21.6—2)
 That which is a symbol of the end *antarūpa* — Chandoma, the third (5.20.3 & 11 & 13, 5.21.2 & 4 & 6 & 10 & 16—8)
 That which has the same endings *samānodarka* — Chandoma, the third (5.20.1 & 16, 5.21.19—2); Prsthya Sadaha, third day (5.1.3 & 12, 5.2.1 & 17—4), Prsthya Sadaha, sixth day (5.12.2 & 9, 5.13.2 & 5 & 10, 5.15.8—6)
Food (anna, annādya) — Virāj (4.16.5—1+4); Cattle (paśu) — Food (5.19.7, 5.21.8—2)
 The word: form *vapus* — Prsthya Sadaha, fifth day (5.6.5, 5.8.12—2)
 The word: forward *pra* — Chandoma, the first (5.16.1 & 11, 5.17.1 & 3 & 7 & 8 & 14—7); Prsthya Sadaha, first day (4.29.3 & 5 & 9 & 11, 4.30.5 & 6 & 11 & 14—8); Prsthya Sadaha, fourth day (5.4.2 & 10, 5.5.8 & 9 & 10—5)
 Not having the word: forward, or the word: hither *neti na preti* — Prsthya Sadaha, fifth day (5.6.2 & 13—2)
 ‘Gone’ (*gata*) — The end anta (5.13.8, 5.21.10—2); Chandoma, the third — The word: gone gata (5.20.4 & 6 & 8, 5.21.1—4)
 The word: great *mahat* — Chandoma, the second (5.18.4 & 12 & 13 & 14 & 16, 5.19.1 & 1 & 1 & 1, 5.19.2 & 10 & 13 & 15 & 18—14)
 ‘Greatness’ (*mahat*) — The word: end anta (5.2.8, 5.12.6—2)
 The word: grow *vr̥dhan* — Chandoma, the second (5.18.3, 5.19.16—2); Prsthya Sadaha, second day (4.31.3 & 5 & 6 & 9, 4.32.11—5), Prsthya Sadaha, fifth day (5.6.4, 5.7.5—2)

- The word: hither *ā* — Chandoma, the first (5.16.1 & 11, 5.17.11—3); Prsthya Sadaha, first day (4.29.3 & 6 & 12 & 14, 4.30.1 & .6—6); Prsthya Sadaha, fourth day (5.4.2 & 10, 5.5.7—3)
- Houses *gr̥ha* — Hymn (sūkta) (3.23.7, 3.24.13—2)
- Instigation *prasava* — Savitṛ (1.8.12 & 14, 1.30.3—3)
- ‘Much’ (*bahu*) — The end *anta* (5.2.15, 5.15.6—2)
- Pairing *mithuna* — Cattle (paśu) (4.21.6, 5.16.19, 5.17.5, 5.18.18, 5.19.5, 5.20.18, 5.21.8—7)
- Connected with Parucchepa *pārucchepa* — Prsthya Sadaha, sixth day (5.12.3 & 4 & 5 & 8, 5.13.1—5)
- The word: thrown around *pariyasta* — Prsthya Sadaha, third day (5.1.3 & 16—2)
- The present tense *kurvat* — Prsthya Sadaha, second day (4.31.3, 4.31.4—2)
- Prosperity *śriyā* — Head (śiras) (4.13.2 & 3—2)
- Plants *ośadhi* — The Victim’s (paśu) Offal (ūvadhya) (2.6.16, 2.11.9—2)
- The word: pure *śuci* — Chandoma, the third (5.20.4 & 8, 5.21.11—3)
- That which is repeated *punarāvṛtta* — Prsthya Sadaha, sixth day (5.12.2, 5.15.5—2)
- That which is sounded *viriphita* — Prsthya Sadaha, fourth day (5.4.2 & 3, 5.5.1—2)
- ‘Standing’ (*sthita*) — The end *anta* (5.13.3 & 9, 5.20.13—3)
- The word: towards *prati* — Chandoma, the second (5.18.3 & 8—2)
- The word: three *tri* — Chandoma, the third (5.20.3, 5.21.12 & 14—3); Prsthya Sadaha, third day (5.1.3 & 13 & 17 & 21—4); Prsthya Sadaha, sixth day (5.12.2, 5.13.11—2)
- The word: truth *satya* — Chandoma, the third (5.20.4 & 8, 5.21.3—3)
- That which is unexpressed *anirukta* — Chandoma, the first (5.16.4, 5.17.16—2)
- The word: upright *ūrdhva* — Chandoma, the second (5.18.3 & 8, 5.19.9—3); Prsthya Sadaha, second day (4.31.3 & 7, 4.32.3—3)
- The word: wagon *ratha* — Chandoma, the first (5.16.3 & 17—2), Prsthya Sadaha, first day (4.29.3 & 7—2)
- That which is by Vimada *vaimada* — Prsthya Sadaha, fourth day (5.4.2 & 3, 5.5.1—3)
- Web (tantu) — Offspring *prajā* (3.11.19, 3.38.5—2)
- “Won” (*jita*) — The end *anta* (5.12.12, 5.21.6—2)
- The word: yoked *yukta* — Prsthya Sadaha, first day (4.29.3, 4.30.4—2)

4.3 The direction of the correspondences

The list above makes it possible to calculate the directions of the correspondences, thereby making it manifest which categories are predominately used as topic and which are used more often in the function of comment. The table below displays how many of the correspondences start from a category and how many end with it. At the same time, we will get to know how the numbers of frequent correspondences are distributed among the categories. It should be noted that, because the occurrences are counted in both the position of comment and that of topic, the sum (1168) is twice as large as the total number of occurrences (584).

After the number of occurrences, the percentage will be given in parentheses. In the vertical columns that display the number of topic and comment positions, the percentage will be of the total number of correspondences, i.e. 584. In the vertical column giving the sum of comment and topic positions, the percentage will be of the total number of both topic and comment positions (1168). The percentage is rounded off to one decimal.

Table 2. The direction of the correspondences in AiB

<i>Category</i>	<i>Topic–comment</i>	<i>Comment–topic</i>	<i>Sum</i>
Animals	17 (2.9 %)	39 (6.7 %)	56 (4.8 %)
Cosmos	2 (0.3 %)	23 (3.9 %)	25 (2.1 %)
Gods	52 (8.9%)	50 (8.6 %)	102 (8.7 %)
Man	11 (1.9 %)	82 (14 %)	93 (8 %)
Metres	55 (9.4 %)	68 (11.6 %)	123 (10.5 %)
Ritual entities	91 (15.6%)	41 (7.0 %)	132 (11.3 %)
Sattra	337 (57.7 %)	12 (2.1 %)	349 (29.9 %)
Varṇa	1 (0.2 %)	26 (4.5 %)	27 (2.3 %)
Misc.	18 (3.1%)	243 (41.6 %)	261 (22.3 %)
Sum	584	584	1168

The table above indicates that *Sattra* and *Ritual entities* are typical topic categories. The ritual and its elements constitute the topic in the majority of the frequent correspondences; we have to remember, however, that the *ad hoc* correspondences are not taken into consideration here. The categories *Ritual entities*, *Sattra* and *Metres* make up the topic in 82.7 % of the correspondences. If the starting-point is mainly in the ritual realm, then such categories as *Cosmos*, *Animals* (mostly cattle), *Varṇa* and *Man* contain the typical comments or ending points. Moreover, the category *Man* holds the largest amount of comment positions, apart from the category of *Miscellaneous*. This is in accordance with the result obtained by Mylius through his study of the correspondences in KB.

Within the category of *Man* (in AiB), breath has the highest number of comment positions (29 %), a fact which indicates that breath (*prāṇa*) plays an important role in the world-view of the text. In the *brāhmaṇas*, however, breath is more than merely the physical process of breathing; the notion of breath also incorporates other vital functions, such as mind and speech, which are thus also labelled as breaths (*prāṇāḥ*).²

Another important thing to take into consideration is the peak in the number of correspondences in the later part of *pañcikā* 4 and the greater part of *pañcikā* 5, which deal with the *sattra* sacrifices. The great number of correspondences in these passages, which constitute a whole system of their own, could conceal — in a condensed presentation such as the table above — the structure of the correspondences in other parts of the AiB. Within the category of *Sattra*, the *dvādaśāha* (a 12-day *soma* sacrifice) has an elaborate system of correspondences; the *dvādaśāha* stands on the border to the *sattra* sacrifices, which are *soma* sacrifices having 12 or more days. In AiB 4.29 to 5.21 a system is developed in which each of the nine principal days of the *dvādaśāha* is given special gods, metres and characteristic words;³ and all the entities pertaining to a certain day are called the symbols (*rūpa*) of that day. These nine days are structured in three triads, the first three days being fundamental, and the next set of three days a repetition of the first set, but with some special extra characteristics: the fourth day is thus the first day again, but with some modifications. The third set is — in a way similar to the second — a repetition with some amplifications of the first set. The tenth day in the *dvādaśāha* is described as the necessary complement to the nine days, but it does not enter the elaborate system of *rūpas* that is such a special characteristic of these days. The remaining two days in the *dvādaśāha* are the introductory and concluding days that surround the central ten days on both sides.

The attribution of *rūpas* to the nine *soma* days follows a certain pattern: in the beginning of the first *khaṇḍa* that deals with one of the days, all the *rūpas* of that day are mentioned, and then follows an enumeration of the hymns to be recited on that day. After the indication of a hymn through its

² Bodewitz, 1986, p. 343.

³ These nine days are constituted by a unit of six *soma* days called *prṣṭhya śaḍaha* and three so-called *chandomas*, which are also *soma*-pressing days.

first *pada*, the text presents the *rūpa* through which the hymn is connected to its day, as in the following example:

AiB 4.29.8 indra nedīya ed ihītīndranihavaḥ pragāthaḥ. prathame pade devatā
nirucyate, prathame ‘hani prathamasyāhno rūpan

‘O Indra come nearer’ is the Pragātha invoking Indra; in the first Pada the god is mentioned, on the first day it is a symbol [*rūpa*] of the first day.

In some cases, the hymn has no such *rūpa*, and the text then makes a secondary connection through another correspondence. A high frequency of a *rūpa* to a certain day in the *dvādaśāha* thus implies that many hymns could be connected to this day through that specific characteristic (*rūpa*).

We have displayed through Table 2 how many times the entities within a category function as comment and how many times as topic. It is also interesting to find out how many times the correspondences start in one category and end in another. For example, how many times do the correspondences start with a ritual entity and end with a part of the cosmos? It is also of importance to see how many times a correspondence both starts and ends within the same category, and the table below gives this more detailed information. The vertical column to the extreme left displays the starting-point (the topic) of the correspondence — marked with extra bold type — and the upper horizontal line, the end (the comment). The frequencies of the correspondences that both start and end within the same category are also marked with extra bold type.

Table 3. The connections between the categories in AiB

Animals		Cosmos	Gods	Man	Metres	Ritual	Sattra	Varṇa	Misc.
Animals	0				6				11
Cosmos		0	2						
Gods		11	2	22	5	2		7	3
Man			3	4				2	2
Metres		2	12	25	0	7		5	4
Ritual	14	8	24	16		8		12	9
Sattra	25	2	7	13	56	23	12		199
Varṇa						1		0	
Misc.				2	1				15

In Table 3, the central place of man as the end of the correspondences is even more apparent than in Table 2. It is, however, noteworthy that the *sattra* correspondence system does not have this strong direction towards man, but that it is more focused upon making connections within the ritual frame, thus linking metres and *sāmans* (but also gods and cattle) to the different *sattra* days. The desire for classification thereby comes to the fore in this subsystem of correspondences, but this inclination is wedded to the craving for the fruits of the sacrifice, a fact illustrated by the following passage.

AiB 4.30.6 yad vā eti ca preti ca, tat prathamasyāhno rūpaṃ. tad yat preti sarvam abhaviṣyat, praiṣyann evāsmāl lokād yajamānā iti. tad yad iheha vo manasā bandhutā nara ity ārbhavam prathame 'hani śaṃsaty, ayaṃ vai loka ihehāsminn evaināṃs tal loke ramayati

(The words) ‘hither’ and ‘forward’ are symbols of the first day; “if (the word) ‘forward’ had been used throughout, the sacrificers would have gone out forward from this world” (they say). In that on the first day he recites as (hymn) to the Ṛbhus, ‘Here, here, in mind is your relationship, O heroes’, and ‘here, here’ is this world, verily thus he makes them remain in this world.

Within the second largest topic category (*Ritual*), *Man* has a central place, but is surpassed by *Gods*. The high number of relations between the ritual and the gods is, however, mainly dependent upon correspondences between different ritual entities and the *vajra* (thunderbolt) of Indra.⁴ A connection with the *vajra* makes the ritual object or recitation into a weapon with which one can destroy one's enemy, e.g. when the sacrificial post is called a *vajra* in 2.1.

On the basis of Brian K. Smith's work *Classifying the Universe* (Smith, B., 1994) one could have expected that the category of *Varṇa* was more predominant in the system of correspondences than what is borne out by the material in AiB *pañcikā* 1-5. The correspondences within *Varṇa* that are used more than once do not include explicit references to the social classes, but to what Smith calls the elemental qualities of the social classes, i.e. *brahman* and *kṣatra*, and the essential powers such as *brahmavarcasa*.⁵ This deficiency in direct references to the social classes could be interpreted as a consequence of the strategy to make the social grid into an implicit principle for the ordering the universe in the interest of the ruling classes; but the reason could also be that the *varṇas* are not in focus in this part of the AiB, while in the later parts they are in the centre of the text's concerns (i.e. *pañcikā* 7.19–8.27), as the theme there is the consecration of the king.⁶

4.4 The inverted correspondences

4.4.1 Introduction

Some of the correspondences are displayed in list 1 as functioning in both directions (i.e. T-C and C-T). The analysis of this phenomenon is of importance for several questions which were dealt with in the previous chapter, such as the evaluation of word order and the relation between identification and predication in nominal sentences. Therefore all the

⁴ For an attempt to link descriptions of this mythological (and real) weapon with archaeological findings, see Rau, 1973, pp. 37–46.

⁵ In AiB 1.28, however, the connection between the social classes and their appropriate metres is given.

⁶ For a discussion of the interesting correspondence between the central vital power of breath and the king, see Bodewitz, 1992.

correspondences in AiB *pañcīkā* 1–5 that are displayed in list 1 as reciprocal will be dealt with below.

4.4.2 Agni and *gāyatrī*

The correspondence between Agni and *gāyatrī* occurs twice with Agni as topic. In 1.1.7 Agni stands in genitive, *gāyatram agneś chandas*, “The metre of Agni is Gāyatrī.” The direction of the correspondence is, however, not evident. One could argue that *gāyatrī* (here in the form of *gāyatra*) is the topic, but the translation of Keith follows the order of C-T, which seems justified, as the discourse is initiated in order to answer the question of how many potsherds the offering of a cake to Agni should be placed on. The translation could, however, also be given as “Gāyatrī is the metre of Agni”, since the preceding sentence is the statement that *gāyatrī* has eight syllables. There is therefore a certain ambiguity in the direction of this correspondence.

AiB 1.1.7 aṣṭākāpāla āgneyo, ‘ṣṭākṣarā vai gāyatrī , gāyatram agneś chandaḥ

That for Agni is on eight potsherds; the Gāyatrī has eight syllables; [thus] the metre of Agni is the Gāyatrī.

In the next example (2.5.2), it is described that *ṛgvedic* verses are recited while a firebrand is carried around the sacrificial victim. These verses are in *gāyatrī* and directed to Agni, and through this he (the *hotṛ*) makes him (the *yajamāna*) successful with his own deity and with his own metre (*svayaivainam tad devatayā svena chandasā samardhayati*). The way in which the relation between the two entities is expressed could cause some doubt concerning the direction of the correspondence. Agni is, however, at the centre of the discourse — ritually active in the form of burning wood, and also explicitly mentioned in the recitation.

The third occurrence (3.13.1) of the correspondence between *gāyatrī* and Agni is placed in the category of metres, i.e. the metre stands as topic. The correspondence is, however, not a perfect match, because it is between *gāyatrī* and Agni, plus the Vasu gods. As in the previous example, the form of the correspondence is not a nominal sentence, but a story of how Prajāpati allotted the different metres to the gods. He gave *gāyatrī* to Agni and the Vasus at the morning *soma*-pressing, (*sa gāyatrīm evāgnaye vasubhyaḥ prātaḥsavane ‘bhajat*). To interpret *gāyatrī* as topic is, as in the

previous cases, not self-evident, but the choice made in list 1 is founded upon the direction of the mythical action of the supreme god Prajāpati. He gave the metres to the gods, and the story can therefore be interpreted as answering the questions: to whom did he give the metre *gāyatrī* and to whom *triṣṭubh*, and so forth.

4.4.3 Indra and *triṣṭubh*

In 3.21.2, a story is told of how Indra, after having slain his chief antagonist Vṛtra, asked the gods for a special portion (*uddhāra*); they replied that he could choose what he wanted, and among other things, he chose the *triṣṭubh* metre. The metre is thus presented in the myth as the natural choice of Indra, as his special metre; the assignment of topic to Indra in this relation is mainly based upon the flow of the narrative; it is Indra who chooses the metre as his special portion.

In 3.13, however, it is told that Prajāpati allotted the *triṣṭubh* metre to Indra and the Rudras — in the same way as he allotted *gāyatrī* to Agni and the Vasus. *Triṣṭubh* seems here to be the starting-point, as is *gāyatrī* in the case of *gāyatrī* and Agni.

We can thus see that the two correspondences between gods and metres (Agni–*gāyatrī* and Indra–*triṣṭubh*) which are represented in list 1 as two-directional have a certain ambiguity concerning the directions of the correspondences. This ambiguity is founded upon the fact that several of the occurrences are not in the form of nominal sentences, but parts of myths and special formulas.

4.4.4 Indra's *vajra* and speech

Also the first occurrence (2.16.4) of the correspondence between Indra's *vajra* and speech (*vāc*) is part of a ritual myth. Indra defeated the Asuras with a verse that is a *vajra* because it is addressed to the grandson of the waters (*aponaptr*), composed in *triṣṭubh*, and finally because it is speech, *vajras tena yad vāk*. The direction, as in the previous examples, is not unequivocal.

In 4.1.4, however, we find a nominal sentence of the more ordinary type, viz. *vāg ghi vajrah*, "...for the thunderbolt is speech", which is part of a

discourse on the relation between the *ṣoḍaśin soma* sacrifice and the *vajra*. The direction of the correspondence is from the topic *vajra* to the comment speech; but if we turn to the next occurrence (2.21.1), the direction is reversed, *vajra eva vāk*, “Speech verily is a thunderbolt.” This reversed order of the words is due to the fact that the latter correspondence is a part of an argumentation focused upon whether the *hotṛ*, at a special moment in the *soma* ritual, should utter speech, i.e. recite. Here we can clearly see how the word order signals which of the words is the topic of the argumentation and which is comment, but this is not a feature of all correspondences.

The correspondence between speech and *vajra* is therefore the first clear-cut example of how a correspondence can function in both directions in AiB.

4.4.5 Breath and Vāyu

Within the category of Man, the first correspondence that appears to function in both directions is that between breath and Vāyu, which is a natural relation since Vāyu is the wind god. Breath seems to be topic twice, viz. in 2.26.6 *vāyur hi prāṇaḥ* and in 3.2.4 *vāyuh prāṇaḥ*.⁷ In 3.3.3, however, the way of expressing the correspondence is different; the text tells us that the *hotṛ* can make the *yajamāna* devoid of breath, through reciting in a special way to Vāyu. The direction seems to be, from a logical point of view, from the god to the breath; but the text presents first the breaths that the *yajamāna* wishes to deprive his enemy of, and then which recitation he should modify to accomplish this desire. The way of expressing the correspondence in this context makes it hard to use as evidence that the *brāhmaṇa* text viewed the relation between breath and Vāyu as reciprocal. In the next chapter, the material in KB will therefore be used for a further discussion of this correspondence.

⁷ In 2.26 the context is the so-called ‘libations for the two deities’, which in the beginning of four *khaṇḍas* are — with the same formula — connected to the breaths (*te vā ete prāṇā eva yad dvidevatyāḥ*). In 3.2, the discourse topic is clearly Vāyu, but the correspondence is part of a quoted formula that is announced through the phrase *tasmād āhur* and concluded with *iti*. The difference between a discourse and the formula incorporated in it therefore has to be taken into consideration.

4.4.6 Seed and breath

In 2.38.6, the context of the correspondence between seed (*retas*) and breath is a special way of reciting in a low voice (\sqrt{jap}), which is brought into relation with the pouring of seed because both these activities are performed inaudibly. After this general co-ordination of the generative power and the *japa*, the text moves on to consider a specific recitation, viz. the two words *pitā mātariśvā*, “Father Mātariśvan.” These two words, in a syllogistic argument, are connected to breath through two nominal sentences; the third and final premise connects seed to breath, which enables the *brāhmaṇa* author to reach the conclusion *retas tat siñcati*, “thus he pours seed.”

AiB 2.38.6 *prāṇo vai pitā prāṇo mātariśvā prāṇo reto, retas tat siñcati*

The father is the breath; Mātariśvan is the breath; seed is the breath; thus he pours seed.

In 2.38.13, the procedure is similar; a recitation is brought into relation with seed through the intermediate entity breath, and in this case, where speech (*vāc*) is linked to the womb, the result is that he pours seed in the womb. The form of the actual correspondence between seed and breath is identical with the former passage in 2.38.6.

AiB 2.38.13 *vāg āyur viśvāyur viśvam āyur ity āha. prāṇo vā āyuh, prāṇo reto, vāg yonir; yoniṃ tad upasaṃdhāya retaḥ siñcati*

‘Speech, life, of all life, all life’ he says; life is the breath; seed is the breath; the womb is speech; thus having created a womb he pours seed.

The last occurrence in which seed seems to be topic is part of a citation from an unknown source on the relation between Vāyu, breath and seed.

AiB 3.2.4 *vāyuh prāṇaḥ prāṇo reto, retaḥ puruṣasya prathamam sambhavataḥ sambhavatīti*

‘The breath is Vāyu, seed is the breath; seed comes into existence first when man comes into existence.’⁸

⁸ This passage, however, could perhaps be translated with the topic of the discourse, Vāyu, as subject, something which perhaps makes the logic of the reasoning appear more clearly, “Vāyu is breath, breath is seed, seed comes into existence, etc.” What speaks against this translation is that it seems that the correspondence between seed

The correspondence that works in the opposite direction (breath–seed) is not of the same character as the previous three correspondences. It is said, first, that the breaths are connected to the word cleansed (*pūta*), and then more specifically that the breaths below are connected to seed, urine, and excrement.

AiB 1.20.4 pūtavantaḥ prāṇās. ta ime ‘vāñco retasyo mūtryaḥ purīṣya iti.

These breaths are connected with (the word) ‘strained’; those breaths below are connected with seed, urine, and excrement.

It is not breath as a whole that is brought into a relation with the polluting functions of the lower parts of the body, but only some of the breaths. The double direction of the correspondence between seed and breath is therefore not manifested in a clear and unambiguous way.

4.4.7 Virāj and food

The correspondence between *Virāj* and food is expressed four times with *Virāj* as topic; the argumentation there is from the use of the metre to its effect, and one time with food as topic. In all the occurrences, the correspondence is expressed through a nominal sentence.⁹ However, food is expressed by either *anna* or *annādya*, which are translated by Keith as “food” and “proper food” respectively.¹⁰ The only time (4.16.5) that food seems to be topic (at least according to the ‘occasional’ word order, cf. Delbrück), the word *annādya* is used (*virāj annādyaṃ*); in all the other cases *anna* is used. It is, therefore, difficult to say if the different directions are dependent upon the words used (*anna* or *annādya*) or if the directions could alternate, i.e. food and proper food are considered as synonyms.¹¹

and breath (and also that between breath and Vāyu) is formalised in the sense that the form is not dependent upon the context. The formula is used, but not changed.

⁹ AiB 1.5.23 *annaṃ vai virāj*. AiB 4.11.18, 5.19.7, 5.21.8 *annaṃ virāj*.

¹⁰ Weber-Brosamer, 1988, pp. 8–25 makes a distinction between *anna* as the food which is eaten and *annādya* as the food which is owned by a person, i.e. the distinction between food and food-resources. He uses the words *Speise* and *Nahrungsmittel* (*Speisevorrat*). For the discussion of the basis of the correspondence between food and *virāj*, see Weber-Brosamer, 1988, pp. 93–110.

¹¹ It is interesting that the formula in KB, which according to the translation of Keith connects *virāj* to prosperity and proper food, has the metre as the middle word

4.4.8 The hymn and the people

The very last correspondence that is represented in list 1 as functioning in both directions is, as in the previous case, not between perfectly matching entities. The hymn (*sūkta*) is in two *khaṇḍas* (2.33 and 3.19) several times correlated to the people (*viś*), with a simple phrase *viṣ sūktam*, “The hymn [is] the people.” However, in 3.31.2 ‘the inside of the peoples’ seems to be topic and the hymns to be the comment, *tad yathāntaraṃ janatā evaṃ sūktāni*, “As are the peoples within, so are the hymns.” This statement is an elaboration of the more simple correspondence between the hymn and the people mentioned above; the relation between the two entities is thus based upon internal corresponding structures.

4.5 The most frequent correspondences

4.5.1 Introduction

With the help of Tables 2 and 3, we have gained a picture of how the correspondences are distributed among the different categories with respect to topic and comment. It is also of importance to see which of the individual correspondences have the highest frequencies, and to try to put forward reasons for this feature of the system. In Table 4 the correspondences occurring six or more times are noted. Each correspondence is marked with the total number of occurrences and separated from other correspondences with a comma. Thus 7, 7, 6 implies that there are three correspondences which have respective frequencies of 7, 7 and 6. If a correspondence has, for instance, the structure (topic) *God* — (comment) *Cosmos* six times and the reverse, (topic) *Cosmos* — (comment) *God* once, then it will be displayed only once, under the category with the highest frequency — in this case under *Gods* — in the following manner: 6+1. As the categories *Cosmos*, *Man* and *Miscellaneous* do not have any such high-frequency correspondences in the function of topic, they will be omitted from the vertical column. The categories *Gods*,

śrīrvirāḷannādyam and that *annāḍya* thus occupies the final place. See next chapter, 5.4.3.1.

Ritual and *Sattra* are void in the position of comment and will therefore be excluded from the horizontal line.

Table 4. The most frequent correspondences in AiB

	Animals	Cosmos	Man	Metres	Misc.	Ritual	Varṇa
Animals				6	7		
Gods		7					7
Metres			6, 6				
Ritual	6		6				6, 6+1
Sattra	15, 8		7	7, 6	7, 14, 8, 8, 7, 7, 6, 6		

4.5.2 Cattle and jagatī

In 1.5.20, it is stated that one who desires cattle should use *jagatī* verses, because *jāgatā vai paśavaḥ*, “Cattle are connected with the Jagatī.” In 1.21.15, the relation is also between the recitation of *jagatī* verses and the gaining of cattle. The same nominal sentence is used as in 1.5, and then the text continues with *paśūn evāsmiṃs tad dadhāti*, “Verily thus he [the *hotṛ*] confers cattle upon him [the *yajamāna*].” In 1.28.11 the context is different, and the question underlying this passage is which metre should be used in the ritual, depending upon which specific social class the *yajamāna* belongs to; the secondary issue is what qualities the metres confer on the *yajamāna* relative to his social class. The text states that the *jagatī* is the correct metre for people from the third social group, the *vaiśyas*, since a *vaiśya* is connected to *jagatī* and cattle are connected to *jagatī*. In this way, he makes him successful with cattle (*jāgato vai vaiśyo, jāgatāḥ paśavaḥ. paśubhir evainaṃ tat samardhayati*).

In 3.18.14, the context is again different. The text tries to answer the question why certain *jagatī* verses are recited at the midday *soma*-pressing. According to the text, cattle seek shelter in the middle of the day because these *jagatī* verses have a place at the midday *soma*-pressing. The

connection between the recital of *jagatī* verses at midday and the behaviour of cattle is thus explained through the correspondence between cattle and *jagatī*. In this way, the *hotṛ* makes the *yajamāna* the owner of (more) cattle, because the midday is connected to the self of the *yajamāna*.

AiB 3.18.14 so jagatī, jāgatā hi paśava, ātmā yajamānasya madhyam̐dinas, tad yajamāne paśūn dadhāti

It is in Jagatī ; for cattle are connected with the Jagatī; the midday is the self of the sacrificer; thus he confers cattle on the sacrificer.

In 3.25.2, the correspondence between cattle and *jagatī* is integrated into the myth of the lost Soma. Different metres in the shape of birds were ordered by the gods to fetch Soma from yonder world (*asau lokaḥ*). The metres did not have the strength to fly the whole distance and returned each in its turn without Soma, but carrying other important objects instead, which hence can be conferred upon the *yajamāna* in the ritual. *Jagatī* returned carrying consecration (*dīkṣā*) and asceticism (*tapas*), but as cattle are connected to *jagatī*, a connection is produced between consecration, asceticism and cattle.¹²

AiB 3.25.2 tasmāt tasya vittā dīkṣā vittam̐ tapo yasya paśavaḥ santi. jāgatā hi paśavo, jagatī hi tān āharat

Therefore by him is consecration obtained, is fervour obtained, who has cattle, for cattle are connected with the Jagatī, for the Jagatī brought them back.

In the last passage (4.3.4) the *hotṛ* interweaves (*vi+ati √saj*)¹³ verses in *jagatī* with double-verses (*dvipadā*), and, in this way, he makes man, who has two feet (*dvipād*), gain a firm footing among cattle, which are connected to *jagatī*, since *jāgatāḥ paśavaḥ*.

The correspondence between cattle and *jagatī* in AiB is thus not part of a larger formula, but seems to be so well established that it can be used in many different contexts.¹⁴

¹² Cf. ṚV 4.26&27, 9.68.6 and 10.144.4–5.

¹³ Cf. Gotō, 1987, p. 321.

¹⁴ The point argued here is that the high frequency of this correspondence is not dependent upon its being part of one special formula. However, it is not argued that it is never part of a formula.

4.5.3 Cattle and pairing

The second correspondence, in the category of *Animals*, is that between cattle (*paśu*) and pairing (*mithuna*). One could argue from a general point of view that *mithuna*, in this context, denotes an activity, and that therefore this correspondence is primarily a way of saying that it is characteristic of cattle to breed. However, if we analyse the different occurrences of this correspondence, we can see in detail how *mithuna* is actually used.¹⁵ The first passage is in 4.21.6 where the subject is ‘the difficult mounting’ (*dūrohaṇa*), which is a special way of reciting that simulates a climbing to heaven, but also a descending. The *dūrohaṇa* passage is concluded with a syllogism aimed at connecting the recitation of hymns, composed in *triṣṭubh* and *jagatī*, with the intended result: cattle.

AiB 4.21.6 *mithunāni sūktāni śasyante triṣṭubhāni ca jāgatāni ca. mithunaṃ vai paśavaḥ paśavaḥ chandāmsi paśūnām avaruddhyai.*

[Pair of] hymns are recited,¹⁶ *Triṣṭubh* and *Jagatī*; cattle are pairing; the metres are cattle; (verily they serve) to win cattle.

There is a difference in the use of *mithuna* with respect to the hymns and cattle. The verses are designated as pairs, or as being ‘pairing’ *mithunāni sūktāni śasyante*, “Pairing [pair of] hymns are recited.” The form *mithunāni* is clearly adjectival and the sentence does not have a form characteristic of a correspondence. On the other hand, in the sentence *mithunaṃ vai paśavaḥ*, “Cattle are pairing”, *mithunam* does not stand in the same number as cattle, and is therefore in this context not an adjective but a noun.

The next example of the correspondence between cattle and pairing is from 5.16.19, which deals with the *chandoma* days in a *sattra*. The correspondence is part of a formula, which is almost identical with that in 4.21; the only difference is that *chandoma* (marked with extra bold type) in this passage has replaced metre (*chandas*), viz. *mithunāni sūktāni śasyante*

¹⁵ Oldenberg (1919, p. 93) remarks that, “Kein prinzipieller Unterschied besteht zwischen Substanzen und Qualitäten ...”.

¹⁶ *Mithuna* can signify either ‘a pair’ or ‘pairing’, ‘copulation’. The former meaning is reflected in Haug’s translation, “Hymns in the *Triṣṭubh* and *Jagatī* metre are mixed to represent a pair. For cattle are a pair; metres are cattle. (This is done) for obtaining cattle.” The latter meaning is used by Keith: “Pairing hymns are recited...”.

traīṣṭubhāni ca jāgatāni ca. mithunaṃ vai paśavaḥ paśavaś chandomāḥ, paṣūnām avaruddhyai. In 5.17, 5.18, 5.19, 5.20 and 5.21 this formula with *chandoma* is repeated verbatim.

We can thus conclude that the high frequency of the correspondence between cattle and pairing in AiB is a result of the use of a specific formula, which appears only in the section dealing with the *sattra* sacrifices.

4.5.4 Bṛhaspati and brahman

The first occurrence of the correspondence between Bṛhaspati and *brahman* (1.13.4) is in a section that deals with the beginning of the *soma* ritual. *Soma* is to be bought and the *adhvaryu* recites a formula, which contains the name Bṛhaspati. The quoting of the formula is immediately followed in the *brāhmaṇa* text by the correspondence *brahma vai bṛhaspatiḥ*, “Bṛhaspati is the holy power.” The correspondence makes it possible for the recitation of the formula (containing the name of Bṛhaspati) to put the beneficiary of the ritual (*yajamāna*) into a relation with *brahman*. The next two occurrences in 1.19 are (in the same way as that in 1.13) about the effects of certain recitations. *Brahman* is mentioned in the first recitation (1.19.1), but the correspondence has the same form as the previous occurrence, viz. *brahma vai bṛhaspatiḥ*. The second recitation (in 1.19) does not contain the names of either *brahman* or Bṛhaspati, but it is mentioned that the recitation is directed to Brahmanaspati and this statement is followed by the correspondence between Bṛhaspati and *brahman*.¹⁷ The result of the two recitations is healing through *brahman*. In 1.21.1, 1.30.5, 2.38.9 and 4.11.1 the issue is also a recitation, either containing the name of Bṛhaspati, or directed to Brahmanaspati, and its effects.

The conclusion is thus that the correspondence between Bṛhaspati and *brahman* is used in exactly the same form in all of the passages and that the purpose is very similar: to connect a recitation with an effect in which *brahman* plays a vital role.

¹⁷ Bṛhaspati and Brahmanaspati are two names for the same god. See e.g. Keith, 1925, Vol. 1, p. 162f.

4.5.5 Prajāpati and the year

The second correspondence in the category of Gods is between Prajāpati and the year. Jan Gonda has dealt with this correspondence, which appears frequently in the *brāhmaṇa* literature, in his book *Prajāpati and the Year*.¹⁸ I have also commented upon the first occurrence of this correspondence in the previous chapter.¹⁹ In 1.13.33, the same result as in 1.1.14 is gained, viz. that he prospers with the verses that have their abode (*āyatana*) in Prajāpati. In 1.1.14, however, the relation is between 17 verses and the seventeenfold (12 months and 5 seasons) Prajāpati, while in 1.13.33 it is between 12 verses and the twelvefold (twelve months) Prajāpati.

AiB 1.1.14 saptadaśo vai prajāpatir dvādaśa māsāḥ pañcartavo hemantaśiśirayoḥ samāsenā. tavān saṃvatsaraḥ, saṃvatsaraḥ prajāpatih

Prajāpati is seventeenfold; the months are twelve, the seasons five through the union of winter and the cool season; so great is the year; Prajāpati is the year.

AiB 1.13.33 dvādaśa vai māsāḥ saṃvatsaraḥ, saṃvatsaraḥ prajāpatih

The year has twelve months; Prajāpati is the year.

These correspondences are variants of the same argumentation; it is only the number of verses and the division of Prajāpati that are different, and in both 1.1 and 1.13 the correlation of Prajāpati and the year is followed by the sentence, *prajāpatyāyatanābhir evābhī rādhnoti ya evaṃ veda*, “With these (verses) which abide in Prajāpati does he prosper who knows thus.”²⁰

In 1.16.44, 1.29.24 and 2.39.7 there are also correspondences between the twelvefold Prajāpati and the year, while Prajāpati is seventeenfold in 1.28.41. The correspondence in 2.17.2, however, does not follow the same pattern as the others; it is instead founded upon a relation between 360 verses and the 360 days of the year. The correspondence between Prajāpati and the year is expressed, and also that between Prajāpati and the sacrifice, because, as AiB states in 2.17, one who desires sacrifice should let 360 verses be recited. In this context, the correspondence between Prajāpati and

¹⁸ Gonda, 1984, esp. pp. 50–53 and 78–79.

¹⁹ See p. 104.

²⁰ It is translated by Keith with some variation in 1.13, “Verily with those whose abode is Prajāpati he prospers who knows thus.”

the year functions as a link between the recital of 360 verses and the object of desire: sacrifice.

AiB 2.17.2 *trīṇi ca vai śatāni ṣaṣṭiś ca saṃvatsarasyāhāni, tāvān saṃvatsaraḥ, saṃvatsaraḥ prajāpatiḥ, prajāpatir yajña. upainaṃ yajño namati yasyaivaṃ vidvāṃs trīṇi ca śatāni ṣaṣṭiṃ cānvāha.*

Three hundred and sixty are the days of the year; so great is the year; Prajāpati is the year; the sacrifice is Prajāpati. To him the sacrifice condescends, for whom one who knows thus recites three hundred and sixty.

All the correspondences between Prajāpati and the year are variations on the same theme: the equal number of divisions makes a relation possible first between a recitation and the year, and then in a second step between the year and Prajāpati. Some of these occurrences are part of an almost identical formula (cf. the correspondence between cattle and *mithuna*), which is complete with premises and conclusion, ready to be used in any context, if there is just one entity in the text that can be brought into relation with one of the premises in the formula.

4.5.6 Anuṣṭubh and speech

The line of reasoning which is presented in the first passage of the correspondence between *anuṣṭubh* and speech (*vāc*) is logical, that is, if one accepts the premises the conclusion will follow as a necessary consequence. The purpose of the argumentation seems, however, somewhat obscure.²¹

AiB 1.28.14–15 *anuṣṭubhi vācaṃ visṛjate. vāg vā anuṣṭub, vācy eva tad vācaṃ visṛjate*

In this Anuṣṭubh he utters speech; the Anuṣṭubh is speech, verily thus in speech he utters speech.

In the next passage (3.15), the context is a myth that tells how Indra, after having slain Vṛtra, went far away (*parāḥ parāvataḥ*)²² and hid, and that ‘far away’ is connected to *anuṣṭubh*, and the metre to speech. In this way, Indra hid in speech, and was found first by the fathers and thereafter by the gods.

²¹ The next sentence, however, connects this recitation with the myth in which speech was used as a ransom for Soma who dwelt among the *gandharvas*. See AiB 1.27.

²² Bodewitz explains the relation between *anuṣṭubh* and *parāvata* as being based upon the notions of the netherworld and death: Bodewitz, 2000b, p. 108f.

This is an explanation of the order of offerings: on the first day one sacrifices to the fathers, and on the second day to the gods.

The remaining four occurrences of the correspondence are all within the same *khaṇḍa* (4.3). Because there are *anuṣṭubh* verses, the text explains, one does not depart from the symbol of speech, the symbol of *anuṣṭubh*, and the symbol of the thunderbolt (*teno vāco rūpād anuṣṭubho rūpād vajrarūpān naiti*). Here the nominal sentence is not used, but instead the word *rūpa* signals that it is a correspondence.

4.5.7 Triṣṭubh and strength

The next frequent correspondence is that between *triṣṭubh* and strength (*vīrya*). As previously, when looking at cattle and pairing, the suspicion could arise that strength (like former ‘pairing’) does not constitute a separate entity, but merely a quality of the metre. This correspondence is, however, of importance for the system of correspondences in that *vīrya* is connected to the class of kings and warriors, and therefore also to the warrior god Indra. Secondly, the ontological question of whether strength in this context should be viewed as something separate, a substance, or as something inherent, a quality, is hard to answer. For the moment, it is enough to point out that in a number of correspondences *vīrya* functions as a substance — in the terminology of Brian K. Smith, an essential power.

In 1.5.17 the text recommends the recitation of *triṣṭubh* verses for one desirous of strength (*vīrya*), and it is told that the *triṣṭubh* is connected to strength (*vīrya*), force (*ojas*) and power (*indriya*).

AiB 1.5.17 ojo vā indriyaṃ vīryaṃ triṣṭup

The Triṣṭubh is force, power, and strength.

In 1.21.10 & 12 the frequently used syllogistic form appears again. The recited verses are in *triṣṭubh*, and *triṣṭubh* is strength (*vīryaṃ vai triṣṭup*). He (the *hotṛ*) therefore bestows strength on the *yajamāna*, (*vīryam evāsmiṃs tad dadhāti*).

Triṣṭubh is as *jagatī* in 1.28.5 connected with a social group within the *varṇa* scheme. The *rājanya* is of a *triṣṭubh* character and therefore, through the recital of *triṣṭubh* verses, which are connected to strength, power and force, he (the *hotṛ*) makes him (the *yajamāna*) prosper through strength,

power and force (*traiṣṭubho vai rājanya, ojo vā indriyaṃ vīryaṃ triṣṭub; ojasavainam tad indriyeṇa vīryeṇa samardhayati*).

In 4.3.3, it is stated that the *hotṛ* interweaves (*vy+ati √saj*) double *padas* with *triṣṭubh* verses. In the argumentation following this initial statement, two lines of reasoning are combined. The double *padas* are associated with man; *triṣṭubh*, in its turn, with cattle (in analogy with the *jagatī* verses), which normally has the result that man becomes established among cattle. However, the conclusion in this passage is instead, due to the connection of *triṣṭubh* with strength, that he becomes established in strength. The two lines of reasoning that are combined are thus: first, the combination of double *padas* and other verses that make man established among cattle, and second, the correspondence between *triṣṭubh* and strength.

The next example (4.11.15) also combines two correspondences, in this case the one between *gāyatrī* and *brahman*, and that between *triṣṭubh* and strength. Through using both these metres in the *vaṣaṭ* call, one acquires *brahma*-splendour (*brahmavarcasa*), *brahma*-glory (*brahmayaśas*) and strength (*vīrya*). The metres and the ‘essential powers’ of the two highest social groups — the *brāhmaṇa* and *rājanya* — are thus combined.

4.5.8 The libations for pairs of gods as connected to breath

The first correspondence to have six or more occurrences in the category of *Ritual* is that between the libations for pairs of gods, such as Mitra–Varuṇa and Indra–Vāyu, and the breaths. All the correspondences are, quite naturally, in the section that deals with these libations, i.e. 2.26–2.30. This is in contrast to the correspondences of the metres, dealt with above, which could be used in any ritual context. The *khaṇḍas* 2.27, 28 and 30 have as their opening phrase the sentence *prāṇā vai dvidevatyāḥ*, with one variant in 2.26, *te vā ete prāṇā eva yad dvidevatyāḥ*, “The cups [i.e. libations] for two deities are the breaths.” This repeated introductory sentence is a marker of the discourse topic (or theme) of the *khaṇḍa*. The correspondence between these libations and the breaths makes the ritual vital to the life of the *yajamāna*. A faulty recitation could make one of the vital functions, i.e. the ‘breaths’, stop and that would endanger the life of

the one who undertakes the sacrifice; the right performance of the ritual becomes thereby a matter of life and death.

4.5.9 The hymn and the people; the *nivid* and the *kṣatra*

The next two correspondences are concentrated similarly in a few *khaṇḍas*, viz. 2.33 and 3.19. The hymn (*sūkta*) is made to correspond to the people (*viś*), and the *nivid* formula to the power (*kṣatra*) of the second social group.²³ The purpose is to bring about different relations between the people and its ruler through inserting *nivids* in different places and in different ways in the hymn; the priest either makes the ruler dominate the people, or vice versa. This is a clear indication that the Brahmins really believed that they could make the *yajamāna* prosper or perish through the performance of the ritual.²⁴

4.5.10 The fivefold sacrifice and the fivefold cattle

The last correspondence in the category of *Ritual* is between the fivefold sacrifice and the fivefold cattle. In the first passage (3.23.5), it is quoted as a twofold expression *pāṅkto yajñah pāṅktāḥ paśava iti*, “The sacrifice is fivefold; cattle are fivefold.”²⁵ This quotation is part of a longer ritual-myth concerning the relation of *ṛc* to *sāman*, but no information is given about the more exact nature of the fivefold cattle; probably the meaning of *paśu* (cattle) is, in this context, the five sorts of victims, one of them being man, that are fit to be sacrificed.²⁶

All the other correspondences between the fivefold sacrifice and the fivefold cattle are in the context of the *sattra* sacrifices. These correspondences are part of a formula that is repeated with two variations.

²³ *Nivid* is a short formula directed to gods and inserted in a recitation (*śastra*).

²⁴ See Smith, B., 1996b. In AiB 3.19, the *brāhmaṇa* author also makes the interesting distinction between those practising black magic (*abhi√car*, see Thite, 1975, pp. 175–183) and those desirous of heaven (*svargakāma*).

²⁵ That the source of the expression is outside of the ‘text’ is indicated by the words *tasmād āhur* (therefore they say; lit. they have said).

²⁶ See e.g. Heesterman, 1985, p. 50ff and ŚB, 1963, part 1, p. 16, note 1. For an enumeration of different reasons for why sacrifice was called fivefold, see Thite, 1975, p. 267f.

In 5.4.4 it is *pāṅkto yajñāḥ pāṅktāḥ paśavaḥ paśūnām avaruddhyai*, “The sacrifice is fivefold; cattle are fivefold; (verily it serves) to win cattle.” The fact that triggers this formula is that some of the recited verses are in the metre *paṅkti*, which consists of five octosyllabic verses; hence its name, *paṅkti*, which denotes the number five or any set of five objects. In 5.18, 19, 20 and 21 the formula is *pañcapadā paṅktiḥ pāṅkto yajñāḥ pāṅktāḥ paśavaḥ paśavaś chandomāḥ paśūnām avaruddhyai*, “The Paṅkti has five Padas; the sacrifice is fivefold. Cattle are fivefold; the Chandomas are cattle; (verily they serve) to win cattle.”

What could cause some confusion is that the form *pāṅktāḥ* could be interpreted as either ‘fivefold’ or as constructed from the *vṛddhi*-form of the metre *paṅkti* and thus meaning “connected to the *paṅkti*”. Keith has decided for the second interpretation in only one case, viz. 4.3.1, where the parallel case of *gāyatrī* makes such a translation plausible, but this double meaning was probably intended and used by the *brāhmaṇa* theologians.

AiB 4.3.1 *gāyatrīś ca paṅktīś ca vyatiṣajati. gāyatro vai puruṣaḥ, pāṅktāḥ paśavaḥ.*

...he intertwines Gāyatrī and Paṅkti verses; man is connected with the Gāyatrī; cattle are connected with the Paṅkti.

4.5.11 Sattrā

The *dvādaśāha rūpa* system generates several correspondences with high frequencies, but these do not make much sense isolated from the system they belong to. I will therefore briefly give the outline of the system of *rūpas*, and in the next chapter a comparison will be made with the material in KB.²⁷ If we concentrate on the nine principal *soma* days, we can see that they are constituted by a *pr̥ṣṭhya śaḍaha*, which consists of six days, and three *chandoma* days. The fundamental distinction, with regard to the correspondences, is, however, primarily the three sets of three days. The two later sets do not only repeat the correspondences of the first set, but add special characteristics. We therefore have to produce two tables, one that displays the recurrent structure of three days and another with the *rūpas* that only apply to one specific day.

²⁷ Cf. Malamoud, 1996, pp. 226–246.

Table 5. The threefold structure of the nine principal days of the *dvādaśāha* in AiB

<i>Days</i>	<i>Characteristic words and extra</i>	<i>World</i>	<i>Tense</i>	<i>Mention of the deity</i>
1, 4, 7	Forward, hither, yoke, wagon, swift, drink	Earth	Future	In the first <i>pada</i>
2, 5, 8	Towards, between, upright, manly, grow. Not having the words: forward or hither	Atmosphere	Present	In the middle <i>pada</i>
3, 6, 9	Horse, end, three, thrown around, stay. That which has the same endings. That which is alliterated. That which is repeated.	Yonder world	Past	In the last <i>pada</i>

The set of three days clearly indicates a motion forward from this world to the other, from the beginning to the end, but the timeline as indicated by the tenses makes the opposite march, from the future to the past. The sense is perhaps that in the beginning you are travelling toward the future and in the end you have reached your goal and look back to what you have achieved.

Table 6.1 The special characteristics of the nine principal days in the *dvādaśāha*²⁸ in AiB

<i>Day</i>	<i>God</i>	<i>Stoma</i>	<i>Metre</i>	<i>Sāman</i>
1	Agni	Trivṛt	Gāyatrī	Rathaṃtara
2	Indra	Pañcadaśa	Triṣṭubh	Bṛhat
3	All-gods	Saptadaśa	Jagatī	Vairūpa
4	Speech	Ekaviṃśa	Anuṣṭubh	Vairāja
5	The cow	Triṇava	Pañkti	Śākvara
6	Dyaus	Trayasstriṃśa	Aticchandas	Raivata

Table 6.2 The special characteristics of the nine principal days in the *dvādaśāha* in AiB

<i>Day</i>	<i>Words and extra</i>
4	Born, call, bright, that which is sounded, has various metres, is deficient, redundant, and that which is by Vimada
5	Udder, cow, dappled, be drunk, oblation, form, that which has an addition, is beautiful, has five padas
6	That which is connected with Parucchepa, has seven padas, The Nābhānediṣṭha, The Nārāśaṃsa
7	Born, that which is unexpressed
8	That which has Agni twice, double invocation, great, again
9	Pure, dwell, gone, dwelling, truth

²⁸ In Table 6.1, days seven to nine are left out, as those days are empty in the listed categories; in Table 6.2, on the other hand, the three first days are left out for the same reason.

If we compare the structure in Table 5 with that in Tables 6.1 and 6.2, it becomes obvious that they both correspond to the pattern that Brian K. Smith has extracted from a number of cosmogonies (and cosmologies) with regard to *varṇa* classification. In the first threefold structure, this is signalled through the different worlds, as the earth is the world of the Brahmins, the atmosphere the world of warriors, and finally the sky that of the *vaiśyas*. The characteristic word ‘manly’ (*vr̥ṣan*) of the second day reinforces this impression. In the second structure with nine days, it is obvious that the first 6 days constitute a system and that the three *chandoma* days basically are seen as a repetition of the first three days.²⁹

I have tried above to give an impression of how the *dvādaśāha* system of *rūpas* is constituted, and how it can generate a high frequency of correspondences. In the next chapter, it will be shown whether this is a special characteristic of the AiB, or whether the KB also has this system. In this chapter, however, the conclusion is that the correspondences in the *sattra* section constitute a subsystem of correspondences within the AiB, and that this system has its own structures and its own directions, which is indicated by the fact that 59 % of the correspondences with *Sattra* as topic have *Miscellaneous* as comment. The structures seem, however, to be fundamentally based upon the threefold classification of the universe (earth, atmosphere, heaven) and the social classes (*brāhmaṇa*, *kṣatriya*, *vaiśya*), which are extended first into six and then into nine days.

4.6 Conclusion

The starting-point in the majority of the correspondences is quite naturally in the ritual realm, and entities within the categories *Ritual*, *Metres* and *Sattra* therefore constitute the topic in 82.7 % of all correspondences in AiB *pañcikā* 1–5. The comments, on the other hand, belong mostly to the categories of *Cosmos*, *Animals* (mostly cattle), *Varṇa* and *Man* — and of these *Man* is the largest category. Within the category of *Man*, the breaths, i.e. the vital powers, have a dominant position.

²⁹ For an explanation of a similar sixfold classification extracted from *brāhmaṇa* cosmogonies and cosmologies, see Smith, B., 1994, p. 79. He sees it as an extension (a duplication) of the basic threefold *varṇa* structure. For a critique of Smith’s approach, see Bodewitz, 2000a, p. 21f.

The correspondences in AiB that function in two directions are rare. In most of these cases, the direction cannot be settled with a high degree of certainty. Only one correspondence seems to be in a clear way two-directional, viz. that between *vajra* and speech. The conclusion is therefore that the direction of the correspondences in AiB *pañcikā* 1–5 is generally constant: in most cases the relation has fixed starting and ending points, and the reciprocal relation is thus unusual. This fact could be explained as a result of the formulaic character of many of the correspondences, especially those expressed in the form of nominal sentences. But it could also be due to the material the *brāhmaṇa* author is commenting upon, viz. ritual actions and objects: it is quite natural for the Vedic theologian to start from the ritual and then to formulate connections into other realms of the existing worlds.

The *varṇas* are seldom explicitly part of specific correspondences, but the *varṇa* system is sometimes an underlying regulating principle, as in the case of the systems of *rūpas* in the *dvādaśāha*.

The high frequency of a correspondence can depend upon several factors. First, it could be caused by the fact that the correspondence is part of a formula that often contains a syllogistic way of reasoning. An example of this is AiB 5.4.4 *pānikto yajñāḥ pānktāḥ paśavaḥ paśūnām avaruddhyai*, “The sacrifice is fivefold; cattle are fivefold; (verily it serves) to win cattle.” Another factor that could contribute to the high frequency of a particular correspondence is that one of the entities in the correspondence is present in all the phases of the rituals; the paradigmatic case of this is the metres. Other correspondences, on the other hand, are specific for a special ritual and therefore appear only in the section which deals with that ritual, even though they are frequently used in that section of AiB. Finally, the high frequency of a correspondence could be a result of its belonging to the *dvādaśāha rūpa* system. This system is the reason why the category of *Sattra* has 337 topic positions, a number which can be compared with that of the second largest topic category, *Ritual entities*, which has 91.

Some of the correspondences are part of an almost identical formula, which is complete with premises and conclusion, ready to be used in any context if there is just one entity in the text that can be brought into relation with one of the premises in the formula. The author of the *brāhmaṇa* text seems to have had a stock of these formulas ready to be used, with the aim

of connecting the ritual with the desired results. The formulas made it easier to memorise the bulky *brāhmaṇa* texts, and also to supply a missing part of a particular argumentation.³⁰ To investigate the genesis and development of the formulas more closely, it would be necessary to examine texts earlier than AiB to see if there are traces of an evolution of the formulas.³¹ In the next chapter, a comparison will be made with KB, which is a later text than AiB, and which can give us an answer to the question of whether the formulas were the property of at least two different Vedic schools, and not just confined to one tradition.

³⁰ See Witzel, 1996, p. 175.

³¹ Within the *brāhmaṇa* genre, the texts that come into question are the *brāhmaṇa* parts of the black YV *saṃhitās*, and if one wishes to trace the formulas further back in time, the *yajus* parts of the YV, and the hymns of AV and ṚV are of importance.

Comparison with Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa

5.1 Introductory remarks

Through the studies of the correspondences in AiB, we have gained an overview of the correspondence system and a picture of how the most frequent correspondences were formed. What remains is to make a comparison with another *brāhmaṇa* text that will show which correspondences are not only part of the world-view of AiB, but are common to at least two *brāhmaṇa* texts. In the list below, the comparison will therefore be made between AiB and KB, which are both *brāhmaṇas* belonging to the ṚV. In 1976, Klaus Mylius made an inventory of the correspondences in KB; the comparison below will thus be between the correspondences in AiB *pañcikā* 1–5 and those presented by Mylius (KB). In that way, we will learn what correspondences are common to the *ṛgvedic śākhās*. However, there could be differences between the criteria for including a statement under the notion of correspondence or identification. This makes it necessary to check the results of Mylius with, at least, a cursory reading of KB, according to the principles previously used to analyse AiB. There is no need to duplicate the work of Mylius, but only to ascertain that the comparison will be valid. It seems also likely that Mylius left out some material, at least from one category.¹ In the list below, the correspondences unnoticed by Mylius will not be marked in any special way; the extra occurrences will instead be displayed in Appendix 2.

A special case, however, is constituted by the system of *rūpas* to the nine principal days in the *dvādaśāha*. Mylius does not recognise these as ‘Identifikationen’ since he focuses upon the minimal form of a nominal sentence as the carrier of the meaning of identity. *Rūpa* signals that it is

¹ Mylius, 1976, p. 151f.

more a question of similarity than outright identification, and these correspondences thereby fall outside of Mylius' scope. As these correspondences are very numerous, I have decided not to introduce them in the list below, but to display them in a special section later in this chapter, in which a brief comparison will be made between the system of *rūpas* in AiB and that in KB.

In the cases where a correspondence noted by Mylius could not be found in the Sanskrit text, this will be marked with a question mark in the list — as follows: KB 7.? — since Mylius gives the *adhyāya* but not the *khaṇḍa* in his list.

Mylius uses the categories: *Götter, Metren, Ritualien, Varṇas, Menschen, Pflanzen/ Tiere/ Mineralien, geographische/astronomische Objekte und Begriffe* and *Sonstiges*. These will be connected to the categories used in Appendix 1, in the following way: *Götter* — *Gods*; *Metren* — *Metres*; *Ritualien* — *Ritual entities, Sattra*; *Varṇas* — *Varṇa*; *Menschen* — *Man*; *Tiere* — *Animals*; *geographische/astronomische Objekte und Begriffe* — *Cosmos*; *Sonstiges, Pflanzen, Mineralien* — *Miscellaneous*.

It should also be observed that the passages in KB are given according to the edition made by Sreekrishna Sarma in 1968 and not according to the older one by Lindner (1887), which Keith's translation of 1920 follows. What may cause some confusion is that Sarma has another way of dividing the *ādhyāyas* into *khaṇḍas*, and sometimes even the *ādhyāyas* do not match. The correspondence between *anuṣṭubh* and *vāc* is in 27.12 according to Sarma's edition, but in 27.7 according to Keith's translation. Mylius also uses the edition made by Sarma, but does not give the *khaṇḍa* in his tables, only the *ādhyāya*. In list 2, *ādhyāya, khaṇḍa* and the division of the *khaṇḍa* into smaller units by the editor will be given. The purpose of this precision is to make it as easy to locate a correspondence in KB as in AiB.

List 2 will follow the structure of list 1, i.e. every correspondence will be displayed twice: once under the category that is topic and once under the comment. This makes it easier to compare lists 1 and 2, i.e. to compare the frequent correspondences in AiB with the material shared between AiB and KB.

One problem is caused by the direction of some of the correspondences. In AiB, cattle and the metre *jagatī* are connected six times, and cattle stand as topic each time. The same correspondence occurs four times in KB, but there with *jagatī* as topic.² The solution used in list 2 is to display this feature within the category of *Animals* in the following way:

Cattle (*paśu*) — Jagatī AiB (1.5.20, 1.21.15, 1.28.11, 3.18.14, 3.25.2, 4.3.4—6+4 KB)

And in the category of Metres:

Jagatī — Cattle *paśu* KB (16.2.29, 17.2.31, 18.6.6, 30.1.24—4+6 AiB)

The inverted correspondences within KB will also be noted, as in the example below:

Cattle (*paśu*) — Bṛhatī AiB (4.3.2—1), KB (23.4.19—1+2)³

5.2 List 2. Correspondences that occur in both AiB and KB

ANIMALS

Cattle (*paśu*) — Pañkti AiB (4.3.1—1+1 KB); Bṛhatī AiB (4.3.2—1), KB (23.4.19, 29.3.11—2+2); Pragātha KB (15.5.20—1+2 KB+3 AiB); Jagatī AiB (1.5.20, 1.21.15, 1.28.11, 3.18.14, 3.25.2, 4.3.4—6), KB (30.1.25—1+4); Metres (*chandas*) — Cattle *paśu* AiB (4.21.6—1), KB (11.5.19, 11.6.18—2); Litanies (*uktha*) — Cattle *paśu* AiB (4.1.3, 4.12.5—2), KB (16.10.8, 16.10.15, 16.10.22, 21.6.18, 30.8.21, 30.8.25, 30.9.14—7); Sacrificial food (*iṭā*) — Cattle *paśu* AiB (2.9.11, 2.10.11, 2.30.1—3), KB (3.9.5, 5.9.6, 13.5.26, 29.3.9—4); Chandomas — Cattle *paśu* AiB (5.16.19, 5.17.5 & 10, 5.18.18 & 20, 5.19.5 & 6 & 7 & 12, 5.20.18 & 19, 5.21.8 & 8 & 8 & 13—15), KB (26.5.28, 26.8.24, 26.13.45, 26.14.41, 29.8.9, 29.8.13, 30.8.2, 30.8.6 & 10 & 14—10); Prsthya Sadaha, fifth day — That which is a symbol of cattle *paśurūpa* AiB (5.6.5 & 6, 5.7.8, 5.8.4 & 8 & 9 & 10 & 14—8), Cattle *paśu* KB (23.4.1 & 18, 23.6.6 & 9 & 12 & 15 & 21 & 33, 23.7.1—9)

COSMOS

Atmosphere *antarikṣa* — Chandoma, the second AiB (5.18.3—1), KB (26.7.1—1); Prsthya Sadaha, second day AiB (4.31.3—1), KB (22.3.1—1)

² For example, KB 16.2.29 *paśavo jagatī*.

³ For a more detailed presentation of the notation in the list, see the first part of Chapter 4.

Brilliance *tejas* — Gāyatrī AiB (1.5.2, 1.28.3—2), KB (17.2.19, 17.7.2—2)
 this [Earth] *iyam* — Aditi AiB (1.8.16, 3.31.9—2), KB (7.8.5—1); Serpent queen (*sarparājñī*)
 AiB (5.23.2—1), KB (27.7.10—1); Chandoma, the first— This world *ayaṃ lokaḥ* AiB
 (5.16.3—1), KB (26.6.30—1)
 Heaven *svarga* — Sacrificial post made of *khadira*-wood AiB (2.1.5—1), KB (10.1.12—1)
 Heavenly world *svargo lokaḥ* — Āhavanīya AiB (5.24.12, 5.26.3—2), KB (10.4.3—1)
 The Waters (*āpaḥ*) — All gods sarvā devatāḥ AiB (2.16.1—1), KB (11.3.7—1)
 Yonder world *asau lokaḥ* — Prsthya Sadaha, third day AiB (5.1.3—1), KB (22.5.1—1)

GODS

Aditi — This [earth] *iyam* AiB (1.8.16, 3.31.9—2), KB (7.8.5—1); Support
pratiṣṭhiti AiB (1.8.14—1), KB *pratiṣṭhā* (1.5.25—1)
Agni — Gāyatrī AiB (1.1.7, 2.5.2—2+1), KB (1.?, 1.2.22, 3.2.27, 10.8.17, 14.?,
 14.3.9, 14.4.30, 19.2.35, 28.?, 28.5.7—7); Prsthya Sadaha, first day — Agni AiB
 (4.29.1—1), KB (22.1.2—1)
Agni gārhapatya — Ahir budhnya AiB (3.36.5—1+1 KB)
Ahir budhnya — Agni KB (16.8.7—1+1 AiB)
All gods (*sarvā devatāḥ*) — The Waters *āpaḥ* AiB (2.16.1—1), KB (11.3.7—1)
Brhaspati — Brahman AiB (1.13.4, 1.19.1 & 3, 1.21.1, 1.30.5, 2.38.9, 4.11.1—
 7), KB (7.12.14, 12.10.17, 18.2.21—3)
Indra — Speech *vāc* AiB (2.26.6—1), KB (2.5.36, 13.4.19—2); Triṣṭubh AiB
 (3.21.2—1+1), KB (3.2.13, 23.2.9 & 12—3); Prsthya Sadaha, second day —
 Indra AiB (4.31.1—1), KB (22.3.2—1)
Indra's vajra — Triṣṭubh AiB (2.16.4, 2.2.33—2+1 KB); Sacrificial post (*yūpa*)
 — Vajra AiB (2.1.3 & 4; 2.3.3—3), KB (10.1.1—1); Sodaśin — Vajra AiB
 (4.1.2 & 3 & 4—2), KB (17.1.1—1); Vasatkāra — Vajra AiB (3.6.1, 3.7.2, 3.8.2—3),
 KB (3.7.10—1)
Prajāpati — Sacrifice *yajña* KB (10.2.11—1+1 KB+2 AiB)
Sarasvatī — Speech *vāc* AiB (2.24.8, 3.1.10, 3.2.10, 3.3.9—4), KB (12.10.8,
 14.5.19—2)
Serpent queen (*sarparājñī*) — This [earth] *iyam* AiB (5.23.2—1), KB (27.7.10—
 1)
Soma — The lordly power *kṣatra* AiB (2.38.9—1), KB (7.12.22, 9.5.1, 10.8.20,
 12.10.11—4)
Vāyu — Breath *prāṇa* AiB (3.3.3—1+2), KB (5.10.18, 13.4.20, 30.3.22—3+1)
Visnu — Sacrifice *yajña* AiB (1.15.4—1), KB (4.2.11, 18.5.21, 18.9.25—3)

MAN

- Breath *prāṇa* — Vāyu AiB (2.2.26, 3.2.4—2+1), KB Vāyu (8.6.8—1+3);
Vanaspati — Breath *prāṇa* AiB (2.4.14, 2.10.8—2), KB (12.9.13—1)
- Breaths (*prāṇāḥ*) — Libations, for two deities (*dvidevatya*) AiB (2.26.1, 2.27.1, 2.28.1 & 2 & 5, 2.30.1—6), KB (13.4.15 & 18, 13.5.4 & 15 & 25 & 32—6); Fore-offerings (*prayāja*) AiB (1.11.3—1), KB (7.2.1, 10.6.7—2); Sacrifice to the seasons (*ṛtuyāja*) AiB (2.29.1 & 6—2), KB (13.7.1 & 12 & 16—3)
- Expiration (*prāṇa*) — Introductory sacrifice (*prāyaṇīya*) Expiration *prāṇa* AiB (1.7.2—1), KB (7.7.3—1)
- Expiration and inhalation *prāṇāpāna* — Libations, Upamśu and Antaryāma AiB (2.21.1—1), KB (11.9.8, 12.5.1 & 5 & 9—4)
- Offspring *prajā* — Anurūpa AiB (3.23.7, 3.24.3—2), KB (15.5.13, 15.6.5, 23.2.21—3)
- The self *ātman* — Stotriya AiB (3.23.7, 3.24.1—2), KB (15.5.13, 15.6.5, 23.2.21—3)
- Speech *vāc* — Indra AiB (2.26.6—1), KB (2.5.36, 13—2); Sarasvatī AiB (2.24.8, 3.1.10, 3.2.10, 3.3.9—4), KB (12.10.8, 14.5.19—2); Anustubh AiB (1.28.15, 3.15.1, 4.3.1 & 2 & 3 & 4—6), KB (5.8.11, 7.10.13, 11.2.13, 14.2.19, 15.4.14, 16.4.21, 26.1.3, 27.2.4, 27.12.8—9); Prsthya Sadaha, fourth day — Speech *vāc* AiB (5.4.3, 5.4.4—2), KB (23.1.7—1)
- Strength *vīrya* — Tristubh AiB (1.5.17, 1.21.10,12; 1.28.5, 4.3.3, 4.11.15—6), KB (7.2.23, 8.2.29, 11.2.17, 11.2.24, 16.1.10 & 2.28 & 4.16 & 7.8 & 10.34, 17.2.27, 17.7.8, 18.5.5, 18.9.14, 29.4.11, 30.9.11, 30.9.23—14)
- Upward breathing *udāna* — Concluding sacrifice (*udayanīya*) AiB (1.7.2—1), KB (7.7.3—1)

METRES

- Anustubh — Speech *vāc* AiB (1.28.15, 3.15.1, 4.3.1 & 2 & 3 & 4—6), KB (5.8.11, 7.10.13, 11.2.13, 14.2.19, 15.4.24, 16.4.21, 26.1.3, 27.2.4, 27.12.8—9)
- Aticchandas — Prsthya Sadaha, sixth day AiB (5.12.1 & 4 & 5 & 8, 5.13.1 & 7—6), KB (23.9.19, 23.11.2—2)
- Brhatī — Prosperity *śrī* AiB (1.5.11—1), KB (28.6.9, 29.5.21—2); Cattle KB (17.2.23, 29.3.10—2+2 KB + 1 AiB)
- Gāyatrī — Brilliance *tejas* AiB (1.5.2, 1.28.3—2), KB (17.2.19, 17.7.2—2); Brahma-splendour *brahmavarcasa* AiB (1.5.2, 1.28.3—2), KB (17.2.19, 17.7.2—2); Agni (and the Vasus) AiB (3.13.1—1+2 AiB+7 KB); The first soma-pressing *prātaḥsavana* AiB (3.12.2, 3.13.1—2+2 KB); Brahman AiB (3.34.10, 4.11.15 & 18—3), KB (3.6.16, 7.12.21—2); Prsthya Sadaha, first day — Gāyatrī AiB (4.29.1—1), KB (22.1.2—1)
- Jagatī — The third soma-pressing *ṛtīyasavana* AiB (3.12.4, 3.13.1—2+2 KB); Cattle *paśu* KB (16.2.29, 17.2.31, 18.6.6, 30.1.24—4+1 KB+6 AiB); Prsthya Sadaha, third day — Jagatī AiB (5.1.1—1), KB (22.5.2—2)

- Pañkti — Cattle *paśu* KB (23.4.3—1+1 AiB); Prsthya Sadaha, fifth day — Pañkti AiB (5.6.1 & 11, 5.8.1 & 2—4), KB (23.4.13, 23.5.30, 23.6.35 & 37, 29.5.6, 30.2.21—6)
- Tristubh — Strength *vīrya* AiB (1.5.17, 1.21.10,12; 1.28.5, 4.3.3, 4.11.15—6), KB (7.2.23, 8.2.29, 11.2.17, 11.2.24, 16.1.10 & 2.28 & 4.16 & 7.8 & 10.34, 17.2.27, 17.7.8, 18.5.5, 18.9.14, 29.4.11, 30.9.11, 30.9.23—14); Second soma-pressing *madhyaṃdinasavana* (3.12.3, 3.13.1—2+4); Indra AiB (3.13.1—1+1 AiB+3 KB); Vajra KB (7.2.13—1+2 AiB); Prsthya Sadaha, second day — Tristubh AiB (4.31.1—1), KB (22.3.2—1)
- Metres (chandas) — Cattle *paśu* AiB (4.21.6—1), KB (11.5.19, 11.6.18—2)
- Virāj — Food *anna* AiB (1.5.23, 4.11.18, 5.19.7, 5.21.8—4+1 *annādya*), KB (9.6.18, 12.4.10, 23.1.8, 23.2.28⁴—4); Food *annādya* KB (14.3.15—1); Food (*annādya*) and prosperity (*śrī*) KB (1.2.19, 2.4.9, 14.3.30, 15.6.27, 16.3.40, 17.3.17, 18.4.19, 19.3.21, 19.4.25, 24.8.21, 26.8.29, 27.5.2, 30.5.31—13)

RITUAL ENTITIES

- Āhavanīya — The heavenly world *svargo lokaḥ* AiB (5.24.12, 5.26.3—2), KB (10.4.3—1)
- Anurūpa — Offspring *prajā* AiB (3.23.7, 3.24.3—2), KB (15.5.13, 15.6.5, 23.2.21—3)
- Bṛhat sāman — Prsthya Sadaha, second day AiB (4.31.1 & 11 & 12, 4.32.2—4), KB (22.3.2—1)
- Concluding sacrifice (udayanīya) — Upward breathing *udāna* AiB (1.7.2—1), KB (7.7.3—1)
- Libations, for two deities (dvidevatya) — Breaths *prāṇa* AiB (2.26.1, 2.27.1, 2.28.1 & 2 & 5, 2.30.1—6), KB (13.4.15 & 18, 13.5.4 & 15 & 25 & 32—6)
- Libations, Upamśu and Antaryāma — Expiration and inhalation *prāṇāpāna* AiB (2.21.1—1), KB (11.9.8, 12.5.1 & 5 & 9—4)
- Fore-offerings (prayāja) — Breaths *prāṇa* AiB (1.11.3—1), KB (7.2.1, 10.6.7—2)
- Introductory sacrifice (prāyaṇīya) — Expiration *prāṇa* AiB (1.7.2—1), KB (7.7.3—1)
- Litanies (uktha) — Cattle *paśu* AiB (4.1.3, 4.12.5—2), KB (16.10.8, 16.10.15, 16.10.22, 21.6.18, 30.8.21, 30.8.25, 30.9.14—7)

⁴ An extra occurrence is given in Keith's translation (*Rig-Veda Brāhmaṇas* 1920, p. 472). The correspondence is not given in the main text of Sarma's edition, but he supplies it in a footnote (KB; 1968, p. 109, footnote 7) writing that it was added in the printed editions of Lindner (KB, 1887) and in the Poona edition in 1911.

- The O-sound (*nyūñkha*) — Food *anna* AiB (5.3.5—1), KB (23.1.8, 23.2.22 & 28, 25.12.14, 30.4.7—5)
- Pañcadaśa stoma — Prsthya Sadaha, second day AiB (4.31.1—1), KB (22.3.2—1)
- Pragātha— Cattle *paśu* AiB (3.19.1, 3.23.7, 3.24.9—3), KB (15.5.20, 18.2.11—2+1)
- Rathamtara sāma — Prsthya Sadaha, first day AiB (4.29.1 & 13, 4.30.3—3), KB (22.1.2—1)
- Sacrifice (*yajña*) — Prajāpati AiB (2.17.2, 4.26.11—2), KB (13.1.1—1+1);
Visnu — Sacrifice *yajña* AiB (1.15.4—1), KB (4.2.11, 18.5.21, 18.9.25—3)
- Sacrificial food (*iḷā*) — Food *anna* AiB (2.4.7—1), KB (3.9.3, 13.5.26—2);
Cattle *paśu* AiB (2.9.11, 2.10.11, 2.30.1—3), KB (3.9.5, 5.9.6, 13.5.26, 29.3.9—4)
- Sacrificial post (*yūpa*) — Vajra AiB (2.1.3 & 4; 2.3.3—3), KB (10.1.1—1);
Yajamāna AiB (2.3.7—1), KB (10.4.2—1)
- Sacrificial post (*yūpa*) made of *bilva* wood — Food *annādyā* AiB (2.1.6—1),
KB (10.1.11—1)
- made of *khadira*-wood — Heaven *svarga* AiB (2.1.5—1), KB
(10.1.12—1)
- made of made of *palāśa*-wood — Brahma-splendour *brahmavarcasa*
AiB (2.1.10—1), KB (10.1.10—1)
- under the name of Vanaspati — Breath *prāṇa* AiB (2.4.14, 2.10.8—2),
KB (12.9.13—1)
- Sacrifice to the seasons (*rtuyāja*) — AiB Breaths *prāṇa* (2.29.1 & 6—2), KB
(13.7.1 & 12 & 16—3)
- Saptadaśa stoma — Prsthya Sadaha, third day AiB (5.1.1—1), KB (22.5.2—1)
- Sodaśin — Vajra AiB (4.1.2 & 3 & 4—2), KB (17.1.1—1)
- Soma-pressing, the first (*prātaḥsavana*) — Gāyatrī KB (14.7.22, 28.3.13—2+2
AiB)
- Soma-pressing, the second (*madhyamḍinasavana*) — Triṣṭubh KB (15.1.12,
15.1.32, 29.2.7, 29.2.12—4+2 AiB)
- Soma-pressing, the third (*tr̥tīyasavana*) — Jagatī KB (16.2.8, 16.9.20—2+2
AiB)
- Stotriya — The self *ātman* AiB (3.23.7, 3.24.1—2), KB (15.5.13, 15.6.5,
23.2.21—3)
- Svistakrt — Support *pratiṣṭhā* AiB (2.10.10—1), KB (3.10.5—1)
- Trivṛt stoma — Prsthya Sadaha, first day AiB (4.29.1—1), KB (22.1.2—1)
- Vālakhilyāh — The breaths of yajamāna *prāṇa* AiB (5.15.3—1), The breaths
prāṇa KB (30.6.9—1)
- Vairūpa sāman — Prsthya Sadaha, third day AiB (5.1.1—1), KB (22.5.2—1)
- Vasatkāra — Vajra AiB (3.6.1, 3.7.2, 3.8.2—3), KB (3.7.10—1)
- Yajamāna — Sacrificial post (*yūpa*) AiB (2.3.7—1), KB (10.4.2—1)

The breaths of yajamāna *prāṇa* — *Vāḷakhilyās* AiB (5.15.3—1), KB (30.6.9—1)

SATTRA

Chandoma, the first, occupying position seven after the six days of a *prṣṭhya sadaha* within a *daśarātra* — This world *ayaṃ lokaḥ* AiB (5.16.3—1), KB (26.6.30—1)

Chandoma, the second, eighth day in *daśarātra* — Atmosphere *antarikṣa* AiB (5.18.3—1), KB (26.7.1—1)

Chandomas — Cattle *paśu* AiB (5.16.19, 5.17.5 & 10, 5.18.18 & 20, 5.19.5 & 6 & 7 & 12, 5.20.18 & 19, 5.21.8 & 8 & 8 & 13—15), KB (26.5.28, 26.8.24, 26.13.45, 26.14.41, 29.8.9, 29.8.13, 30.8.2, 30.8.6 & 10 & 14—10)

Prsthya Sadaha, first day — Agni AiB (4.29.1—1), KB (22.1.2—1); Trivṛt stoma AiB (4.29.1—1), KB (22.1.2—1); Rathambara sāman AiB (4.29.1 & 13, 4.30.3—3), KB (22.1.2—1); Gāyatrī AiB (4.29.1—1), KB (22.1.2—1)

Prsthya Sadaha, second day — Indra AiB (4.31.1—1), KB (22.3.2—1); Pañcadaśa stoma AiB (4.31.1—1), KB (22.3.2—1); Bṛhat sāman AiB (4.31.1 & 11 & 12, 4.32.2—4), KB (22.3.2—1); Triṣṭubh AiB (4.31.1—1), KB (22.3.2—1); Atmosphere *antarikṣa* AiB (4.31.1—1), KB (22.3.1—1)

Prsthya Sadaha, third day — Saptadaśa stoma AiB (5.1.1—1), KB (22.5.2—1); Vairūpa sāman AiB (5.1.1—1), KB (22.5.2—1); Jagatī AiB (5.1.1—1), KB (22.5.2—1); Yonder world *asau lokaḥ* AiB (5.1.3—1), KB (22.5.1—1)

Prsthya Sadaha, fourth day — Speech *vāc* AiB (5.4.3, 5.4.4—2), KB (23.1.7—1)

Prsthya Sadaha, fifth day — Pañkti AiB (5.6.1 & 11, 5.8.1 & 2—4), KB (23.4.13, 23.5.30, 23.6.35 & 37, 29.5.6, 30.2.21—6), That which is a symbol of cattle *paśurūpa* AiB (5.6.5 & 6, 5.7.8, 5.8.4 & 8 & 9 & 10 & 14—8), Cattle *paśu* KB (23.4.1 & 18, 23.6.6 & 9 & 12 & 15 & 21 & 33, 23.7.1—9)

Prsthya Sadaha, sixth day — Aticchandas AiB (5.12.1 & 4 & 5 & 8, 5.13.1 & 7—6), KB (23.9.19, 23.11.2—2)

VARṆA

Brahman⁵ — Brhaspati AiB (1.13.4, 1.19.1 & 3, 1.21.1, 1.30.5, 2.38.9, 4.11.1—7), KB (7.12.14, 12.10.17, 18.2.21—3); Gāyatrī AiB (3.34.10, 4.11.15 & 18—3), KB (3.6.16, 7.12.21—2)

⁵ It may be questioned whether *brahman* should be placed in the category of Varṇa. For an overview of the many interpretations of *brahman*, see Gonda, 1950. Here I have

COMPARISON WITH KAUṢĪTAKI BRĀHMAṆA

Brahma-splendour *brahmavarcasa* — Gāyatrī AiB (1.5.2, 1.28.3—2), KB (17.2.19, 17.7.2—2); Sacrificial post made of made of palāśa-wood AiB (2.1.10—1), KB (10.1.10—1)
Lordly power *kṣatra* — Soma AiB (2.38.9—1), KB (7.12.22, 9.5.1, 10.8.20, 12.10.11—4)

MISCELLANEOUS

Food (*annādya, anna*) — Virāj AiB (4.16.5— 1+4 AiB+18 KB); The O-sound (*nyūñkha*) — Food *anna* AiB (5.3.5—1), KB (23.1.8, 23.2.22 & 28, 25.12.14, 30.4.7—5); Sacrificial food (*iḷā*) — Food *anna* AiB (2.4.7—1), KB (3.9.3, 13.5.26—2); Sacrificial post (*yūpa*) made of *bilva* wood — Food *annādya* AiB (2.1.6—1), KB (10.1.11—1); Udumbara tree — Food *annādya* AiB (5.24.3—1) KB (25.13.23—1)
Prosperity *śrī* — Brhati AiB (1.5.11—1), KB (28.6.9, 29.5.21—2)
Support *pratiṣṭhiti, pratiṣṭhā* — Aditi AiB (1.8.14—1), KB (1.5.25—1); Svistakrt AiB (2.10.10—1), KB (3.10.5—1)
Strength *ūrj* — Udumbara tree AiB (5.24.3—1) KB (25.13.23—1)
Udumbara tree — Strength *ūrj* AiB (5.24.3—1) KB (25.13.23—1), Food *annādya* AiB (5.24.3—1) KB (25.13.23—1)

chosen to follow the classification of Mylius, in order not to introduce too great differences between his list and the lists of this study.

5.3 The direction of the correspondences

In order to compare the results obtained through the analysis of AiB with the material in list 2, the same sort of tables will be constructed as in the previous chapter. The first table will tell us if the relation between topic and comment positions has changed, i.e. whether the categories can still be classified as primarily topic or comment categories.

Table 7. The direction of the correspondences common to AiB and KB

<i>Category</i>	<i>Topic-comment</i>	<i>Comment-topic</i>	<i>Sum</i>
Animals	12 (3.2 %)	73 (19.3 %)	85 (11.2 %)
Cosmos	—	24 (6.3 %)	24 (3.2 %)
Gods	59 (15.6 %)	26 (6.9 %)	85 (11.2 %)
Man	3 (0.8 %)	93 (24.6 %)	96 (12.7 %)
Metres	92 (24.3 %)	59 (15.6 %)	151 (20 %)
Ritual entities	109 (28.8 %)	33 (8.7 %)	142 (18.8 %)
Sattra	98 (26 %)	—	98 (13 %)
Varṇa	—	26 (6.9 %)	26 (3.4 %)
Miscellaneous	5 (1.3 %)	44 (11.6 %)	49 (6.5 %)
Sum	378	378	756

What immediately emerges from a comparison between Tables 2 and 7 is that the very high number for *Sattra* in the position of topic has decreased from 331 to 98. As previously mentioned, this is due to the fact that Mylius only took notice of those correspondences that were expressed with simple nominal sentences. Therefore, later in this chapter, we will analyse the *rūpas* of the *dvādaśāha* in KB in more detail, and compare them primarily with the system in AiB.

The trend in Table 2 that *Ritual*, *Sattra* and *Metres* are the primary starting-points of the correspondences is confirmed in Table 7, where they constitute 79 % (Table 2: 83 %). The categories *Animals* (cattle), *Cosmos*, *Man* and *Varṇa* on the other hand are the typical comment categories with 57 % (Table 2: 29 %). *Man* is the primary comment category in Table 7 as

in Table 2, and within the category of *Man* breath (*prāṇa*) makes up 36 %, speech (*vāc*) 29 % and strength (*vīrya*) 21 %.

It is interesting, and perhaps a bit surprising, that the category *Gods* has almost twice as many topic positions as comment positions. Why are the gods not a goal of the correspondences in the same manner as man or cosmos? Could this be a foreshadowing of the later ‘insignificance’ of the gods in the *Upaniṣads*?⁶ Or is it perhaps because the gods were considered as parts of the ritual realm, more precisely of the recitations, which were in focus for the *hotṛ*? The gods are therefore present in the ritual and, if one wants to accomplish a special purpose with the help of the ritual, then the link is made from the god to that special goal, as with Sarasvatī and speech. However, some of the correspondences are made from a god to the ritual realm, e.g. the correspondences of the different metres, a fact which contradicts this latter explanation at least in some cases.⁷

Another striking feature of Table 7 is that the category of *Animals* has an even stronger position as comment category than in Table 2. Within *Animals*, there is only one entity, viz. cattle (*paśu*). This could be explained by the longing for larger herds that was a prominent desire among the Vedic tribes. Land does not seem to have been of as much importance for wealth as high numbers of cattle were.⁸ However, *paśu* signifies not only domestic animals but also the five sacrificial victims, namely men, cattle (i.e. kine), horses, goats and sheep.

So far, the addition of material (KB) has not substantially changed the conclusions based on AiB, but has instead confirmed them. To be able to compare the relation between the categories in greater detail, a table with the same structure as Table 3 will be made below, with list 2 as the material.

⁶ See Mylius, 1976, p. 150. He hints at a Marxist interpretation in footnote 6.

⁷ Or perhaps, as argued above (p. 7), there is no necessary contradiction between classification and efficacy.

⁸ However, Tilak (1990, p. 52) thinks that cattle were considered as wealth since they were used in agricultural labour, as ploughing; but on p. 79 she also mentions that cattle were eaten by the Vedic peoples, as the Vedic texts clearly state. See e.g. KB 11.3, where it is also told that in yonder world cattle eat men, but through ritual means this gruesome heavenly fate can be averted. Moreover, it is necessary to have access to land for the herding of cattle, and the fight for free space was therefore an important activity for the Vedic tribes; see Witzel, 2001, p. 6.

Table 8. The connections between the categories

	Animals	Cosmos	Gods	Man	Metres	Ritual	Varṇa	Misc.
Animals					11	1		
Gods		7	2	13	15	5	15	2
Man			3					
Metres	10	4	3	35		6	9	25
Ritual	21	5	14	42	8	4	2	13
Sattra	42	8	4	3	24	17		
Misc.					1			4

Man is the principal comment category for *Ritual* and *Metres*, but not for *Gods*, which was the case when only AiB was analysed. On the other hand, the direction from *Ritual* to *Man* is more pronounced when one looks at the correspondences that are common to AiB and KB. The category *Sattra*, though, does not have a similar connection to man; for *Sattra*, it is instead *Animals*, *Metres* and *Ritual* that are the primary comment categories. This is due to the fact that within *Sattra* there are two groups of entities that appear in list 2: firstly the *chandomas*, which have connections to *Cosmos* and *Cattle*, and secondly the six days of the *pr̥ṣṭhya śaḍaha*, which are mainly connected to different metres and *sāmans*.

The correspondences with a god as topic are rather evenly distributed among the categories as regards comment, a fact which indicates that the gods were intrinsically connected with all realms of the Vedic world, such as the macrostructure of the Vedic cosmos, the Vedic society, ritual and the structure of the human person. The only lacuna is constituted by correspondences that begin with a god and end with cattle, or some other entity within the category of *Animals*; there are also no correspondences with cattle as topic and a god as comment. The correspondences involving cattle (both as comment and as topic) are all located within the ritual realm.

5.4 Inverted correspondences

5.4.1 Introduction

The addition of material (KB) has given us more examples of correspondences that are represented (in list 2) as having a two-way function. Some of these correspondences function in one direction in AiB and in another in KB, but there are also examples of two-way correspondences within KB. However, the analysis of AiB showed that most of the two-way correspondences were ambiguous in their directions. To see whether the material from KB alters this conclusion, we have to examine those occurrences in detail.

5.4.2 Cattle and the metres: *pañkti*, *bṛhatī*, *jagatī*

There were no cases in AiB of reversed correspondences within the category of *Animals*, while there are three when the occurrences in KB are also counted. The first is between cattle and the metre *pañkti*, and it is stated in AiB 4.3.1 that *pāñktāḥ paśavaḥ*, “Cattle are connected with the Pañkti.”⁹ In KB 23.4.3, however, the direction is inverted *paśavaḥ pañktir iti*, “The Pañkti is cattle, (they say).” The different directions of this correspondence are, however, dependent upon the forms used to express it. In AiB, the relation is expressed through the use of the *vṛddhi*-form of *pañkti*, viz. *pāñkta*, which conveys the meaning of “connected to *pañkti*”, but also, at the same time, the meaning of being ‘fivefold’. *Pāñkta* therefore occupies the first position in the nominal sentence, as is normal for an adjective. In KB, however, the form *pañkti* (meaning the metre *pañkti*, but also any set of five objects or the number five) is used, and it then occupies the second position. The question is therefore whether these alternating forms of expressing the relationship between *pañkti* and cattle are used with different purposes, or if they are merely different ways of expressing the same thing. The next two correspondences are also between cattle and a metre, and they are expressed in the same double way; they can therefore be expected to give an answer to this question.

⁹ For the meaning of *pañkti* as fivefold, see p. 143.

The correspondence between cattle and *br̥hatī* is expressed in the same way in AiB 4.3.2 and KB 23.4.19 and the order is from cattle to *br̥hatī*, viz. *bārhatāḥ paśavaḥ*, “Cattle are connected with the *br̥hatī*”, while in KB 17.2.23 and 29.3.10 it is *paśavo br̥hatī*, “The *Br̥hatī* is cattle.” Moreover, in KB 29.3.11 there follows an occurrence of the opposite direction, not noted by Mylius, *bārhatāḥ paśavaḥ*. In KB, the same correspondence could thus be given in both directions directly after one another, which indicates that the direction of the correspondence has significance for the meaning. To state that *br̥hatī* is connected to cattle, and that cattle in turn are connected to *br̥hatī*, seems to lay emphasis on the two-way relation expressed by the correspondence.

Cattle are also connected to the metre *jagatī* six times in AiB, which have been discussed under the heading *The most frequent correspondences* in the previous chapter.¹⁰ In KB however, the direction is reversed. In 16.2.29, 17.2.31, 18.6.6 we find *paśavo jagatī*, and in 30.1.24 *paśavo vai jagatī*. It is noteworthy that the last correspondence is followed, as was the case with *br̥hatī*, by the reversed correspondence *jāgatāḥ paśavaḥ*, and this correspondence is also lacking in Mylius’s tables. The impression that the correspondences in KB are used more clearly and freely in both directions is reinforced by this last example. In the case of both *br̥hatī* and *jagatī*, the double correspondence is part of a formula, which has the following structure.

- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| 1. paśavaḥ X | X [is] cattle. |
| 2. X (in vṛddhi) paśavaḥ | Cattle are connected to X. |
| 3. paśūṇām evāptyai | [It leads] to the obtaining of cattle. |

5.4.3 Agni and Ahirbudhnyas

The next two-way correspondence is between Agni *gārhapatya*, i.e. Agni in his role as the householder’s sacrificial fire, and the mythological snake Ahirbudhnyas. In AiB 3.36.5, the fire is in focus and this is reflected in the expression of the correspondence, *eṣa ha vā ahir budhnyo yad agnir gārhapatyaḥ*, “Agni *Gārhapatya* is the dragon of the deep”, while in KB 16.8.6–7 it is the other way round, *ahim budhnyam śamsati agnir vā*

¹⁰ See p. 134.

ahirbudhnyah, ‘He recites ‘the Dragon of the Deep’; the dragon of the deep is Agni.’”

5.4.4 Indra, his vajra and the metre *triṣṭubh*

Indra is closely connected to the metre *triṣṭubh* in a similar way as Agni with *gāyatrī*. Within AiB, two correspondences seem to have the opposite directions, but this cannot be established with certainty, as was indicated in the previous chapter.¹¹ The occurrences in KB do not support the reciprocal relation of the correspondence, but instead all three have Indra as topic: 3.2.13, 23.2.12 *traīṣṭubha indrah*, and 23.2.9 *traīṣṭubho vā indrah*.

Also Indra’s *vajra* is connected to the *triṣṭubh* metre in AiB. In 2.16.4 it is told that a certain verse was the thunderbolt (*vajra*) of Indra, among other things because it was composed in the *triṣṭubh*.

AiB 2.16.4 tān abravīd indro: mā bibhīta, triṣamṛddham ebhyo ‘ham prātar vajram prahartāsmīty, etāṃ vāva tad ṛcam abravīd. vajras tena yad aponaptriyā, vajras tena yat triṣṭub, vajras tena yad vāk. tam ebhyaḥ prāharat, tenainān ahaṃs. tato vai devā abhavan, parā asurāḥ

To them said Indra ‘Fear not; against them in the morning shall I hurl my thunderbolt thrice made perfect.’ This verse did he speak; it is a thunderbolt, in that it is addressed to the son of the waters; it is a thunderbolt, in that it is a Triṣṭubh ; it is a thunderbolt in that it is speech. It he hurled against them; with it he slew them; thus indeed the gods prospered, the Asuras were defeated.

Vajra is clearly topic in AiB 2.16.4; in AiB 2.2.33 the relation is more complex, as *triṣṭubh* is mentioned before the correspondence and therefore should be topic, but the order of the words seems to indicate that *vajra* is topic here as well.

AiB 2.2.33 ekādaśākṣarā vai triṣṭup, triṣṭub indrasya vajra. indrāyatanābhir evābhī rādhnoti ya evaṃ veda.

The Triṣṭubh has eleven syllables; the thunderbolt of Indra is the Triṣṭubh; verily thus with those whose abode is Indra he prospers who knows thus.

However, in KB 7.2.13, the order of the words is reversed (*vajrastrīṣṭup*), and thus the topic Triṣṭubh is clearly indicated by both the context and the word order. The verses to be recited are mentioned first, as is the fact that

¹¹ See p. 129.

they are composed in the *triṣṭubh* metre — which makes the connection to the *vajra* possible. The ritual recitation is thereby connected to the weapon of Indra, and hence could be used against human enemies, which thus correspond to the mythical Asuras.

KB 7.2.12–15 triṣṭubhau haviṣo yājyāpuronuvākye. vajras triṣṭup. etena vai devās triṣsamṛddhena vajreṇaibhyo lokebhyo ‘surān anudanta. tatho evaitad yajamāna etenaiva triṣsamṛddhena vajreṇaibhyo lokebhyo dviṣato bhratṛvyān nudate

The invitatory and offering verses of the oblation are Triṣṭubh verses; the Triṣṭubh is a thunderbolt; by this thrice-formed thunderbolt the gods pushed away the Asuras from these worlds. Verily thus also the sacrificer with his thrice-formed thunderbolt pushes away the rivals who hate him from these worlds.

5.4.5 Breath and Vāyu

Breath is linked to the wind god Vāyu in AiB, but, in the previous chapter, the two-way relation of this correspondence could not be established with certainty. With the additional material from KB, however, this aspect becomes more clear. In AiB, the correspondence was expressed twice with breath as topic, viz. 2.26.6 *vāyur hi prāṇaḥ* and in 3.2.4 *vāyuḥ prāṇaḥ*. In KB, the same type of construction is used once.

KB 8.6.6–9 pataṅgam aktam asurasya māyayeti prāṇo vai pataṅgaḥ vāyur vai prāṇaḥ vāyavyam eva svāhākāram etābhir anuvadati

‘The bird anointed by the craft of the Asura’ (he says); the bird is breath; breath is Vāyu; verily thus with these (verses) he accompanies the call of Hail! to Vāyu.

However, in KB Vāyu is topic in three passages.

KB 5.10.17–19 atha yad vāyuṃ yajati prāṇo vai vāyuḥ prāṇam eva tad ātman dhatte¹²

In that he sacrifices to Vāyu, and Vāyu is breath, [verily thus he puts breath in the self].

¹² L. and P. has the reading *tat prīṇāti* instead for *tad ātman dhatte*. This is reflected in the translation of Keith; the last clause of the translation is therefore not made by Keith, but by me.

KB 13.4.18–20 te vā ete prāṇā eva yad dvidevatyāḥ vāg evendraḥ prāṇo vāyuḥ¹³

[The libations to the pairs of gods are the breaths,] Indra is speech, Vāyu is breath.

KB 30.3.20–23 tārksye dūrohaṇam rohati vāyur vai tārksyaḥ prāṇo vai vāyuḥ prāṇam eva tad yajamānā rohanti

In the Tārksya he mounts the difficult mounting; Tārksya is Vāyu; Vāyu is breath, [thus the sacrificers mount the breath.]¹⁴

The pattern emerging from the analysis of the passages in KB is clear, namely, if the god is mentioned earlier in the text, then he becomes the topic of the correspondence, and when the breath has been mentioned, it is topic, and this is marked through the last position in the nominal sentence. This reversal of the direction of the correspondence was not present in the same unambiguous way in AiB.

5.4.6 The metres and the *soma*-pressings

The three *soma*-pressings (morning, midday and evening) are connected to the three metres *gāyatrī*, *triṣṭubh* and *jagatī* through correspondences, which are expressed in both directions. The first pressing is linked to *gāyatrī* and in AiB 3.12.2 it is told that through a recitation and a formula with eight syllables (which is the same quantity of syllables as in a *gāyatrī* verse) they place *gāyatrī* in front (*purastāt*) of the morning pressing. Later in the *khaṇḍa*, the same technique is used to place *triṣṭubh* (11 syllables) at the midday pressing and *jagatī* (12 syllables) at the evening *soma*-pressing. In AiB 3.13, a myth fulfils the same function; Prajāpati gives the metres with the corresponding pressings to different gods.¹⁵

In KB, however, the direction is in all occurrences from the ritual elements to the metres. The first pressing is linked to *gāyatrī* in two instances, viz. 14.7.22 and 28.3.13 *gāyatram prātaḥ savanam*, “The morning pressing is connected with the Gāyatrī.” The second pressing is connected to *triṣṭubh* in four cases¹⁶ and in all these cases the midday

¹³ The first clause is omitted in the editions of L. and P., and the translation of that passage is therefore my own.

¹⁴ L. *prāṇam evā-* (var. P. *prāṇa evā-*) -*smiṃs tad dadhāti*.

¹⁵ For a discussion of this myth, see p. 128.

¹⁶ KB 15.1.12&32, 29.2.7&12.

pressing is linked to both *triṣṭubh* and Indra, viz. *aindraṃ hi traiṣṭubhaṃ mādhyamdinam savanam*, “The midday pressing is connected with Indra and the Triṣṭubh,” which indicates that these three entities constitute a group of closely connected objects.¹⁷ The third *soma*-pressing has as its metre *jagatī* and the correspondences are formulated in the same way as the previous ones: *jāgataṃ hi tṛtīyasavanam*, “for the third pressing is connected with the Jagatī.”¹⁸

The correspondences between the metres and the *soma*-pressings are thus expressed in different ways in the two *brāhmaṇas*. In AiB a myth or an explanation based upon the number of syllables in the recitation is used. In KB, however, the *vr̥ddhi* form of the metres is used to express the relation between a pressing and a specific metre. The fact that the directions of the correspondences are not inverted in the KB, and that different ways of expression are used in the two texts, indicates that in the case of the correspondences between the metres and the *soma*-pressings the two-way relation cannot be established with certainty on the basis of the material hitherto investigated.

5.4.7 The pragātha sāman and cattle

The correspondence between the *pragātha sāman* and cattle mostly has the direction from the *sāman* to cattle.¹⁹

KB 15.5.19–21 *pragāthaṃ śamsati paśavo vai pragāthaḥ paśūnām evāptyai*

He recites a Pragātha; the Pragātha is cattle; verily (it serves) to obtain cattle.

In KB 15, there is, however, one passage in which cattle seems to be topic. It is, however, not part of a simple causal explanation of a recitation; the context is instead an enumeration of various connections between elements in the world of the *yajamāna* and parts of the recitation. There is no conclusion that pinpoints the desired goal of these correspondences, but the entities corresponding to parts of the recitation are themselves often the focus of different desires, e.g. offspring and cattle.

¹⁷ See Smith, B., 1994, p. 296.

¹⁸ KB 16.2.8, 16.9.20.

¹⁹ AiB 3.19.1, 3.23.7, 3.24.9; KB 15.5.20, 18.2.11.

KB 15.6.5–8 ātmā vai stotriyaḥ prajānurūpaḥ mahiṣī dhāyyā pragāthaḥ paśavaḥ ātmā
sūktaṃ yad antarātmaṃs tan nivit pratiṣṭhā paridhāniyānaṃ yājyā

The strophe is the self; the antistrophe offspring; the supplementary verse the wife; cattle the Pragātha; the hymn the body; the Nivid what is within the body; the concluding verse a support; the offering verse food.

The correspondence between cattle and *pragātha* is different from the rest of the correspondences in the quoted passage. The direction of the others is, according to the word order C-T, from the ritual realm to important objects in the Vedic world-view. The correspondence between cattle and *pragātha* deviates from this pattern since cattle occupies the second position of the nominal sentence, which is strange as all the other occurrences of this correspondence have the opposite word order, and also as the context cannot be used as the explanation of this inversion.

5.4.8 Sacrifice and Prajāpati

In AiB, sacrifice (*yajña*) is connected to Prajāpati twice. In the first occurrence, the line of reasoning proceeds from the statement that one should use 360 verses for one desiring sacrifice, because then the verses become linked to the year (360 days), and as Prajāpati is connected to the year, and also to the sacrifice, the last link to the object of desire, sacrifice, is obtained.

AiB 2.17.2 trīṇi ca śatāni ṣaṣṭiś cānūcyāni yajñakāmasya. trīṇi ca vai śatāni ṣaṣṭiś ca
saṃvatsarasyāhāni, tāvān saṃvatsaraḥ, saṃvatsaraḥ prajāpatiḥ, prajāpatir
yajñaḥ

Three hundred and sixty should be recited for one desiring the sacrifice;
three hundred and sixty are the days of the year; so great is the year;
Prajāpati is the year; the sacrifice is Prajāpati.

According to the ‘occasional’ word order, which is reflected in Keith’s translation, sacrifice is topic. According to the logic of the argumentation, the progression seems, however, to be the opposite: 360 verses → the year (360 days) → Prajāpati → sacrifice. An alternative translation captures how the statements connect to each other: “So great is the year; the year is Prajāpati; Prajāpati is the sacrifice.” Nevertheless, the first sentence specifies that the topic of the whole argumentation is sacrifice as an object of desire, a fact that perhaps may be relevant for the explanation of the direction of the last correspondence between sacrifice and Prajāpati.

The next occurrence (AiB 4.26.11) does not shed much light on this issue, even though the order of the words is the same, viz. *prajāpatir vai yajñah*, and it is cited in the text as a formula recommended to be used in the debate over an oblation to Vāyu.²⁰

In KB, however, we find an occurrence that has the opposite order of the words. The correspondence is given in an argumentation on the question whether the sacrificial post should be of a particular height, or whether one should leave it unmeasured.

KB 10.2.8–12 yatraiva manasā velāṃ manyeta tat kurvīta tad yūpasya ca vedeś ceti ha smāha prajāpatir vai manaḥ yajña u vai prajāpatiḥ. svayaṃ vai tad yajño yajñasya juṣate. yan mano manasaḥ

‘Both for the post and the altar (he should choose) the size which he considers in his mind suitable’, (Kauṣītaki) used to say. Mind is Prajāpati; Prajāpati is the sacrifice; the sacrifice itself rejoices in the sacrifice when mind in mind.

In this case, the structure of the Sanskrit text is as follows: Prajāpati X, Y Prajāpati. The translation according to the word order C-T thus follows here the logic of the argumentation. It seems that KB, in this case, as in some of the previous examples, reverses the order of the words in the nominal sentence with more ease than is the case in AiB. If the principle of Hengeveld is relevant in this context, it could indicate that a change in the view of the correspondence has come about in the period of time between the composition of the two texts, a change from a focus upon relation to identification.

Another feature which seems to point in the same direction is that the correspondence between the fifth day in the *prṣṭhya śaḍaha* and cattle is expressed in AiB with the help of *paśurūpa*, i.e. “the form of cattle” or “the symbol of cattle”. A recitation could thus be linked to the fifth day if it has *paśurūpa*. KB likewise makes use of *rūpa* in connection with the *dvādaśāha*, but KB also uses the more straightforward and condensed nominal sentence. Mylius has listed three such occurrences, all in the twenty-third *adhyāya*, and all with the same form *paśavaḥ pañcamamahāḥ*, “The fifth day is cattle.” *Rūpa*, however, is also used, viz. in the phrase (or

²⁰ *prajāpatir vai yajño, yajñasyāyātayāmatāyā iti brūyād. yad u vāavyas, tena prajāpater naiti. vāyur hy eva prajāpatis. tad uktham ṛṣiṇā: pava māṇaḥ prajāpatir iti.*

short formula) *paśumaditi vā asya rūpam*, “Containing (the word) ‘cattle’ is a symbol of this (day).” This phrase establishes, on the basis of the word ‘cattle’, the connection between a recitation and the fifth day.²¹ The fact is, nevertheless, that the word *rūpa* is used consequently in this context in AiB, while KB also utilises the more condensed nominal sentence without *rūpa*. This difference between the two texts, together with the fact that the correspondences which are in the form of nominal sentences are more often reversed in KB, are indications that the view of the correspondences as identifications is more prominent in KB than in AiB.

5.5 The most frequent correspondences

5.5.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter a survey of the most numerous correspondences in AiB was made with the intention of discovering whether there were any special reasons why certain correspondences were more frequent than others. In that context the line was drawn at six occurrences, but as the addition of occurrences from KB has increased the frequencies, the *terminus a quo* in this section will be seven. In the previous chapter, the correspondences were organised according to which categories they belonged to in list 1 and treated individually. In the following analysis, however, a different categorisation will be used: the correspondences will be organised according to the principles that make them frequent. The first category that will be commented upon is thus constituted by those correspondences that are used throughout the entirety of the two *brāhmaṇa* texts. Thereafter correspondences that only figure in special sections of the texts will be analysed, and finally those correspondences that are part of frequently used formulas will be treated. There is, nevertheless, some overlapping between these categories, as a correspondence concentrated in a specific passage can also be part of a formula used in that ritual context.

²¹ This short formula is also used for the fifth day in a *abhiplava śaḍaha*, KB 21.3.16&19&25&28&31&34.

Table 9. The most frequent correspondences in AiB and KB

	<i>Animals</i>	<i>Man</i>	<i>Metres</i>	<i>Varṇa</i>	<i>Misc.</i>
Animals			7+4		
Gods		4+3	9+1	10	
Metres		15, 20			22+1
Ritual	9, 7	12			
Sattra	25, 17		10, 8		

5.5.2 Correspondences that occur throughout the texts

The metres evidently constitute the structure of the Vedic recitations and they are consequently present in all the phases of the Vedic sacrifices; the correspondences between the metres and other entities can therefore be applied to almost any ritual context. Most of these correspondences, however, have already been treated, such as those between cattle and *jagatī*²² and between Agni and *gāyatrī*.²³

The occurrences in AiB of the correspondence between *anuṣṭubh* and speech have also been treated in the previous chapter.²⁴ The material in KB displays (cf. AiB 1.28.14–15) a typical threefold structure of argumentation: first the metre is mentioned, then its connection with speech, and finally some effect involving speech is asserted.²⁵

KB 5.8.10–13 *sā vā anuṣṭub bhavati vāg anuṣṭup parāñca u vai pitarah tān evaitad vācānuṣṭubhāgamayati*

It is an Anuṣṭubh verse; the Anuṣṭubh is speech; the fathers are turned away; verily thus with the Anuṣṭubh as speech he causes them to come.

²² For the discussion of the occurrences in AiB see p. 134; for those in KB see p. 162.

²³ For the occurrences in AiB see p. 128. The ways of expressing the correspondence are rather fixed. The sentence *gāyātram agneś chandaḥ*, “The metre of Agni is the Gāyatrī”, is used once in AiB and thrice in KB. The sentence *gāyatro vā agnir gāyātracchandaḥ*, “Agni is connected with the Gāyatrī and has the Gāyatrī for his metre”, appears thrice in KB.

²⁴ See p. 139.

²⁵ The phrase *vāg anuṣṭup* is used in KB 5.8.11, 7.10.13, 11.2.13, 14.2.19, 26.1.3, 27.2.4, 27.12.8; *vāg evāsau prathamānuṣṭup* is utilised in 15.4.24 and 16.4.21.

The gods are present in almost all ritual contexts, mainly through the explicit mentioning of their names in the *ṛgvedic* recitations, but also as the recipients of the libations and oblations. All the correspondences of the gods are not, however, present in a wide range of textual passages. Only two correspondences have seven or more occurrences, viz. that between Bṛhaspati and *brahman* and that between Vāyu and breath.²⁶ The correspondence between Bṛhaspati and *brahman* in AiB always has the same wording, namely *brahma vai bṛhaspatiḥ*, and this phrase is used three times in KB also in the exact same form.²⁷ The correspondence between Bṛhaspati and *brahman* thus functions as a minor formula.²⁸

5.5.3 Correspondences concentrated in specific text passages

The libations for two deities (*dvidevatya*) are linked to the breaths six times in AiB and these occurrences are located, in contradistinction to those of the metres, within a few *khaṇḍas* that discuss this particular topic.²⁹ The situation in KB is not different: the use of the correspondence is confined to *khaṇḍas* 13.4 and 13.5. In KB, however, the correspondence does not function as the marker of the theme of the *khaṇḍas*; it is instead a part of different argumentations, e.g. in KB 13.5.15 *nāpidadhāti prāṇā vai dvidevatyāḥ net prāṇānapidadhānīti*, “He does not cover (thinking) ‘(The cups) for two deities are the breaths; let me not cover the breaths.’”³⁰

The system of correspondences in AiB, which was given in the sections dealing with the basic units of the *sattra*, was analysed in the previous chapter. In the comparison with KB, which is displayed in list 2, only correspondences expressed by nominal sentences of the type often associated with the meaning of identification were represented. This was a consequence of the delimitation imposed by Mylius in his article, but as

²⁶ For the discussion of this correspondence see pp. 130 and 139.

²⁷ For the occurrences in AiB see p. 137.

²⁸ Noteworthy is also the use of the alternating phrase *brahma vai brahmaṇaspatiḥ*, in KB 8.7.3 and 9.5.12. Mylius’ categorisation of the correspondence in 12.10.17 under *Brahmaṇaspati* is incorrect, as the phrase here is clearly *brahma vai bṛhaspatiḥ*.

²⁹ See p. 141.

³⁰ In KB 13.4.15, 13.5.25 *prāṇā dvidevatyāḥ* is used, in 13.5.4, 13.5.15, 13.5.32, *prāṇā vai dvidevatyāḥ* and in 13.4.18 *te vā ete prāṇā eva yad dvidevatyāḥ*.

‘correspondence’ is, in this study, defined in a broader way, it is of value to find out whether there is a similar system in KB, and whether it is different in any interesting way. If we first turn to the basic unit of six days called a *ṣaḍaha*, the difference is that in KB both the *abhiplava* and the *prṣṭhya ṣaḍahas* are commented upon in detail. The first, in order of presentation in the *brāhmaṇa* text, is *abhiplava*, and the ‘symbols’ of its six days are as follows.

Table 10. The correspondences of the *abhiplava ṣaḍaha* in KB

<i>Day</i>	<i>Characteristic words and features</i>	<i>World</i>	<i>God</i>	<i>Vital power</i>
1	Forward, hither, yoke	This world	Agni	Speech
2	Apart, up	Atmosphere	Indra	Breath
3	Thou, the end, stand. Repetition	Yonder world	Āditya	Sight
4	Born, hither, food	The quarters	The Moon	Hearing
5	Wealth, cattle. Addition		Rudra	Fame, strength
6	The all, the end. The same endings	The waters	Prajāpati	Brilliance, the immortal

The recurrent structure in AiB, with the three worlds plus the words connoting forward motion and the end, is also present here, and likewise the connection between Agni and this world, Indra and the atmosphere. However, the third day is connected to Āditya instead of the All-gods, while the fifth day is characteristically connected to cattle.

The *prṣṭhya ṣaḍaha* is also treated in KB and the similarity with the *rūpas* given in AiB is almost complete. The system in KB, however, has more

connections to other realms outside the ritual, and it also differs in some details. In the table below, the entities that are not present in the system of AiB are marked with extra bold type. The ‘characteristic words’ are, however, left out in this table.

Table 11. The correspondences of the *pr̥ṣṭhya ṣaḍaha* in KB

<i>Day</i>	<i>God</i>	<i>World and other entities</i>	<i>Quarter</i>	<i>Season</i>	<i>Stoma</i>	<i>Metre</i>	<i>Sāman</i>
1	Agni, the Vasus	This world	Eastern	Spring	Trivṛt	Gāyatrī	Rathaṃ-tara
2	Indra, the Maruts	Atmosphere	Southern	Summer	Pañcadaśa	Triṣṭubh	Bṛhat
3	Ādityas, Varuṇa	Yonder world	Western	The rains	Saptadaśa	Jagatī	Vairūpa
4	Speech, Sādhya and Ājya gods, Bṛhaspati, the moon	Food	Northern	Autumn	Ekaviṃśa	Anuṣṭubh	Vairāja
5	Rudra, the Maruts	Cattle	Zenith <i>ūrdhvā dik</i>	Winter	Triṇava	Paṅkti	Śākvara
6	Prajāpati, the All-gods	The Waters	<i>arvācī dik</i>	The cool of the seasons	Trayas-triṃśa	Ati-cchandās	Raivata

The structure displayed by the *rūpas* of the *pr̥ṣṭhya ṣaḍaha* in KB is coherent with other classifications in the *brāhmaṇas* as demonstrated by Brian K. Smith.³¹ The principles of classification are therefore not unique

³¹ Smith uses the material of KB in his study. It is labelled cosmogony 13, even though it is not about creation, merely classification. Smith, B., 1994, esp. pp. 125–170.

to the *pr̥ṣṭhya śaḍaha*, but it seems that the elaborate system of *rūpas* to the nine days of the *daśarātra* is a unique feature of the *ṛgvedic brāhmaṇas*.³²

Moreover, the system in KB is more elaborate than that in AiB, something that can be explained on the basis of chronology: i.e. KB is a later text than AiB.

5.5.4 Correspondences that function as parts of formulas

5.5.4.1 Introduction

In this section those correspondences that are part of larger formulas, i.e. those that consist of more than one sentence, are analysed. These formulas are standardised lines of reasoning that argue from two or more premises to a conclusion, which often points out the result of the ritual action, under the condition that the prescribed movements and utterances are performed with the appropriate knowledge.

5.5.4.2 *Virāj* and food (*anna* or *annādyā*)

The correspondence between the metre *virāj* and food (*anna* or *annādyā*) is used five times in AiB and 18 times in KB, and it is thereby, when both texts are considered, the second most frequent correspondence.³³ The following passage is characteristic for the occurrences in AiB.³⁴

³² Some of the more basic characteristics appear, however, in PB 11.1–13.12.

³³ For a discussion of the inverted occurrences in AiB, see p. 132. *Virāj* is moreover not only a metre, but also denotes other entities, or functions (see Weber-Brosamer, 1988, pp. 93–110), the most famous example being *virāj* as the first principle emanating from the unmanifest *puruṣa* in ṚV 10.90.

³⁴ The other passages are: AiB 4.11.18 *gāyatrī ca virājā ca vaṣaṭkuryād. brahma vai gāyatrī annam virād, brahmaṇaiva tad annādyam samdadhāti. 4.16.5–6 ...virāḥ annādyam, virājam eva tan māsi-māsy abhisampādayanto yanty. annādyakāmāḥ khalu vai satram āsata. tad yad virājam māsi-māsy abhisampādayanto yanty, annādyam eva tan māsi-māsy avarundhānā yanty asmai ca lokāyāmuṣmai cobhābhyām. 5.19.7 annam virāḥ annam paśavaḥ paśavaś chandomāḥ, paśūnām avaruddhyai. 5.21.8 annam virāḥ and then as in 5.19.7.*

AiB 1.5.23–24 *virājāv annādyakāmaḥ kurvītānnaṃ vai virāṭ tasmād yasyaiveha bhūyiṣṭhaṃ annam bhavati sa eva bhūyiṣṭhaṃ loke virājati, tad virājo viratṭvam*

Virāj verses should he use who desires proper food; the Virāj is food; therefore he who here has most food is most glorious in the world; that is why the Virāj has its name (the glorious).

The connection between *virāj* and food thus enables the ritual, when *virāj* is used, to make the sponsor of the sacrifice (*yajamāna*) an owner of more food, as a result of his sacrificial undertakings.

In KB, the correspondences are of three different types. The first type is similar to the example from AiB quoted above, but it consists of only one occurrence and *annādya* is used.³⁵ The second type, which consists of a double correspondence between (proper) food (*annādya*), prosperity (*śrī*) and *virāj*, is all the more frequent with the 13 occurrences in KB. They are all of the same form, viz. *śrīrvirāḷannādyam śriyo virājo ‘nnādyasyopāptyai*, “Prosperity and proper food are the Virāj (and so they serve) for the winning of the Virāj as prosperity and proper food.”³⁶ The occurrences of this type are distributed rather evenly over the whole text of KB.³⁷

The third type consists of larger formulas that use *anna* instead of *annādya*. The first formula of this type is built up of four statements: three premises that are correspondences and the conclusion stating the effect.

1. X is connected with the Virāj.	vairājaḥ (vai) X
2. Virāj is food.	annaṃ virāṭ
3. X is food.	annam X
4. Thus by food he causes proper food to abound.	annena tad annādyam samardhayati

The formula above is used twice and, in the place of X, *soma* and the waters (*āpah*) are respectively instantiated.³⁸

³⁵ KB 14.3.15, *etad vai kṛtsnamannādyam yad virāḷeva* (L. P. *virāḷ*).

³⁶ The word order indicates that *annādya* is topic, while the contexts in which the formula is used point to *virāj* as topic.

³⁷ There is, though, a lacuna in *khaṇḍa* 3–13.

³⁸ KB 9.6.18 and 12.4.10.

In KB 23.1.8–9 and 23.2.28–29 another formula is used.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. The Virāj is food. | annaṃ virāt |
| 2. The sound O is food. | annaṃ nyūṅkhaḥ |
| 3. Verily thus he places food in X and Y. | annam eva tad X
ca Y ca dadhāti ³⁹ |

5.5.4.3 *Uktha and cattle*

Uktha is a Sanskrit term signifying *ṛgvedic* verses that are combined into larger units and recited by the *hotṛ* — in contradistinction to the singing of the *udgāṭṛ* and the murmuring of the *adhvaryu*. These litanies (*uktha*) are linked to cattle nine times (in AiB and KB). The first occurrence in AiB (4.1.3) is part of an explanation trying to show why one should use the *ṣodaśin* on the fourth day of a *ṣaḍaha*.⁴⁰ The basic correspondence of this *khaṇḍa*, from which all the other explanations spring forth, is that between the *ṣodaśin* rite and the *vajra*.

AiB 4.1.3 vajro vai ṣoḷaśī paśava ukthāni, tam parastād ukthānām paryasya śaṃsati

The Ṣodaśin is a thunderbolt; the litanies cattle, putting it round after the litanies he recites.

The conclusion of the author of the *brāhmaṇa*, which points to the desired goal of the correspondence, is that cattle surrounded by the thunderbolt (*vajra*) come to man. The structure of the ritual elements thus makes it possible to bring about (through the correspondences) a similar structure in the world outside the ritual enclosure.⁴¹ The aim of the discourse is to make the ritual an instrument for gaining more cattle, which usually is the case when correspondences with cattle are used. In this instance, though, that aim is subordinated to the primary goal of the *khaṇḍa* — to show that it is appropriate to use the *ṣodaśin* on the fourth day.

³⁹ In one passage (KB 23.2.29) the entities in which food is placed are different according to Sarma's edition (*yajñe ca yajamāneṣu ca*) and the earlier editions (*ātmani prajāyām ca*). Hence, there is a difference between Keith's translation, based on the earlier editions, and the main reading in Sarma's edition, which is used in this study.

⁴⁰ The name *ṣodaśin* denotes both a particular one-day *soma* sacrifice (*ekāha*, i.e. with one pressing-day) and a particular chant (*stotra*) and recitation (*śāstra*) used that day. See ŚB, 1963, Vol. XLI, p. xvi ff; ĀŚ VI. 2 and 3.

⁴¹ For an explanation of the structure of this sacrifice, see AiB, 1863, Vol. 2, p. 255.

The second occurrence of the correspondence between cattle and *uktha* (AiB 4.12) explains that the *caturviṃśa* day⁴² is an *ukthya* and states, *paśavo vā ukthāni, paśūnām avaruddhyai*, “The Ukthas are cattle; (it serves) for the winning of cattle.”⁴³ The form of the correspondence is also in this case a nominal sentence with the *uktha* as topic.

In KB, three of the occurrences are located in one single *khaṇḍa* (16.10), which also deals with the *ukthya* rite. The correspondences are all part of a formula that is triggered when something commented on by the author of the *brāhmaṇa* can be divided into four entities. First the fourfoldness is declared and thereafter three statements follow, beginning with the correspondence between litanies and cattle, and then it is declared that cattle are fourfold and finally that they are four-footed. The conclusion which follows upon these premises is, as is very often the case, that the ritual action in question leads to obtaining of cattle.

- | | |
|--|------------------------------|
| 1. The litanies are cattle. | <i>paśavo vā ukthāni</i> |
| 2. Cattle are fourfold, | <i>catuṣṭayā vai paśavaḥ</i> |
| 3. and also four-footed. | <i>atho catuṣpādāḥ</i> |
| 4. Verily (they serve) to obtain cattle. | <i>paśūnām evāptyai</i> |

In the very last *khaṇḍas* of the KB, the formula above is utilised three more times, even if the fourfoldness once is exchanged for fivefoldness (30.8.25). In that case, the third premise naturally has to be dropped, as cattle do not have five hooves.

- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| 1. The litanies are cattle. | <i>paśavo vā ukthāni</i> |
| 2. Cattle are fivefold. | <i>pāṅktāḥ paśavaḥ</i> |
| 3. Verily (they serve) to obtain cattle. | <i>paśūnām evāptyai</i> |

Mylius also lists KB 21.6.18 as an example of the correspondence between the litanies (*uktha*) and cattle, but the edited text gives the correspondence as between *ukthya* and cattle, not *uktha*.⁴⁴ However, Sarma

⁴² *Caturviṃśa* is the name of the one-day *soma* sacrifice, which is used as the second day of a *Sattra*.

⁴³ *Ukthya* is one of the basic forms of the one-day *soma* sacrifice. The relation between *ukthya* and *uktha* is on one level based on the phonetic similarity of the two words, but the ritual *ukthya* also contains litanies (*uktha*). For a discussion of the two words, see ŚB, 1963, Vol. XLI, pp. xiv–xvi.

⁴⁴ KB 21.6.18 *paśava ukthyāni*.

also gives an alternative reading in a footnote, which has *uktha* instead of *ukthya*. The context of the correspondence is the *ukthya* rite, as part of an *abhiplava śaḍaha*. In that sacrificial rite there are six days; the first and the last are of the *vyotir-agniṣṭoma* type, while the four days in the middle are *ukthya* days.⁴⁵ The *agniṣṭomas* are linked to *brahman* and the *ukthya* days to cattle (either directly or through the mediation of the litanies). The conclusion of the text is that cattle surrounded by *brahman* could be gained through the ritual *abhiplava śaḍaha*.⁴⁶

The numerous occurrences in both AiB and KB indicate that the connection between cattle and *uktha* (and *ukthya*) was well established. The high frequency of the correspondence in KB is mainly due to the fact that it is part of several formulas.

5.5.4.4 Chandomas and cattle

The connection between the *chandoma* days and cattle in AiB is part of a larger formula that is also used with other entities than *chandoma*; i.e. the formula is complete with premises and conclusion, while the object linked to cattle is dependent upon the context.⁴⁷ In KB, the situation is similar and the formula, which was utilised for the connection between fourfold cattle and *uktha*, is also used for the connection between *chandoma* and cattle.⁴⁸

- | | |
|--|-----------------------|
| 1. The Chandomas are cattle. | paśavo vai chandomāḥ |
| 2. Cattle are fourfold, | catuṣṭayā vai paśavaḥ |
| 3. and also four-footed. | atho catuṣpādāḥ |
| 3. Verily (they serve) to obtain cattle. | paśūnām evāptyai |

The variant with fivefold cattle, which was applied to *uktha* and cattle, is also used for the relation between *chandoma* and cattle.⁴⁹

- | | |
|--|----------------------|
| 1. The Chandomas are cattle. | paśavo vai chandomāḥ |
| 2. Cattle are fivefold. | pāñktāḥ paśavaḥ |
| 3. Verily (they serve) to obtain cattle. | paśūnām evāptyai |

⁴⁵ Hillebrandt, 1897, p. 157.

⁴⁶ KB 21.6.19 *brahmaṇaiva tat paśūn ubhayataḥ pariḡrhyātman dadhate*.

⁴⁷ See, p. 137.

⁴⁸ KB 26.5.28, 29.8.13 and 30.8.6.

⁴⁹ KB 26.8.24, 26.13.45, 29.8.9 and 30.8.2&10&14.

This variant of the formula is triggered by the fact that something in the recitation can be divided into five parts. In 26.14.41, it is instead double *padas* that are recited and then another sort of reasoning is used, viz. that which links the number two with man (men have two legs) and as *chandoma* is connected to cattle, the *yajamānas* are placed above cattle.

KB 26.14.40–44 anvahaṃ dvipadāḥ śasyante. paśavo vai chandomāḥ. yajamānacchandasaṃ dvipadāḥ. adhiṣṭhāyām eva tat paśūnām yajamānān dadhāti. adhīva vai paśūn puruṣas tiṣṭhaty adhīva vai paśūn puruṣas tiṣṭhati. [Day by day] (the verses) of two Padas are recited; the Chandomas are cattle; (the verses) with two Padas are the metre of the sacrificer; verily thus he places the sacrificers in the overlordship of cattle; man stands over cattle as it were [— man stands over cattle as it were].⁵⁰

The tendency for the correspondence between *chandoma* and cattle to be incorporated into formulas, consisting of two or three premises and a conclusion, is thus present in both AiB and KB.

5.5.4.5 *Triṣṭubh* and strength

The metre *triṣṭubh* is connected to strength (*vīrya*) six times in AiB and fourteen times in KB. Often the almost synonymous words *bala* (might), *ojas* (force) and *indriya* (power) are mentioned in the same context as *vīrya*. *Triṣṭubh* is moreover closely connected to Indra, and together with the midday *soma*-pressing they thus have a part in the powers connected with the second social class, the warriors.

The correspondence between *Triṣṭubh* and strength (*vīrya*) is, twice in AiB (AiB 1.21.10 & 12), part of a formula with a syllogistic form of reasoning.⁵¹ First, it is mentioned that a certain recitation is composed in the *triṣṭubh* metre, a fact which triggers the statement that *triṣṭubh* is strength; and then the conclusion follows, viz. that the *yajamāna* thereby will become stronger, or that strength thus inheres in him.

⁵⁰ This translation is in some minor points different from Keith's. The reason is that the text edited by Sarma is slightly different compared with the earlier editions of KB. The first sentence has, in L. and P., the extra phrase *sarveṣu chandomeṣu* and the final sentence has in Sarma's edition the extra phrase *adhīva vai paśūn*.

⁵¹ See p. 140.

- | | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. It is in Triṣṭubh verses. | tad u traiṣṭubham |
| 2. The Triṣṭubh is strength. | vīryam vai triṣṭup |
| 3. Verily then he places strength in him. | vīryam evāsmiṃs tad dadhāti |

The correspondence is in KB also often part of a similar formulaic argumentation. The main difference is that the correspondence there is between *vīrya* (strength), *bala* (might, or force) and the *triṣṭubh*.⁵² First the use of *triṣṭubh* verses is mentioned, and then one more premise follows and finally the conclusion.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. (Triṣṭubh is mentioned in some way) ⁵³ | |
| 2. The Triṣṭubh is might and strength. | balam vai vīryam triṣṭup |
| 3. Verily thus he confers upon the sacrificer
might and strength. | balam eva tad vīryam
yajamāne dadhāti |

In KB there is also another formula, which exists in several variants.⁵⁴ It uses not only the correspondence between *triṣṭubh* and strength, but also that between *jagatī* and cattle.⁵⁵ The conclusion, which points out the effect, thus combines strength and cattle.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. The Triṣṭubh is might and strength. | balam vai vīryam triṣṭup |
| 2. The Jagatī is cattle. | paśavo jagatī |
| 3. Verily thus at the end he finds support
in might, in strength, and in cattle. | bala eva tad vīrye
'ntataḥ paśuṣu ca pratitiṣṭhanti ⁵⁶ |

5.6 Conclusion

The correspondences common to AiB and KB display tendencies similar to those of the correspondences of AiB that were analysed in the previous chapter. The starting-point for the common correspondences is thus also mainly in the ritual realm, and the primary comment category is *Man*.

⁵² KB 7.2.23, 8.2.29, 16.1.10, 16.4.16, 16.7.8, 16.10.34, 17.2.27, 18.9.14, 30.9.11, 30.9.23.

⁵³ The first premise differs according to what kind of recitation is in *triṣṭubh*.

⁵⁴ KB 16.2.28, 17.7.8, 18.5.5, 29.4.11.

⁵⁵ In KB 29.4.11 the correspondence between cattle and *jagatī* is, however, missing.

⁵⁶ Var. in KB 17.7.10 *pratitiṣṭhanti*, and in KB 29.4.12 *'harahaḥ pratitiṣṭhanto yanti*.

The low frequency of correspondences within the category of *Varṇa* was confirmed in the correspondences common to AiB and KB, even though the correspondence between *Bṛhaspati* and *brahman* is frequent with ten occurrences. The importance of the *varṇas* is thereby not contradicted, as evidenced by several passages that were commented upon. The social classes seem, however, not to figure frequently in a direct way in the actual correspondences, but to be represented mostly by entities in other categories, as is the case, for example, with the priestly class and the *gāyatrī* metre.

The material from KB has in some respects changed the previous conclusions about the directions of the correspondences. The two-way character of the correspondences is more pronounced in KB; the same correspondence, in the form of a nominal sentence, appears once with entity A as topic and B as comment, and with B as topic and A as comment another time. This was not the case in AiB, where the inverted correspondences were often instead incorporated in ritual myths, in which the direction is hard to interpret. Correspondences, appearing within AiB in solely one direction, occasionally have another direction in KB. Either this indicates a different way of looking upon the correspondence in KB, or it could be a consequence of the more general tendency in KB to use the directions of the correspondences more freely.

An important fact that became clear in the previous chapter was the dominance of the category Man as comment, and the prominent place the breaths have within this category. The further analysis has demonstrated that this was not restricted to AiB, but that KB and AiB share an amount of correspondences ending in the breaths of man. Chapter 6 will analyse these correspondences, and the scope of the analysis will be extended to include *brāhmaṇas* outside the *ṛgvedic brāhmaṇas*; moreover, references will be made to some relevant *upaniṣad* passages.

An exceptionally high number of correspondences are present within the sections, in both AiB and KB, which comment upon the *sattra* sacrifices, especially the *dvādaśāha* (or more precisely the *navarātra*). The basis of this system can also be found in other contexts within the *brāhmaṇas*, but the detailed structuring of *rūpas* to the *navarātra* days seems to be a special feature of the *ṛgvedic brāhmaṇas*.

In the last section of this chapter, the most frequent correspondences were discussed according to how they were used in the texts. One basic division is into two groups, as was already clear in the analysis of AiB. The first group consists of well-established correspondences that can be used in any context, often in the same form. The majority of these involve the metres, which are used in the whole ritual by the *hotṛ* for his recitations. Thus, in AiB and KB, which are *ṛgvedic brāhmaṇas*, the metres tend to get into focus in nearly all ritual discourses. The second group is made up of correspondences that are well established, but involve entities used only in a small portion of the ritual. Hence, they are concentrated in the section which comments on that particular ritual segment.

A special characteristic of several of the highly frequent correspondences is that they are often part of formulas that use forms of syllogistic reasoning. The formulas seem to be sometimes independent of the entity commented upon, in the sense that the formula could be used with several different entities — in other words, in the formula one variable is supplied by the context. However, a special characteristic is often necessary for triggering the formula. It could be that five entities should be present in some way, e.g. that five verses are recited, for the activation of the formula. An example of this is the formula based upon the fivefold cattle.

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| 1. X [is] cattle. | paśavo vai X |
| 2. Cattle are fivefold. | pāṅktāḥ paśavaḥ |
| 3. It [leads] to the obtaining of cattle. | paśūnām evāptyai |

To conclude, the analysis of the material shared between AiB and KB has, in some respects, confirmed the conclusions that were based solely on AiB, and in other respects adjusted them. Not all of these points can be analysed in detail in this study, but as one of the most interesting features of the correspondence system is its focus upon the vital principles — the so-called breaths of the human person — this aspect will be dealt with more extensively in the next chapter. The material will naturally be the two *ṛgvedic brāhmaṇas*, but also other *brāhmaṇa* texts will be used.

The Vital Powers

6.1 The breaths and the system of ritual correspondences

One of the most conspicuous features of the correspondence system, both in AiB and KB, is the high number of correspondences within the category of Man — a fact that is partly due to the frequent use of the vital powers, the so-called breaths, in the correspondences. These breaths, therefore, according to the *brāhmaṇa* world-view, are intrinsically connected to the efficacy of sacrifice. To gain a more profound understanding of the Vedic conceptions of sacrificial efficacy, we thus have to look more carefully at the correspondences of the vital powers.

The importance of breath, and of the vital powers classified under that notion, is also a characteristic of the later parts of the Vedic corpus, viz. the *āraṇyakas* and the *upaniṣads*.¹ An analysis of the correspondences involving *prāṇa* could therefore be helpful in the study of the development of the Vedic world-view from *brāhmaṇas* to *upaniṣads*.²

Prāṇa (breath) and *prāṇāḥ* (breaths) are, however, ambivalent notions in the Vedic texts, and the nature of the different breaths has been disputed among Indologists. *Prāṇa* signifies both a special breath and the set of five breaths: *prāṇa* (exhalation), *apāna* (inhalation), *udāna* (inhalation, up-breathing), *vyāna* (breath between inhalation and exhalation, air diffused in

¹ See e.g. CU 5.1, BU 1.3. *The Early Upaniṣads*, 1998, p. 22f; Keith, 1925, p. 519; Connolly, 1992, chs. 1 and 2. For a discussion of the *upaniṣad* passages which refer to the *prāṇāgnihotra*, see JB, 1973, pp. 265–292.

² See e.g. Blezer, 1992, who, however, mainly concentrates on *prāṇa* in the BU, and the transitory stages in the later parts of the ŚB.

the body) and *samāna* (concentrated breath).³ These breath terms appear sometimes all five together, or as a set of four or three breaths (e.g. *prāṇa*, *apāna*, *udāna*), or as pairs (*prāṇāpāna*, *prāṇodāna*), or only one breath is mentioned (mostly *prāṇa*).

Prāṇa (-āḥ) is, moreover, a term for the vital functions of the human body, such as breath (*prāṇa*), mind (*manas*), sight⁴ (*cakṣus*), hearing (*śrotra*) and speech (*vāc*).⁵

The breaths could also have functions more akin to those in the later *āyurvedic* system, viz. as being operative in different parts of the body and connected with bodily activities such as excretion.⁶

Finally, *prāṇa* could mean breath in the sense of life, and consequently it can signify the human soul that animates the body.⁷

³ For a passage in which all five breaths are mentioned together, see ŚB 8.1.3.6. The translations of *prāṇa* as exhalation and *apāna* as inhalation are chosen here on the basis of Bodewitz's study (Bodewitz, 1986). Many of the older interpretations, however, reversed these functions; see e.g. Brown, George, 1990 (reprint of an article from 1919), but also more recently this view has been adhered to by Zysk, 1993, even though he considers the question as not finally decided. For a selection of scholarly works on *prāṇa* and *prāṇāḥ*, see Zysk, 1993, p. 198, footnote 1. My decision to interpret *prāṇa* as exhalation is primarily motivated by the analogy of forward motion that is of importance in the *brāhmaṇa* correspondences.

⁴ Keith consistently translates *cakṣus* as eye and *śrotra* as ear, but in this context they probably refer primarily — as in the *upaniṣads*, which Olivelle, in the introduction to his translation of the principal *upaniṣads*, has pointed out (*The Early Upaniṣads*, 1998, p. 22) — to the senses (i.e. seeing and hearing) and not to the physical sense organs.

⁵ The number of vital functions varies in different contexts; KB 7.12.8, for example, mentions the number nine without, however, specifying the individual breaths. See also ŚB, 1963, part 1, p. 19f., note 2.

⁶ E.g. AiB 1.20.4. For a short summary of the *āyurveda* doctrine of the breaths, see Zysk, 1993, pp. 206–208.

⁷ The original meaning of *ātman*, according to Oldenberg, 1915, p. 52ff, 1919, p. 86, was certainly breath. See also Keith, 1925, Vol. 2, p. 450ff. Nevertheless, Mayrhofer (1986, p. 165) rejects the etymological connection with Germanic *atmen*. Bodewitz also downplays the connection between *ātman* and *prāṇa* (Bodewitz, “Vedic Conceptions of the Soul”, p. 6). For a short discussion of *prāṇa* and *ātman* in the *saṃhitās* and *brāhmaṇas*, see Connolly, 1992, pp. 23–37. The connection between breath and soul is a nearly universal feature. For a comparative perspective focused upon the rabbinic literature, see Kosman, 1988.

In this context we cannot give a detailed exposition and argumentation regarding the different senses of the breath terms. Instead the primary task will be to single out the correspondences that involve *prāṇa* and to analyse how they are used. The question whether these correspondences can be found outside the *ṛgvedic śākhās*, i.e. in other *brāhmaṇas* and *saṃhitās*, will also be addressed.⁸

The study of the function of the breaths in the correspondence system is, however, not complete without the consideration of the ‘*ad hoc*’ correspondences, i.e. those that appear in AiB, and not at all in KB. It is, therefore, important to see how often *ad hoc* correspondences involving breath are made and whether there are any patterns in their use. The analysis of the *ad hoc* correspondences will be focused primarily upon AiB, chiefly in order to delimit the material, but also because there could be special patterns in one *brāhmaṇa* text that are not present in the others. The designation of these correspondences as *ad hoc* will, however, be evaluated against other Vedic texts, a procedure that will indicate if they really are *ad hoc*, or merely of low frequency in the *ṛgvedic brāhmaṇas*.

6.2 The correspondences of breath common to AiB and KB

6.2.1 Vāyu

The correspondence between breath and the wind god Vāyu occurs in both AiB and KB, and it has already been discussed in the two previous chapters, but there the issue was the direction of the correspondence. The sense of *prāṇa* in this correspondence is clearly the respiration process, perhaps with a focus upon exhalation, which bears a likeness to the blowing wind. If, however, we focus upon the specific passages and their textual contexts, other facets of *prāṇa* also become manifest. In the first example (AiB 2.26.2), another correspondence common to the two *brāhmaṇa* texts is present, namely that between the libations for the pairs of gods and the breaths. The correspondence is spelled out in the first line of the *khaṇḍa* (*te vā ete prāṇā eva yad dvidevatyāḥ*), and then the major

⁸ The texts quoted from, beside the *ṛgvedic brāhmaṇas*, are ṚV, AV, the black YV *saṃhitās*, TB, ŚB, PB, JB, and the *upaniṣads* BU, AU and CU.

gods of the Vedic pantheon are correlated, through the libations directed to them, with the different ‘breaths’: Indra with speech (*vāc*), Vāyu with breath (*prāṇa*), Mitra with sight (*caḥṣus*), Varuṇa with the mind (*manas*), and the Aśvins with the self (*ātman*) and hearing (*śrotra*). *Prāṇāḥ* (i.e. *prāṇa* in plural), in this context, thus denote the vital powers of man, in which also, surprisingly, *ātman* is included, and the set of five powers is thereby extended to six. This is perhaps done because pairs cannot yield an odd number, but *ātman* is nevertheless considered here as one of the *prāṇāḥ*. We have, then, in this passage, two meanings of *prāṇa*: first, as a term (*prāṇāḥ*) for the vital powers of man, and, second, in a more restricted sense, as one of the vital powers, viz. the breathing (*prāṇa*).

In KB, there is a parallel passage (KB 13.4) that also deals with the libations to the pairs of gods. There are, however, some minor differences: the pair Mitra–Varuṇa has only one correspondence, viz. that to sight (*caḥṣus*). The Aśvins, in a similar way, are only connected to hearing (*śrotra*). Thus, two entities are excluded: the mind (*manas*) and the self (*ātman*).⁹ Nevertheless, *Ātman* is also present in this context, but before the enumeration of the correspondences to the pairs of gods, i.e. in the same sentence in which the correspondence between the libations to the pairs of gods in general and the breaths is expressed. However, the correspondence involving *ātman* in this passage (KB 13.4.14) is between the sacrificial cakes (*puroḷāśā*) and *ātman*: *ātmā vai yajamānasya puroḷāśāḥ*, “The cakes are the body [self] of the sacrificer.”¹⁰

The correspondence between Vāyu and breath is also, in AiB 3.2 and 3.3, a part of a longer discourse on the vital powers. The first *khaṇḍa* describes the perfection of certain bodily functions which is achieved through the *praiṅga* recitation, which is made up of seven parts directed to different

⁹ In KB 8.7.20 the same set of four vital powers is given (i.e. *prāṇa*, *vāc*, *caḥṣus*, and *śrotra*) albeit in a different context.

¹⁰ Although *ātman* is translated, in this context, as body, the meaning of self should not be considered as absent, as Olivelle points out (*The Early Upaniṣads*, 1998, p. 487), in the context of the *upaniṣads*: “...the two closely related meanings of ‘body’ and ‘self’ (as the essential core of a human being) are present whenever the term *ātman* is used, even though the one or the other meaning may occupy the foreground within a particular context.” Furthermore, Bodewitz writes: “In the Brāhmaṇas *ātman* is the self or oneself in opposition to everything else or even the body or trunk in distinction to the members of the body.” (Bodewitz, “Vedic Conceptions of the Soul”, p. 6.)

gods, or pairs of gods.¹¹ The gods are seven if one counts the pairs of gods as units (i.e. as one deity), which has the consequence that Mitra–Varuṇa and Indra–Vāyu are considered as two gods, not as four.¹² The second *khaṇḍa* describes how the *hotṛ* should manipulate the recitation of the *praūga śāstra*, if he desires to deprive the *yajamāna* of the corresponding bodily parts and functions. This is possible because, as the *brāhmaṇa* declares, the *praūga* is connected in a special way to the self (*ātman*).

AiB 3.2.3 tad dha vai yajamānasyādhyātmatamam ivokthaṃ yat praūgam

Now the Praūga is [in a way the hymn that is most related to the self of the sacrificer.]¹³

Thus, through making minor changes in a part of the recitation, which is directed to a specific god, e.g. Vāyu, the *hotṛ* can take away the corresponding vital power from the *yajamāna*, that is, in this case: breath.

1. Breath (*prāṇa*) — Vāyu¹⁴
2. Exhalation and inhalation (*prāṇāpānau*) — Indra-Vāyu
3. Seeing (*cakṣus*) — Mitra–Varuṇa
4. Hearing (*śrotra*) — The Aśvins
5. Strength (*vīrya*) — Indra
6. The limbs (*aṅga*) — The All-gods
7. Speech (*vāc*) — Sarasvatī¹⁵

The discussion of the *praūga* passage in AiB has indicated that the vital powers (*prāṇāḥ*), at least in AiB, do not make up a fixed category, but that all the powers relating to the functions of the body and the ‘soul’ could be

¹¹ For the ritual context and a translation of the whole litany, see Caland, 1906–07, pp. 239–241.

¹² See Gonda, 1976, p. 9.

¹³ The translation by Keith is as follows: “Now the Praūga is the most related to the self of the litanies for the sacrificer as it were.” Haug translates it as: “The Pra-uga Shastra is, as it were, most intimately connected with the sacrificer”.

¹⁴ It seems that Keith mistranslated 3.2.4 *yad vāyavyaṃ śamsati* as “In that he recites (a triplet) to Viṣṇu...” The god receiving the recitation is clearly not Viṣṇu but Vāyu, at least according to the editions of Aufrecht (AiB, 1879), Haug (AiB, 1863) and Satyavrata Sāmaśramī (AiB, 1895–1906).

¹⁵ For an explanation of the reasons (esp. inspired thoughts, *dhī*) behind this correspondence, see Ludvik, 2000.

included. It has also become apparent that references to *ātman* are, in some way or other, present in the textual context of these vital powers.

In the passage of KB (14.5) which is devoted to the *praüga*, no list of deities and their corresponding vital powers (see above) is given.¹⁶ The *ātman* of the sacrificer is mentioned, but it is instead correlated to the preceding *ājya śāstra*. The *praüga* is, nevertheless, connected in a general way to the breaths and therefore enables the sacrificer both to live a good life on earth and to gain immortality in heaven. Vāyu in this context is connected to both exhalation (*prāṇa*), and inhalation (*apāna*).

KB 14.5.28–29 vāyur agregās tat prāṇarūpam. vāyavā tad apānasya rūpam

‘Vāyu proceeding in front’ is the symbol of expiration; ‘O Vāyu’ is the symbol of inspiration.¹⁷

In the other occurrences of the correspondence between Vāyu and breath, it is mostly part of a short argumentation following upon the actualisation of Vāyu, e.g. through a recitation. The argumentation consists, for the most part, of two sentences: one which states the correspondence between Vāyu and breath, and one which infers some result appropriate for the context, e.g. that the breaths are thereby bestowed upon the *yajamāna*.

If we widen the textual horizon to the whole of the Vedic corpus, the picture gained from the comparison between the two *ṛgvedic brāhmaṇas* is confirmed with an abundance of material.¹⁸ The connection between wind and breath is present from ṚV onwards, and it occupies an important place in the Vedic world-view in all its stages.¹⁹ In AV, an entire hymn praises breath (*prāṇa*) as the highest principle, and correlates it with, among other things, the wind. In this context, however, it is not Vāyu, but another wind god, Vāta, that is mentioned.²⁰

¹⁶ The two correspondences given are those to Vāyu (breath) and Sarasvatī (speech).

¹⁷ For the place of the *purorucs* in the *praüga* recitation, see ĀŚ 5.10 and AiB, 1863, Vol. 2, p. 158f.

¹⁸ This correlation is, however, not unique to the Vedic religion, but is found in several other religious traditions as well. For a survey of the notion of ‘breath’ in Hindu, Buddhist, Chinese, Jewish, Greek, Christian and Islamic sources, see Findly, 1987.

¹⁹ For passages in ṚV, see Zysk, 1993, p. 199.

²⁰ According to Keith, 1925, Vol. 1, p. 139f., the primary distinction between Vāyu and Vāta is that the former is more anthropomorphic. In AiB 2.6.13, there is moreover a correspondence between the breath (*prāṇa*) of the victim (*paśu*) and the wind (*vāta*).

AV 11.6.15 (11.4.15)²¹ prāṇam āhur mātariśvānam vāto ha prāṇa ucyate. prāṇe ha bhūtaṃ bhavyaṃ ca prāṇe sarvaṃ pratiṣṭhitam

Breath they call Mātariśvan, breath is called the wind; in breath what has been and what will be, in breath is all established.²²

In the earliest part of the Vedic prose, the black *yajurveda sāmhitās*, the connection between Vāyu and breath is referred to several times, e.g. in TS 2.1.1.1, 3.3.5.1; MS 2.5.1. Also in ŚB, it is mentioned frequently, e.g. in one of the numerous tales about the creation performed by Prajāpati.

ŚB 7.1.2.5 sa yo 'smāt prāṇo madhyata udakrāmat. ayam eva sa vāyur yo 'yaṃ pavate²³

Now the vital air which went out from within him is no other than the wind that blows yonder.²⁴

The connection between wind and breath is also of importance in the speculations of the *upaniṣads*, for example in Chāndogya Upaniṣad 4.3.4.²⁵

CU 4.3.4 tau vā etau dvau saṃvargau. vāyur eva deveṣu prāṇaḥ prāṇeṣu.

These, then, are the two gatherers — the wind among the deities and the breath among the vital functions.²⁶

²¹ The Sanskrit text is taken from the edition of Vishva Bandhu (AV, 1960–62) which uses another division of the text than the translation by Whitney (AV, 1905). The numbers outside the parenthesis are according to the edition of Vishva Bandhu, and those inside are according to the translation of Whitney.

²² Translation by Whitney (AV, 1905, p. 633).

²³ The text is from the *Mādhyandīna* recension, edited by Albrecht Weber 1849 (ŚB, 1964), and this edition will henceforth be used. For other passages that mention the relation of Vāyu to breath, see e.g. ŚB 4.4.1.15; 4.5.2.5; 6.2.2.6–7.

²⁴ ŚB, 1963, part 3, p. 312. All the translations from ŚB will, henceforth, be taken from Eggeling's translation, unless stated otherwise. The translation of *ayam* as 'yonder' seems, however, to be misleading, esp. as the contrast with *asau*, which is used in the next sentence, is thereby concealed.

²⁵ See furthermore e.g. BU 1.3.13, 1.5.22, 3.2.13, AU 1.1.4, 1.2.4. See also Connolly, 1992, pp. 58–67 for a collection of *upaniṣad* text passages dealing with *prāṇa* as the ultimate principle.

²⁶ Sanskrit text and translation, *The Early Upaniṣads*, 1998, p. 217. All subsequent *upaniṣad* passages and translations will be from the same source, unless otherwise indicated.

6.2.2 Savitr̥

Another god who is connected to breath is Savitr̥. This correspondence is given without any explanation (*prāṇo vai savitā*), and seems therefore to be well established. The contexts in AiB in which this correspondence occurs are the commentary upon the *pravargya* sacrifice and the discussion of the libation dedicated to Savitr̥ at the third *soma*-pressing. In KB, the correspondence is also part of the commentary of the *sāvitragraha*, which is also the case in ŚB where this correspondence is mentioned six times. In ŚB 4.4.1.1 the connection between Savitr̥ and the mind is mentioned, and the correspondence between Savitr̥ and breath is then given, but also an explanation of how the libation to Savitr̥ works in combination with the *upāṃśu* and *antaryāma* libations (see below) in placing the breaths in the sacrificial man.²⁷ One of the reasons for the connection between Savitr̥ and breath could thus be the close link between the libation to Savitr̥ and the *upāṃśu* and *antaryāma* libations, which contain explicit references to breath in their accompanying recitations.²⁸

6.2.3 The *upāṃśu* and *antaryāma* libations

The two *soma* libations, *upāṃśu* and *antaryāma* — which are performed in the morning of the *soma*-pressing day and which immediately precede the libations to the pairs of gods — are also connected to breath.²⁹ In the course of their performance, explicit references are made to inhalation and exhalation, and, moreover, actual ritual in- and out-breathings accompany the recitations.³⁰ The two libations are often considered as a pair (*upāṃśvantaryāmau*) and are, therefore, correlated with the pair of breathings called *prāṇāpānau*, i.e. exhalation and inhalation; but the libations are also, in KB, correlated on an individual basis with their respective breath.

²⁷ According to the commentary of Eggeling; ŚB, 1963, Vol. 26, p. 357, footnote 1.

²⁸ The *sāvitragraha* is, moreover, drawn from the *antaryāmapātra*. Caland, 1906–07, p. 352f.

²⁹ For the procedure of these libations see Caland, 1906–07, pp. 155–157, 160–162; Staal, 1983, Vol. 1, p. 601.

³⁰ ŚB, 1963, part 2, p. 254, footnote 4.

In AiB 2.21, the context of the correspondence is an argumentation centred upon whether the *hotṛ* should speak before these two libations have been performed. It is there argued that if the *hotṛ* were to speak before the libations, then speech, in the shape of the thunderbolt, would destroy the breaths of the *yajamāna*, due to the connection between the libations and the breaths of the *yajamāna*. If, however, speech, i.e. the recitation, is used at the proper time, the breaths are placed in the *ātman* and the *yajamāna* obtains life in its fullness (*sarvam āyuh*).³¹

In KB 11.9.8, the context is similar: the morning litany (*prātaranuvāka*) is connected to speech, and the *upāṃśu* and *antaryāma* libations to inhalation (*apāna*) and exhalation (*prāṇa*). The argumentation is, therefore, that one should not speak during the period between the morning litany and the libations, since speech and the two breaths would then be separated.³²

The *upāṃśu* and *antaryāma* libations are accompanied by clear references to breath in the ritual, a fact which makes it probable that their correspondences to exhalation and inhalation are mentioned in other texts than the *ṛgvedic brāhmaṇas*. In the ṚV and AV, however, there are no references to these correspondences, while in the TS the two libations together with the pressing-stones, which are used for extracting the *soma* liquid, are correlated, respectively, with the three breaths: *prāṇa*, *apāna* and *vyāna*.³³

TS 6.4.6 *prāṇāpānau vā etau yad upāṃśvantaryāmau vyāna upāṃśusavanaḥ*

The Upāṃśu and Antaryāma [libations] are expiration and inspiration, the Upāṃśu pressing-(stone) is cross-breathing.³⁴

In ŚB the *antaryāma* is instead correlated with *udāna*.

³¹ It seems that Keith does not translate the correspondence between *ātman* and the stones used for extracting the *soma* juice necessary for the *upāṃśu* libation (i.e. AiB 2.21.4 *ātmā vā upāṃśusavanaḥ*).

³² Moreover, in KB 12.5, the focus is first on the actual exhalation and inhalation that accompany the ritual pouring of the libations, and, secondly, upon the issue whether one should offer the libations before and after sunrise, or both of them before or after sunrise.

³³ See also TB 1.5.4.1&2.

³⁴ The Sanskrit text is from Weber's edition (TS, 1872) and the translation from Keith, 1914. See also in the other black *yajurvedic saṃhitās*, MS 4.5.5–6; KS 27.1–2.

ŚB 4.1.1.1–2.27 *prāṇo ha vā asyopāṃśuḥ. vyāna upāṃśusavana udāna evāntaryāmaḥ*

The Upāṃśu (graha), forsooth, is the out-breathing of the Sacrifice, the Upāṃśu-savana (press-stone) the through-breathing, and the Antaryāma (graha) the in-breathing.

In spite of the explicit mentioning of breath in the performance of these libations, the correspondences to breath do not occur in the three main *sāmaveda brāhmaṇas*, viz. PB, ŚB and JB.³⁵

6.2.4 Vanaspati

The correspondence between the lord of the forest (*vanaspati*), i.e. the sacrificial post, and breath is located, in AiB and KB, within the sections dealing with the animal sacrifice.³⁶ In AiB 2.4, the *āprī* verses, which are recited in the beginning of the animal sacrifice, are given their correspondences and notably many of these are to the breaths.³⁷

1. The kindling sticks (*samidh*) — The breaths (*prāṇāḥ*)
- 2¹. Tanūnapāt — The breath (*prāṇa*)
- 2². Narāśaṃsa — Offspring (*prajā*) and speech (*vāc*)³⁸
3. The sacrificial food (*iḍ*) — Food (*anna*)
4. The strew (*barhis*) — Cattle (*paśu*)
5. The doors (*dur*) — Rain (*vṛṣṭi*)
6. Dawn and night (*uśāsānaktā*) — Day and night (*ahorātre*)
7. The divine *hotṛs* (*daivyā hotārā*)³⁹ — Exhalation and inhalation (*prāṇāpānau*)

³⁵ There are, however, short references to the libations in ŚB 3.8.19 and PB 6.6.5.

³⁶ Vanaspati, which lit. means ‘lord of the forest’, has a couple of different meanings; the primary meaning is ‘tree’. Another important meaning of *vanaspati* is the *soma* plant: see ŚB 5.3.3.4. In the context of the animal sacrifice, *vanaspati* is the tree that is used as the sacrificial post, to which the victim is tied. See Macdonell, 1958, Vol. 2, p. 241.

³⁷ For the recitation and the ritual context of the *āprī* verses, see Schwab, 1886, p. 90–96. In AiB 2.10, the correspondence between *vanaspati* and the breaths (N.B. plural in this case) is also a commentary on a verse from an *āprī* hymn, viz. ṚV 10.70.10.

³⁸ *Narāśaṃsa* is, according to Keith (AiB, 1920, p. 137, footnote 2; Keith, 1925, p. 165), only an option replacing *tanūnapāt* for certain families of priests.

³⁹ For a discussion of the divine *hotṛs* in a study analysing the role and significance of the *maitrāvaruṇa* priest, see Minkowski, 1991, pp. 129–139.

8. The three goddesses (Sarasvatī, Bhāratī, Iḍā or Iḷā)
— Exhalation, inhalation and cross-breathing (*prāṇa*, *apāna*, *vyāna*)
9. Tvaṣṭṛ — speech (*vāc*)
10. The lord of the forest (*vanaspati*) — Breath (*prāṇa*)
11. The calls of Hail (*svāhākṛti*) — Support (*pratiṣṭhā*)

In KB, this elaborate linking of the *āpri* verses is not made, but instead the more general connection between the verses and the self is expressed.

KB 10.6.16–17 āpriḥhir āpriṇāti. sarveṇa ha vā eṣa ātmanā sarveṇa manasā yajñam
saṃbharate yo yajate

He invokes with the *Āpri* verses; with the whole self, with the whole mind,
he gathers together the sacrifice, who sacrifices.

Moreover, in KB 12.9, the relation between *ātman* (the body, and/or the self) and the breath is once more actualised through *vanaspati*. The victim is there correlated with *ātman* and *vanaspati* with breath. *Vanaspatis* should, therefore, be invited to the sacrifice; breath would otherwise be separated from *ātman*, a fate that, inevitably, leads to death.

Vanaspatis is referred to in the *āpri* hymns of the RV,⁴⁰ but in that context, breath is not mentioned, which makes it probable that the correspondence of Vanaspati and breath is an invention of the *brāhmaṇa* period. However, the correspondence is not present in the black yajurvedic *saṃhitās*. Moreover, in the commentaries of the *āpri* hymns and in the other parts of the ŚB, no mention of the correspondence of Vanaspati and breath is made, while the relation between the eleven fore-offerings (which are accompanied by the *āpri* hymns) and breath is given.

ŚB 3.8.1.3 te vā eta ekādaśa prayājā bhavanti. daśa vā ime puruṣe prāṇā ātmaikādaśo
yasminn ete prāṇāḥ pratiṣṭhitā etāvān vai puruṣas tad asya sarvam ātmānam
āpyāyayanti

Now there are here eleven fore-offerings; for here in man there are ten vital
airs, and the eleventh is the self wherein those vital airs are contained; this
is the whole man; thus they fill his whole self.

⁴⁰ RV 1.13.11; 1.142.11; 2.3.10; 3.4.10; 5.5.10; 7.2.10; 9.5.10; 10.70.10; 10.110.10;
and also AV 8.12.1; 15.6.2; 19.9.14.

6.2.5 The fore-offerings

Also the fore-offerings (*prayājāḥ*) are connected to the breaths (*prāṇāḥ*) in both AiB and KB. In AiB 1.11.3, the correspondence is part of an argumentation devoted to the question whether the introductory sacrifice (*prāyaṇīya iṣṭi*) should be performed with both fore- and after-offerings. The fore-offerings, according to AiB, are connected to the breaths and the after-offerings to offspring; the omission of one of these offerings therefore deprives the *yajamāna* of either his breaths or his offspring.⁴¹

In KB (7.2.1 and 10.6.7) the fore-offerings are also connected to the breaths, but the after-offerings (*anuyājāḥ*), are instead correlated with the inhalations (*āpānāḥ*).⁴² The plural of *apāna* is here, probably, meant to correspond to the plural form of the after-offerings, and, in a similar vein, we should therefore translate *prāṇāḥ*, in this context as exhalations. The resemblance between the forward motion in time initiated by the fore-offerings and the act of breathing forth seems to be the analogy lying behind this correspondence. The conclusion of the sacrifice — which, in this case, is imbedded in a larger sacrifice — is thus, according to the same principle, similar to the inhalation of air. We can therefore conclude that, in this context, it is not the group of vital functions that is in focus, even though breath is in plural; it is instead the releasing and returning movement of air in the respiratory process.

In ŚB, the fore-offerings and the after-offerings are linked to exhalation (*prāṇa*) and inhalation (*apāna*), due (as in KB) to the forward direction of the fore-offerings (*pra-*) and the reversed direction of the after-offerings.⁴³

⁴¹ Cf. TS 6.1.5; KS 23.9; KKS 36.6 where the fore-offerings are connected to the self and the after-offerings to offspring.

⁴² The same correspondences are made in KS 12.2. Cf. TS 6.3.11, which connects the after-offerings to both inhalation and exhalation, through the mediation of the speckled butter, *yat pṛsadājyenā 'nūyājān yajati prāṇāpānāv eva paśuṣu dadhāti*.

⁴³ The five fore-offerings are also in another passage (ŚB 11.2.6.4) connected to the senses, or rather to the breaths in the head. For a correspondence to nine breaths, see MS 1.10.8, KS 36.2, and ten breaths with *ātman* as the eleventh MS 3.9.8.

ŚB 11.2.7.27 *prāṇā vai prayājāḥ. apānā anuyājās tasmāt prayājāḥ prāṅco hūyante tad dhi prāṇārūpaṃ pratyāṅco 'nuyājās tad apānarūpaṃ*

The fore-offerings, indeed, are the exhalations, and the after-offerings the inhalations: wherefore the fore-offerings are poured out in a forward direction, for that is the form of the exhalation; and the after-offerings (are poured out) in a backward direction, for that is the form of the inhalation.⁴⁴

6.2.6 The introductory and concluding sacrifices

The complementary motions (forward and back) are also present in the correspondence between the pair of rites called the introductory (*prāyaṇīyā*) and concluding sacrifice (*udayanīyā iṣṭi*), and the pair of exhalation and inhalation. However, depending upon the name *udayanīyā*, the breath of inhalation is here not called *apāna*, but instead *udāna*.⁴⁵ In AiB 1.7, the connection to the breaths is further elaborated through the commentary that the *hotṛ* is common (*samāna*), a word which is also the name of one of the five breaths.⁴⁶ The same play on the word *samāna* is present in KB 7.7, but there it is only the pair of breaths (*prāṇodānau*) that are *samāna*.⁴⁷

In ŚB, the symmetry of the introductory and concluding sacrifices is not expressed through the correspondence to exhalation and inhalation, but through a correspondence to the two arms of the sacrifice (ŚB 3.4.1.1). However, the words *prāyaṇīya* and *udayanīya* are — in the context of the introductory and concluding *atirātra* of a *sattra* — connected to inhalation and exhalation.⁴⁸

⁴⁴ This translation deviates from Eggeling's only in the translation of *prāṇa* as exhalation and *apāna* as inhalation. Eggeling gives 'out-breathing' and 'off-breathing', which fails to render the analogy of the breaths and the offerings in a clear way. For more passages that link the fore-offerings to the breaths, see KKS 41.7; KS 26.9.

⁴⁵ Keith translates *udāna* in this context as 'out-breathing' and *prāṇa* as 'expiration', which thus means that Keith interprets them as not being complementary, but denoting the same act of breathing. Cf. Bodewitz, 1986, p. 335.

⁴⁶ The thought behind this statement is probably that the introductory and concluding sacrifices are alike (*samāna*), and that the *hotṛ* officiates at both rituals (i.e. he is common *samāna*).

⁴⁷ KB 7.7.5 *samānau hīmau prāṇodānau*.

⁴⁸ ŚB 12.2.4.1. Cf. TS 7.5.1.3 and PB 23.1.3. See also KS 34.6, which correlates the *udayanīya* to *apāna*. In TS 7.3.3.1, two sets of breaths are mentioned: *prāṇa*, *apāna*, *udāna*, and *prāṇa*, *apāna*, *vyāna*, both of which are linked to three *atirātras*.

6.2.7 The offerings to the seasons

The correspondence between the offerings to the seasons (*ṛtuyāja*)⁴⁹ and breath is mentioned in the first sentence of both AiB 2.29 and KB 13.7 as a proclamation of the discourse topic of the *khaṇḍas*. In both these texts, the same lines of reasoning are then developed: three different recitations performed in the *ṛtuyāja* are correlated, respectively, with *prāṇa*, *apāna* and *vyāna*, and these breaths are, therefore, bestowed upon the sacrificer through the *ṛtuyāja*. After this argumentation, the *khaṇḍas* develops another recurrent theme, viz. the importance of the continuity of the breaths and the belief that this continuity should not be broken by some ritual action or exclamation.

The correspondence between the *ṛtuyāja* and breath seems to be a special characteristic of the *ṛgveda brāhmaṇas*; in the other *brāhmaṇas* and *saṃhitās* other themes are developed.⁵⁰

6.2.8 Vālakhilya

In 5.15 of the AiB, the collection of hymns called *vālakhilya* (or *vālakhilyāḥ*) is correlated to the breaths. This is part of a number of correspondences that mainly connect recitations with the self of the *yajamāna*. The correspondences are between the *nābhānediṣṭha* and seed (*retas*); *vālakhilya* and the breaths; *vṛṣākapi* and the body/self (*ātman*); and, finally, between the *evayāmarut* and support (*pratiṣṭhā*). If one of these recitations were omitted, then the corresponding entity would also be removed.⁵¹

In KB (30.6), the context is similar: the *vālakhilyas* are connected to the breaths, and both the strophe (*stotriya*) and the antistrophe (*anurūpa*) to the

⁴⁹ For the details of the *ṛtugrahas* which takes place at the morning *soma* pressing, see Caland, 1906–07, pp. 224–229.

⁵⁰ See TS 6.5.3; MS 4.6.7; KS 28.2. In ŚB 4.3.1.22–23, however, the *aindrāgno grahaḥ* is correlated to exhalation and inhalation: the effect ‘this all’ (*idaṃ sarvam*) generated by the *ṛtugrahas* becomes thereby established on these breaths.

⁵¹ There is a parallel passage in PB 20.9.2. The *nābhānediṣṭha* is there connected to seed, and *evayāmarut* to support, i.e. as in AiB, but the *vālakhilyas* are in PB instead correlated to cattle and the *vṛṣākapi* is presented as active in shaping the form of cattle, i.e. during their embryonic existence.

body (*ātman*). Through the continuity in the recitation (the *vāḷakhilyas* coming after the strophe and the antistrophe) the breaths are not separated from the body.⁵²

In ŚB 8.3.4.1, the *vāḷakhilyas* are also connected to the breaths, i.e. the vital powers, but there *vāḷakhilya* does not denote the collection of *ṛgvedic* hymns by that name, but instead bricks numbered 65–78 in the third layer of the great fire altar (*agnicayana*). These bricks are further correlated more specifically to seven breaths in the front and seven at the back of the body, and through the laying down of these bricks, he (i.e. the *adhvaryu*) places 14 breaths in the Agni–Prajāpati.

TS 5.3.2 mentions only seven breaths in the head, and two below, but does not make such an elaborate correlation of the individual bricks. The text nevertheless gives an explanation of why these bricks, together with other bricks of the third layer, are connected to breath. The third layer is, namely, connected to the atmosphere, and before the consecration of the individual bricks, a horse is made to sniff at a naturally perforated pebble and thereby put breath into it.⁵³ Moreover, ritual breathing is performed by the *adhvaryu* and breath is explicitly mentioned in the recitations.⁵⁴

6.3 The ‘*ad hoc*’ correspondences of the breaths in AiB

6.3.1 Introduction

There are a number of correspondences involving breath that do not appear more than once in AiB, and there are also those which are used

⁵² Furthermore, an explanation of the correspondence is given, based on the meaning of *vāḷakhilya*: *yad vā urvarayor asaṃbhinnāṃ bhavati. khila iti vai tam ācakṣate. vālamātrā u heme prāṇā asaṃbhinnāḥ. tad yad asaṃbhinnāḥ. tasmād vāḷakhilyāḥ*, “That which is not in contact in two fields, they call Khila; these breaths are a hair (*vāḷa*) in breadth and are not separated; therefore are they Vāḷakhilyās.”

⁵³ For the description of the laying down of the third layer of the *agnicayana* altar, see Staal, 1983, Vol. 1, pp. 459–464. The ritual of the breathing horse is performed at the first, third and fifth layers.

⁵⁴ However, breath is not mentioned in the recitation accompanying the laying down of the *vāḷakhilya* bricks, as is done in the case of the *prāṇabhṛt* bricks, and in the recitation during the ritual of the naturally perforated pebble.

several times in AiB but not even once in KB. The following analysis will deal with these correspondences; the aim is to discern patterns in what seems to be *ad hoc* and arbitrary, and, in that way, gain insights into how the correspondences were formulated and used. The primary context, in which the correspondences will be situated and analysed, is AiB, but their status as *ad hoc* also has to be evaluated against the whole of the *brāhmaṇa* corpus. Thereby, it will be possible to determine whether their low frequency in the *ṛgvedic brāhmaṇas* is due to their having been invented in a particular textual context and thereby limited to one Vedic school. The first task, however, is to present all the correspondences in AiB that involve breath in one comprehensive list; the correspondences common to AiB and KB will thus also be included. Thereby, it will be possible to present an overall picture of the use of the breaths in the correspondences made and used in AiB.

6.3.2. List 3. The correspondences of breath in AiB *pañcikā* 1–5

ANIMALS

The Victim's (paśu) breath (*prāṇa*) — Wind *vāta* (2.6.13—1)

GODS

Āditya — Breath *prāṇa* (5.31.3—1)

Ādityas — Breaths *prāṇa* (3.29.3—1)

Agni-Soma — In- and out-breathing *prāṇāpānau* (1.8.12—1)

Bharata — Breath *prāṇa* (2.24.8—1)

Deities (*devatā*), 7 — 7 breaths in the head *śiṛṣan prāṇāḥ* (3.3.1—1)

Goddesses, three (*devī*) — Inhalation, expiration and cross-breathing *prāṇa, apāṇa, vyāṇa* (2.4.12—1)

Hotṛs, divine (*daivyā hotārā*) — Inhalation and expiration *prāṇāpānau* (2.4.11—1)

Indra-Vāyu — Expiration and inhalation *prāṇāpānau* (3.2.5, 3.3.4—2)

Jātavedas — Breath *prāṇa* (2.39.11—1)

Maruts — Breaths *prāṇa* (3.16.1—1)

Mātariśvan — Breath *prāṇa* (2.38.6—1)

Savitṛ — Breath *prāṇa* (1.19.4, 3.29.4—2)

“Seers, divine, guardians of the body, born of fervour” (*ṛṣayo daivayāśas tanūpāvānas tanvas tapojāḥ*) — Breaths *prāṇa* (2.27.5 & 6 & 7—3)

THE VITAL POWERS

Tanūnapāt — Breath *prāṇa* (2.4.5—1)

Vāyu — Breath *prāṇa* (3.3.3—1)

MAN

Breath (*prāṇa*) — Vāyu (2.26.6, 3.2.4—2), “The youth well clad” *yuvā suvāsaḥ* (2.2.30—1)

Breaths below (*prāṇāḥ avāñcaḥ*) — Seed, urine and excrements *retas, mūtra, purīṣa* (1.20.4—1)

Father (*pitṛ*) — Breath *prāṇa* (2.38.6—1)

Life (*āyus*) — Breath *prāṇa* (2.38.13—1)

Seed (*retas*) — Breath *prāṇa* (2.38.6 & 13, 3.2.4—3)

Strength (*vayas*) — Breath *prāṇa* (1.28.31—1)

METRES

Bṛhatī — Breaths *prāṇa* (3.14.2 & 2, 4.10.1—3)

Verses 9 (*pāda*) — 9 breaths *prāṇa* (1.20.1—1)

RITUAL

After-offerings (*anuyāja*) — The breaths below the head *avāñc* (1.17.14—1)

Atirātra, introductory — Forward-breathing *prāṇa* (4.14.7—1)

Concluding sacrifice (*udayanīya*) — Inhalation *udāna* (1.7.2—1)

Libations, for two deities (*dvidevatya*) — Breaths *prāṇa* (2.26.1, 2.27.1, 2.28.1 & 2 & 5, 2.30.1—6)

Libations, for two deities: Indra and Vāyu — Speech *vāc* and breath *prāṇa* (2.26.2—1)

Libations, Upamśu and Antaryāma — Expiration and inhalation *prāṇāpāna* (2.21.1—1)

Fore-offerings (*prayāja*) — Breaths *prāṇa* (1.11.3—1), Breaths in the head *śīṛṣan prāṇāḥ* (1.17.14—1)

Guest reception with seven padas (*ātithya*) — The head of sacrifice with seven breaths *śīro yajñasya* (1.17.9, 1.25.1—2)

Introductory sacrifice (*prāyaṇīya*) — Expiration *prāṇa* (1.7.2—1)

Kindling sticks (*samidh*) — Breaths *prāṇa* (2.4.4—1)

Oblation (*havis*) — Breath *prāṇa* (5.25.9—1)

Potsherds, nine (*kapāla*) — Nine breaths *prāṇa* (1.15.3—1)

Sacrifice to the seasons (*ṛtuyāja*) — Breaths *prāṇa* (2.29.1 & 6—2)

Vālakhilyāḥ — The breaths of the yajamāna *prāṇa* (5.15.3—1)

Vanaspati — Breath *prāṇa* (2.4.14, 2.10.8—2)

Vaṣaṭkāra — Expiration and inhalation *prāṇāpāna* (3.8.9—1)

THE VITAL POWERS

SATTRA

Ṣaḍaha, the third— Nine breaths and nine worlds of heaven *prāṇāḥ, svargā lokāḥ*
(4.16.3—1)

MISCELLANEOUS

‘Forward’ (*pra*) — Breath *prāṇa* (2.40.1—1)
the Holder (*yantr*) — Inhalation *apāṇa* (2.40.5—1)

Table 12. The correspondences to breath in AiB

<i>Category</i>	<i>Number of correspondences</i>
Animals	1
Gods	19
Man	10
Metres	4
Ritual	25
Sattra	1
Miscellaneous	2

The distribution of the correspondences, as displayed above, presents a somewhat different picture than the one gained through the comparison of AiB and KB. The high number of correspondences with a god, or an entity from within the ritual realm, as topic is apparent, and this fact probably reflects a will to connect the gods and the ritual to the vital powers of man. That the ritual elements are given such connections could be interpreted as caused by the desire to invest the rituals with the ability to strengthen the life of certain men, and thereby the powers necessary for their life. But why are the gods connected to the vital powers of man? Is it with the same aim, i.e. so that through the intercession of the gods, man’s vital powers can be strengthened? Or, perhaps, we have to consider the gods as parts of

the ritual realm, i.e. as parts of the mantras used. The mentioning of a god's name is, in that case, on the same level as the reference to any other entity in the sacrifice.

Another salient feature displayed in the table above is the almost total absence of correspondences to breath in the context of the *sattra* sacrifices.

6.3.3 Basic principles for the formulation of correspondences

6.3.3.1 *Analogy*

Many of the correspondences displayed in list 3 seem, at first sight, to be wholly arbitrary and invented *ad hoc* to support a special argument concerning a sacrifice, or more often a tiny detail of a sacrifice. On closer inspection, however, it is apparent that, in most cases, some fundamental principles govern the formulation and use of the correspondences. Even if a correspondence is used only once, it is often made according to a set of basic principles. The most conspicuous and most frequently used of these principles is analogy, but, as will be demonstrated below, not only similarity could be the basis of a correspondence, but also other relations. One deity has, for example, the task of protecting the bodies of the gods, and he is therefore connected to breath and the vital powers of the body. The methods used for justifying or explaining a correspondence must, however, not lead us to ignore the possibility that certain correspondences could in fact be arbitrary, having been made to support reasoning that was otherwise not persuasive.

If two objects have some common feature, this shared characteristic could be made the basis of a correspondence, which connects them and at the same time enhances the sphere of ritual efficacy. The great number of different characteristics that can be used implies that there are many subtypes of analogy. One major type is based upon the number of breaths and the corresponding number of ritual elements, or gods — i.e. numerical concord (*sampad*).⁵⁵ If e.g. three or seven deities are mentioned, they could be correlated to the corresponding set of three or seven breaths. In 2.4.12, three goddesses thus correspond to the set of out-, in- and 'betwixt'

⁵⁵ Gonda, 1960a, 177f; Oldenberg, 1919, p. 46ff.

breathing; and in 3.3.1, seven deities are correlated to seven breaths in the head. Could, therefore, any set of gods be linked to some breaths merely on the basis of their numerical congruence? If we start with the lowest numbers, a single item is, quite naturally, not enough to form the basis of a correspondence, but two items brought together as a pair, and thereby expressing a composite whole, are more suited to reasoning based upon numerical concord.⁵⁶ Different pairs of gods are correlated to the pair of exhalation and inhalation (*prāṇāpānau*); Agni–Soma, in AiB 1.8, is linked to two different pairs: first, to the two breaths, *prāṇāpānāv agnīṣomau, prasavāya savitā, pratitiṣṭhityā aditiḥ*, “Agni and Soma are expiration and inspiration, Savitṛ (serves) for instigation, Aditi for support.” Two sentences later, the same formula is repeated, but Agni–Soma is instead correlated to the eyes (*caḥsuṣī evāgnīṣomau*), which constitute another paradigmatic pair.⁵⁷ The two different correspondences given to this pair of gods are thus not considered as exclusive; the duality makes it possible for the gods to enter into a relation with any other pair, as long as it does not contradict the normal attributes and functions of the gods.⁵⁸ The connection between Agni–Soma and inhalation and exhalation is also present in a myth that is told in several versions in the *brāhmaṇas*. Agni–Soma had become trapped within Vṛtra, as a result of Tvaṣṭṛ’s revenge on Indra, who in order to kill the monster — without hurting the gods — induced Vṛtra into fever, a condition which enabled the two gods to leave the body of Vṛtra. At the same time as they escaped from Vṛtra, inhalation and exhalation left him.⁵⁹

Also the pair Indra–Vāyu is connected to inhalation and exhalation in AiB, and this is based not only upon the duality of the gods, but also on

⁵⁶ See, however, ŚB 8.4.3.2–19, where the creation performed by Prajāpati is coordinated with different numbers of vital powers (including bodily parts as fingers and toes). The sequence of numbers there is: 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, thus excluding the duality of breaths in its preference for a series of odd numbers.

⁵⁷ For further references, see Gonda, 1976, p. 376f.

⁵⁸ Another pair that Agni–Soma is correlated with is day and night, see KB 10.5.10. Further, in ŚB 1.6.3.23–25, some more pairs are given: the moist and the dry; the sun and the moon; the waxing half-moon and the waning. For a detailed discussion of the God(s) Agni–Soma, see Gonda, 1974, pp. 363–397.

⁵⁹ See e.g. TS 3.5.2.4. For a collection of passages telling this myth, consult Gonda, 1974, p. 379f.

Vāyu's function as a wind god, which activates his link to *prāṇa*. The context in AiB has already been dealt with above, viz. the *prāṇa śāstra*.⁶⁰ However, the more frequent correspondence of this dual deity seems to be to speech (Indra) and breath (Vāyu), or only speech.⁶¹

Furthermore, in AiB 2.4, the two divine *hotṛs*, who are invoked in the *āpri* verses, are connected to *prāṇāpānau*. This correspondence seems to be unique to AiB, and is therefore perhaps made *ad hoc*, but not arbitrarily. The basis is clearly the presence of two priests.⁶²

The next instance of *sampad* is, in a way, an extension of the duality, viz. the trinity.⁶³ When three breaths are mentioned, they are often constituted by the pair of exhalation and inhalation plus the breath called *vyāna*, which is the breath lying between inhalation and exhalation. In AiB, there is a correspondence between the three breaths and three Goddesses (*devī*), viz. Sarasvatī, Bharatī and Idā, who are invoked (as the divine *hotṛs* above) in the *āpri* verses.⁶⁴

In the correspondences to breath, there is a leap from the three breaths, which express the totality of the respiration process, to seven breaths in the head, which probably are more focused upon the senses. In AiB 3.3.1, there is a correspondence between the seven deities invoked in the *prāṇa śāstra* and seven breaths in the head. In ŚB 6.5.3.11 the same principle is used, and four sets of seven entities are given, viz. seven balls of horse-dung, seven formulas, seven deities and finally seven breaths in the head. The conclusion is that the ritual places seven breaths in the head (of the *yajamāna*). In AiB, another set of seven entities is also connected to the breaths in the head, viz. seven *padas* in the ritual guest reception (*ātithya*), the guest being Soma the king (AiB 1.17.9). In the same ritual, nine potsherds are used and they correspond to the nine breaths (AiB 1.5.13), and in a similar way the third *ṣaḍaha* of the *gavām ayana* is connected to

⁶⁰ See pp. 80 and 186.

⁶¹ See e.g. AiB 2.26, ŚB 4.1.3.12 and TS 6.4.7&9. For a passage in which both the connection to *prāṇāpānau* and that to speech is prominent, see KS 27.3. For a broader discussion of this dual deity, see Gonda, 1974, pp. 209–228.

⁶² Outside AiB, other pairs of gods are also connected to exhalation and inhalation, e.g. Mitra–Varuṇa in ŚB 3.2.2.13.

⁶³ See Gonda, 1976, p. 10ff.

⁶⁴ I have not been able to find this particular correspondence in the other Vedic texts.

nine breaths and nine worlds of heaven (AiB 4.16.3).⁶⁵ The nine breaths are probably the seven breaths in the head plus two breaths directed downwards in the body.⁶⁶

In the category of *Metres* only two correspondences to breath are given in AiB. In the first correspondence, nine verses are connected to the nine breaths (AiB 1.20.1). The other correspondence is between *br̥hatī* verses and the breaths, and this correspondence occurs in two places in AiB. In both these text passages, however, no special reason for the correspondence is given, and it therefore gives an impression of being well-established. If we turn to the other Vedic texts for clues regarding the nature of this correspondence, we find in PB 7.3.8 that *br̥hatī* is connected to *vyāna*, *gāyatrī* to exhalation and *triṣṭubh* to inhalation; and the metres are furthermore assigned one of the three worlds, the middle being *br̥hatī*'s realm. This explanation is based upon the fundamental division into three, and hence it does not explain why *br̥hatī* is connected in AiB to the totality of the vital powers. In PB 7.7.6, however, it is written that there are nine risings in the *br̥hatī* and consequently nine corresponding breaths.⁶⁷

The remaining correspondences are those that have as comment either breath, *prāṇah* (i.e. in singular), or the breaths, *prāṇāḥ* (i.e. an undefined number of breaths). If we start with those that are between a single god and breath, one hypothesis is that it is something in the character of the god, or the ritual implement, that makes the correspondence to breath possible. One clear example, which has already been treated above, is that between Vāyu and breath. Furthermore, Mātariśvan, which appears both as an independent deity and as an epithet of Agni, was originally a deity of the descending fire, and has therefore been interpreted as a Prometheus who brought fire to the Vedic forefathers.⁶⁸ In the *brāhmaṇas*, however, he has become a wind god, a fact that could explain the correspondence to breath in AiB. Moreover, this is made manifest in ŚB 6.4.3.4 which contains a

⁶⁵ There are six days in a *śadaha*, and the calculation giving the number nine is thus: $6*3=18$ and $18/2=9$.

⁶⁶ See Zysk, 1993, p. 203.

⁶⁷ See PB, 1931, p. 150, note 1. Furthermore, in JB 1.127 it is mentioned that *yo 'yaṃ prāṇi prāṇa eṣa eva saḥ*, "It [scil. *br̥hatī*] is this forward air". No reason for this correspondence is given, however.

⁶⁸ See Gonda, 1960a, p. 69f.

commentary upon four *yajus* formulas; the first is *saṃ te vāyur mātariśvā dadhātu*, “May Vāyu Mātariśvan heal.” The third formula is *yo devānāṃ carasi prāṇathena*, “Thou who goest along by the breath of the gods”, and the addressee of the formula is explained by the *brāhmaṇa* being the wind (scil. Vāyu Mātariśvan), because “he goes along by means of the breath of the gods.” Thus, we again have a connection between the wind and breath, although this is not obvious in AiB.⁶⁹

The only correspondence involving breath within the category of animals belongs also to the theme of wind and breath. In this context, however, the topic is the breath of the animal victim, and not of man, although man is implicitly included, as he constitutes one of the five classes of sacrificial victims.

Another correspondence which is based upon an apparent analogy is that between the word for ‘forward’ *pra* and *prāṇa* (AiB 2.40.1). The similarities are on two levels, the phonetic (*pra-*) and the semantic (forward motion). The latter sort of analogy is also used in the correspondence between *āditya* (the sun) and breath.

AiB 5.31.3 udyann u khalu vā ādityaḥ sarvāṇi bhūtāni praṇayati, tasmād enam prāṇa ity ācakṣate
 Āditya as he rises leads forward all creatures; therefore they call him breath.

It is, thus, *prāṇa* as exhalation, and not as breath in general, that is meant in this context, and it is the forward motion that functions as the link between the sun and *prāṇa*.⁷⁰

The correspondence between Bharata and breath (2.24.8) is a comment on a recitation containing the name of the goddess Bhāratī. The question is thus why the correspondence is not between Bhāratī and breath. A clue to the shift of deity can be found in ŚB 1.4.2.2 where, in a comment on the name Agni Bhārata, two reasons for Agni’s epithet are given: the first is that he bears the oblation to the gods (*bharati*), and the second that he, as

⁶⁹ See also AV 11.6.15 (11.4.15); TS 4.4.12.5; TS 5.1.5.1; TB 4.1.4.1.

⁷⁰ In TS 5.2.5.4, the correspondence between *āditya* and exhalation is merely stated, and no reason for the connection is given (*asau vā ādityaḥ prāṇaḥ*), Cf. ŚB 3.9.4.7 which identifies *āditya vivasvant* with *upāṃśusavana* (see also ŚB 4.3.5.16 and TS 6.5.6.5) and thereby to *vyāna*.

breath, sustains (*bibharti*) the living beings.⁷¹ The connection between *bhar-* and breath is thus based upon the life-supportive functions of the breaths. That this reason is relevant to the passage in AiB is, however, not beyond question.

In AiB 2.4.4, the kindling sticks are correlated briefly to the breaths; the text also supplies the explanation that the breaths enkindle (*sam √indh*) all that is here. Both the sticks and the breaths are thereby connected to fire, which is thus the medium uniting them. This explanation is part of the commentary on the *āprī* verses, in which the kindling sticks are addressed. In ŚB, the same correspondence is given, but the explanation provided is more precise, viz. that the breaths enkindle man and among other phenomena give rise to fever.⁷²

Another example of analogy is the ‘Holder’ (*yantr*), a word in the *ṛgvedic* hymn 3.13, which in AiB 2.40.5 is connected to inhalation *apāna*.⁷³ The reason given for this correspondence is that inhalation restrains, and thus ‘holds’ exhalation.

AiB 2.40.5 apāno vai yantāpānena hy ayaṃ yataḥ prāṇo na parāṇ bhavati

The holder is inspiration, for expiration here is restrained by inspiration and departs not.

Finally, the subject of the first *pada* of ṚV 3.8.4 *yuvā suvāsāḥ parivīta āgāt* “The youth well clad, covered round, hath come” is, in AiB 2.2.30, connected to breath. The reason given is that breath is enclosed within (lit. surrounded by) the body (*so ‘yaṃ śarīraiḥ parivṛtaḥ*).⁷⁴

6.3.3.2 Other reasons for the correspondences

In the following section, the focus will be on the other relationships than analogy that are used to establish correspondences to breath. However, the

⁷¹ See also ŚB 1.5.1.8 and TS 2.5.9.1.

⁷² In ŚB 1.4.3 a very elaborate linkage is made between the eleven *sāmidhenī* verses — which are recited when the kindling sticks are thrown upon the fire — and the vital powers. Cf. ŚB 10.6.2.11.

⁷³ ṚV 3.13.3, *sa yantā vipra eṣām, sa yajñānām athā hi saḥ*. In Geldner’s translation, “Der Beredte ist der Lenker dieser (Beredten), denn er ist auch (der Lenker) der Opfer.”

⁷⁴ *Parivṛta* is thus a gloss on *parivīta*. This designation denotes the addressee of the hymn, *vanaspati* (the tree) in his role as the sacrificial post.

principle of the correspondence between strength and breath is not perceptible at first sight. The structure of the argumentation is, nevertheless, well known: first, a hymn that is to be recited is mentioned *pratīkena*, then a correspondence is made to a word in the recitation. In this case, the line is *agne brhad yajamāne vayo dhā iti*, “O Agni, do thou accord great power to the sacrificer”, and the correspondence is made between strength (*vayas*) and breath.⁷⁵ Finally it is stated, as a conclusion, that breath is placed in the *yajamāna*. Is this an example of an *ad hoc* correspondence invented for a reinterpretation of a ṚV line, or are there some more fundamental reasons for the connection between strength and breath? On the basis of the previous discussion of the breaths as encompassing all the vital powers of man, one can argue that the text, here, states that strength is one of the vital powers of man: that man needs strength to live. Another possible interpretation is based upon the fact that although *vayas* is only one of the many vital powers, the conclusion of the text is not that strength alone is infused in the *yajamāna*, but life in a more general sense, i.e. it is an argumentation from a part to the whole.⁷⁶ The mentioning of one vital power thus makes it possible to invest the *yajamāna* with all the powers necessary for a full life.

A correspondence which is apparently not based upon analogy is that between Tanūnapāt and breath. It is founded upon an analysis of the name Tanūnapāt, as ‘the protector of bodies’, and since breath is dependent upon the body (*tanū*),⁷⁷ Tanūnapāt also protects the breaths. Another, perhaps more accurate, rendering of the meaning of *tanūnapāt* is ‘the one who is generated by himself’. The interpretation of *tanūnapāt* is, however, in this context probably influenced by the myth accompanying the *tanūnaptra* ritual, in which the gods deposited their bodies with Tanūnapāt as their witness.⁷⁸ In ŚB 3.4.2.5 & 11, the connection between this god and breath

⁷⁵ AiB 1.28.31.

⁷⁶ In ŚB 4.3.4.29 both breath and *vayas* are mentioned in the same *yajus*, but they do not seem to be correlated. See ŚB 13.2.6.15 for the connection between *vayas* and *āyus*.

⁷⁷ *Tanū* signifies, according to Pinault, 2001, p. 205, “...the body as physical entity identified with the person, the self. To some extent, the word tends to the value of a reflexive pronoun.”

⁷⁸ See AiB 1.24, TS 6.2.2, The nature of this deity is referred to by Keith as “even more obscure than Narāśaṃsa” (Keith, 1925, p. 166).

is instead mediated through a correspondence between *tanūnapāt* and the wind, and furthermore between the wind and inhalation and exhalation.

The same connection between the protection of the body and the breaths seems to be at work in the correspondence between the recitation *ṛṣayo daivayāsas tanūpāvānas tanvas tapojāḥ*, “Seers, divine, guardians of the body, born of fervour” and the breaths in AiB 2.27.

Another explanation is used for the correspondence of Jātavedas, a name meaning: the one who knows all beings (or generations), or the one who has “innate wisdom”.⁷⁹ Jātavedas, in AiB, is once (2.39.11) connected to breath. The explanation given there is that:

AiB 2.39.11 *prāṇo vai jātavedāḥ, sa hi jātānām veda. yāvatām vai sa jātānām veda te bhavanti, yeṣām u na veda kim u te syuḥ*

Jātavedas is the breath, for he knows of born creatures. Of so many creatures as he knows, they become; for how could they exist of whom he knows not?

The sense of this passage seems to be that as the god creates living beings, he is also connected with their principle of life, viz. breath.

The ritual exclamation *vaṣaṭ (vauṣaṭ)*, in AiB 3.8.9, is connected respectively to speech (*vāc*), expiration and inhalation (*prāṇāpānau*).⁸⁰ The correspondences are motivated by the fact that through the pronunciation of *vauṣaṭ* both breath and speech leave man. The same explanation is found in ŚB 4.2.1.29, *prāṇo vai vaṣaṭkāraḥ so ‘smād etad vaṣaṭkurvataḥ parāṇi ivābhūt*, “For the Vaṣaṭ is the breath, and that breath has, as it were, departed from him while uttering the Vaṣaṭ.”

In the category of Man, breath can assume the position of topic, and this is the case twice: once in a correspondence to Vāyu, and once in the pinpointing of the functions of the breaths below (*prānāḥ avāñcaḥ*) in contradistinction to the breaths of the head. The functions of the breaths below are signified by what they emit, and thus the function of procreation is signified by seed, and urination and defecation by urine and excrement: the breaths below seem to propel these substances out of the body. The

⁷⁹ An epithet of Agni; see Keith, 1925, p. 160.

⁸⁰ Cf. KB 12.5. See ŚB 1.7.2.21 for the connection between the *vaṣaṭ* call and speech.

connection between seed and breath also occurs with breath as comment.⁸¹ In AiB 2.38, this is part of a somewhat obscure passage, in which also the word ‘father’ is connected to breath, a fact which demands some further explanation, but which is not given in the text of AiB. Perhaps the chain of associations is from the father to seed and then to breath.

Later in the same *khaṇḍa*, seed is once again correlated to breath; and in this passage also life (*āyus*) is connected to breath, which is not surprising as the breaths are the vital powers of the human body, in the broad sense of the term. In ŚB 1.4.1.4–6, however, another reason for the correspondence between seed and breath than its indispensability for life is presented. The forward motion of the ejaculation of seed is presented as corresponding to the emission of breath, and, in a similar way, childbirth corresponds to inhalation. These forward and backward movements are furthermore presented as characteristic of all moving beings, e.g. cattle.⁸² In TS 5.2.10.3, on the other hand, the relationship between breath and seed is constituted by the putting down of the *prāṇabhṛt* bricks; the ritual act is presented in an etiological explanation as the cause of why animals are born with speech, breath, sight and hearing. Through the arrangement of the bricks, breath is, to wit, put into the seed, which is thus vitalised through the ritual act.⁸³

6.3.4 Correspondences to breath that seem *ad hoc*

Some of the correspondences to the breaths do not seem to be governed by any basic principle, and they do therefore appear as constructed arbitrarily for a certain argumentation. No explanation is given in the text of the AiB and the other *brāhmaṇas* do not give any supplementary information. This fact does not, however, necessarily mean that no generic principles have been used; it could instead be that they are not made

⁸¹ All the occurrences of the correspondence between seed and breath have been dealt with above; see p. 131.

⁸² See also ŚB 6.2.2.6, where the animal victim for Vāyu Niyutvat is connected through a myth to the seed of Prajāpati, and also to exhalation and inhalation. For other connections between seed and breath see ŚB 6.3.21; 7.3.1.45; 9.5.1.68; 10.3.2.7; 13.3.8.1; JB 1.127.

⁸³ Cf. ŚB 7.3.1.45.

explicit in the texts. The possibility that these correspondences were manufactured just for the sake of the argumentation should nevertheless not be excluded.

The first example is the connection between the *Ādityas* and the breaths. The connection between *Āditya* (i.e. the sun) and breath were explained above, but this explanation could not easily be extended to the whole group of gods called *Ādityas*. In AiB 3.29.3, the correspondence between the *Āditya* gods and the breaths is part of an explanation of why a secondary *vaśat* call is not made. If it were made, it would stop the breaths (i.e. the *Ādityas*). No explanation of the association of the *Āditya* gods with the breaths is given in the text, but a fact that could explain why the *Ādityas* were connected to the breaths in this passage is that the individual gods of that group are often connected to different vital powers.⁸⁴

That the Maruts, on the other hand, would be connected to breath is not surprising as they are gods of the storm winds and the connection between breath and the wind is, as indicated above, central in the *brāhmaṇa* world-view.⁸⁵ In AiB, however, the correspondence only occurs once and then embedded in a myth, which tells how all the gods left Indra after he had performed his greatest deed, viz. the killing of *Vṛtra*. Only the Maruts did not leave him, and this is reinterpreted by the *brāhmaṇa* text as meaning that the breaths did not leave him, and that the breaths therefore are Indra's true friends. This correspondence, in spite of its meteorological basis, is not present outside AiB, and seems therefore to be made *ad hoc* in AiB, even if it is perhaps based upon the general relation between wind and breath.⁸⁶

The connection of the oblation (*havis*) to breath *prāṇa*, in AiB 5.25.9, is part of a special formula called *caturhotṛ*, which contains several correspondences with the topic in the sacrificial realm, while the comment

⁸⁴ *Mitrāvaruṇau* are connected to eyesight (*cakṣus*) in AiB 3.2.6, 3.3.5, and to both sight and mind in AiB 2.26.2. See also ŚB 4.1.4.1. For a discussion (mainly based upon the *ṚV*) of the gods which were called *ādityas*, see Brereton, 1981.

⁸⁵ The emphasis is more upon the violent nature of the winds, but also upon the rain that they bring with them; see e.g. ŚB 9.1.2.5. Another recurrent theme is their function as the subjects of the ruling gods, e.g. in PB 6.10.10.

⁸⁶ There is, however, a passage in the *mantra* text of TS (3.3.2.1) in which the Maruts together with some other gods are described as supporters of breath.

is some mental state or object such as thought, speech and intelligence.⁸⁷ This formula was a part of the common knowledge of the different Vedic schools and, thus, is not *ad hoc*. But on the other hand, no clue is given to why *havis*, in this context, is correlated to breath.⁸⁸

⁸⁷ See Mylius, 1993.

⁸⁸ See e.g. ŚB 4.6.9.18 and PB 4.9.13.

6.4 Conclusion

The majority of the correspondences that involve breath, and which are common to AiB and KB, have their starting-point in the ritual realm. The direction of these correspondences is clear: the correspondences forge links between the ritual world and the vital functions of the human body, and ‘soul’. In addition, most of the occurrences are within the commentary to the morning *soma*-pressing and the animal sacrifice.⁸⁹ This uneven distribution is demonstrated in the table below.⁹⁰

Table 13. The distribution of the correspondences which have breath as comment and are common to AiB and KB.

AiB		KB	
Pañcikā	Number of correspondences	Adhyāya	Number of correspondences
1	3	1–5	1
2	11	6–10	4
3	1	11–15	15
4		16–20	
5		21–25	
		26–30	1

⁸⁹ That the morning pressing has such a prominent role is partly due to the fact that there are elements which are common to all pressings; the *brāhmaṇa* texts thus treat these features only once, i.e. in the context of the morning pressing.

⁹⁰ For a table that shows the distribution of these correspondences according to the different rituals, see Appendix 3.

However, in list 3, where all the correspondences to breath in AiB were displayed, another major group of correspondences to breath was discerned, viz. that between different gods and breath, or the breaths.

In the analysis of the correspondences common to AiB and KB, two factors emerged that explain why certain correspondences of breath were used in several *brāhmaṇa* texts.

1. The actual ritual performance contains explicit references to breath, through either words or actions. Examples: the *upamśu* and *antaryāma* libations; the consecration and laying down of the *vālakhilya* bricks.

2. Clear analogy. Examples: Vāyu and breath; the introductory and concluding sacrifices as connected with exhalation and inhalation.

The correspondences that were not covered by these explanatory principles were those of *vanaspati* and the offerings to the seasons. This could perhaps explain why these correspondences were not found outside the *ṛgvedic śākhās*.

When the analysis was extended to the *ad hoc* correspondences of AiB, a broader spectrum of basic principles governing the formulation of correspondences was discovered. The principle of analogy played an important role, as in the case of the correspondences common to the two *brāhmaṇas*. One major type of analogy was numerical congruence, in which the numbers 2, 3, 7 and 9 had a special place. Other types of analogy were based upon phonetic similarities, or that the god in question fulfilled a function similar to one of those fulfilled by breath.

However, the correspondences were also based upon principles other than analogy, e.g. in the case of the god Tanūnapāt who was regarded as the guardian of the body, or in that of the ritual exclamation *vaṣaṭ* connected to breath on the ground that, when *vaṣaṭ* is said, breath is also emitted.

All the five breaths were used in the correspondences or in their contexts, but of the five breaths, *prāṇa*, *apāna* and *udāna* were most frequent.

Through the analysis of the different correspondences of breath, it became obvious that there are several parallels between the *brāhmaṇas* of RV and YV, and that the SV *brāhmaṇas* do not contain the

correspondences to breath which are common to AiB and KB, with the exception of that between Vāyu and breath. This could be due to differences in the ritual material treated, the *sāmaveda brāhmaṇas* being focused upon the singing of the *udgātṛ* and his assistants in the Vedic rituals.⁹¹

Until now, the focus of the analysis has been upon the system of the correspondences and the principles governing that system. This focus has been necessary for the identification of the aims and concerns of those who have produced this elaborate web of correspondences, and also for discovering the basic principles that governed the formulation and use of the individual correspondences. Nevertheless, in the case of the breaths something more is present, which bears within itself the destruction of the system, and which is, in a sense, the short-circuiting of all the relations established with entities outside the ritual enclosure. The tendency is that the sacrificer also becomes the goal of the ritual activity; and it is not only the sacrificer considered as self, as *ātman*, that is intended, but the focus is upon the constituent principles of the self, the vital powers: that is, the breaths. The efficacy is, then, both dependent upon the self — as knowledge of the correspondences is a prerequisite for the attaining of the fruits of the ritual actions — and, at the same time, directed towards it: to the inner principles of the self, among which mind, and also somewhat contradictorily *ātman*, have a place.

Thus, in one sense, the correspondences to the breaths short-circuit the efficacy of sacrifice since they also make the principles of sacrificial efficacy the goal of the correspondences. However, the final result of this process, that is, the breakdown of the correspondence system, is not effectuated in the *brāhmaṇas*. To observe such a development we have to turn instead to the end of the Veda, the *upaniṣads*, and in a second step beyond the Veda. This task falls thereby outside the scope of this study, but nevertheless indicates an interesting direction for future research.

⁹¹ The breath is, however, also central in the SV *brāhmaṇas*, see e.g. JB 1.1.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Sacrifice as an act

We have now in four chapters studied in detail the efficacy of sacrifice as it was expressed in the *brāhmaṇa* system of correspondences. In this chapter, the discussion will return to a more general level, and the Vedic material will be evaluated in a discussion of how it can contribute to the understanding of sacrificial theory. That is, we will treat the *brāhmaṇa* theory of sacrifice as one of the many theories that define the aims of sacrificing and which argue in what ways the sacrificial practices achieve, or fail to achieve, these ends.

The efficacy of the Vedic sacrificial acts was, on one level, believed to be dependent upon the correct performance of the rituals, and much effort was consequently invested in making the sacrifices adhere to the rules and prescriptions governing the sacrificial procedures. The efficacy seems, however, to have been considered as ultimately dependent upon the knowledge of the performer(s) of the rituals, i.e. ‘the one who knows thus’, *ya evaṃ veda*. The priests, therefore, make the ritual gestures and utterances produce the intended fruit under the condition that they know the correct correspondences. These often have the human being itself as their goal, and more specifically the vital principles (the breaths) of the human body. Both the supposed efficacy and the aim of Vedic sacrifices were thereby to a high degree dependent upon the ‘inner’ side of the human person.

If we reconnect to the hypothesis chosen for this study — viz. that metaphysical thinking is of importance for the sacrificial practices, and that the best way to analyse this thinking is through the basic problems that it tries to deal with — then the question is what problems were operative in the *brāhmaṇa* correspondence system. The subject of the study naturally limits the field, so that many important questions have to be left out, but at least two are of importance when dealing with the efficacy of sacrifice. The

first is the question of the nature of human acts, which, at first sight, may appear to be too general for the concerns of the *brāhmaṇas*.¹ A central question when dealing with human acts is, however, the kind of causality operating in such actions.² The connection between the sacrificial act and its effect is thus a question of the special mechanisms of causality, which are made possible through the ritual. The concern of ritual efficacy is, thereby, a gateway to the more general question of how human acts achieve their ends. This leads to the conclusion that discourses on sacrificial acts (*karman*)³ become almost by necessity a pondering upon human acts in general (*karman*).

Moreover, sacrifice is not merely a human act, but it is often considered as the supreme, paradigmatic and creative act — and, hence, also a divine act. The step from sacrificial ‘theory’ to ethics is therefore never far away. In the Vedic corpus this step is taken mainly in the *upaniṣads* where the word *karman* is used in an ethical context.

BU 4.4.5. puṇyaḥ puṇyena karmaṇā pāpaḥ pāpena⁴

A man turns into something good by good action and into something bad by bad action.⁵

¹ For a differentiation between human acts and acts of man, see McInerny, 1992, p. 8f.

² See e.g. the volume *Mental Causation* edited by John Heil and Alfred Mele (Heil, 1993); see also Alvira, 1991, pp. 233–244.

³ *Karman* in sing. nom. is used in AiB *pañcikā* 1-5 only in the formula *etad vai yajñasya samṛddhaṃ yad rūpasamṛddhaṃ, yat karma kriyamāṇam ṛg abhivadati*, “that in the sacrifice is perfect which is perfect in form, that rite which as it is performed the verse describes” (AiB 1.4.9, 16.14, 17.2, 25.7, 29.24, 30.29; 2.2.33). In 2.31.6, however, the instr. *karmaṇā* is used in what seems to be a comparison between similar actions performed inside and outside the ritual, *taṃ yathā gṛhān itaṃ karmaṇānusamīyād, evam evainam idam anusamīma iti*, “Just as one may attend upon one come to his house with due performance, even so now do we attend upon this.” Cf. AiB 6.32.17. The pl. instr. of *karman* (*karmabhiḥ*) is, in AiB 3.45, used in a formula as denoting sacrificial procedures, e.g. AiB 3.45.3 *taṃ ātithyena nedīyo ‘nvāgachams, te karmabhiḥ samatvaranta*, “...to him with the guest reception they came nearer; they hastened with the performance”. See further pl. instr. AiB 4.13.8&14.1; pl. acc. AiB 2.13.6; pl. loc. AiB 1.12.5.

⁴ In AiB, *pāpa* and *pāpman* are used mainly to describe something destructive, which is hypostasised in the rival, either human (*bhrātrvya*) or divine (*asura*), but it also signifies a sort of substance clinging to humans, which can be removed through different rituals; see e.g. AiB 4.4.5–6; 5.1.10. In the legend of Śunaḥśepa (AiB 7.17.4), however, the meaning is clearly a moral evil, *pāpaṃ karma mayā kṛtam*.

The second question of importance for the correspondence system is the inquiry into what a human person really is. This issue is interrelated with the former question, as the Vedic investigation of the efficacy of the sacrificial acts was centred upon the vital principles of man. This means that the inquiry into the basis of the efficacy of the act becomes, at the same time, a question of the foundation of the human person (*ātman*) — the agent (*kartr̥*) of the act.⁶ This question was also pursued further in the *upaniṣads* and led to a more pronounced doctrine of the spiritual nature of *ātman*.⁷

The discussion of the ontology of the self was in the *brāhmaṇas* mainly expressed through the correspondences, and the correspondences' ambivalence between relation and identification can also be seen in the later developments of conceptions of the self. On the one hand, there is (Advaita) Vedānta, which tended towards the unity of self and cosmos, to the point where there was only room for one principle, and relations thereby became, on the fundamental level, impossible. On the other hand, there is Buddhism which denied the unity of the self and considered it as a conglomeration of principles, a bundle that hence tends toward dissolution.⁸

However, an important feature of many religious sacrificial 'theories' — which does not come to the fore through the use of the *brāhmaṇas* as the empirical material — is the nature and role of the supernatural recipients of the sacrificial oblations.⁹ This is partly due to the fact that in the *brāhmaṇas* also the gods had to rely on sacrifices, something which renders the role of

⁵ See also KU 1.2 and KaṭU 5.7. Cf. BU 4.4.23 in which it is told that *ātman* is not changed by good or bad actions, and CU 3.14.2-3, where it is told that *ātman* in the heart contains all actions.

⁶ This is due to the more general feature that the reflection of consciousness upon consciousness becomes possible first when it is involved in an act, either physical or mental.

⁷ See e.g. CU 3.14.

⁸ The ontology of the self, in both Vedānta and Buddhism, is connected with general ontology; the question of the nature of the human person thereby becomes a question of the ultimate nature of the universe. A similar opposition is that between the philosophies of Parmenides and Heraclitus in ancient Greece.

⁹ Also according to the theory advocated by Lawson and McCauley, the recipients (the superhuman agents) fulfil important functions; see e.g. Lawson, 1990, p. 5.

the gods, as receivers of the sacrificial oblations, somewhat ambiguous.¹⁰ Another reason for the diminishing importance of the gods, in the later parts of the Vedic corpus, is what has been called the ‘interiorisation’ of sacrifice, i.e. sacrifices are carried out either mentally or within the body of the performer.¹¹ The focus is, thereby, placed upon the subject with the consequence that the former recipients become peripheral to the act, and the efficacy of the act is seen as residing primarily in the knowledge and intention of the subject.

The two questions dealt with above, the nature of the human agent and the nature of its acts, are not only operative in a religious theory of sacrifice; the same questions are of importance in scholarly theories that embrace a methodological agnosticism, or outright materialism. A theory of sacrifice is thus, according to the observations above, predisposed to become a theory of human actions in general, and thereby also a theory of the human person — because the consideration of action is intrinsically connected with the question of the constitution of the agent.¹² In other words: a theory of sacrifice cannot be separated from its larger theoretical framework, which consists primarily of an ontology of the human person and a theory of action.¹³

Sacrificial theories that are based upon an evolutionary scheme avoid, however, to a certain extent, such a generalisation of the theoretical implications of sacrificial theory, as these theories differentiate between successive stages of human development. The ‘anthropology’ implied by an explanation of the sacrificial behaviour of certain ‘primitive’ groups is, thereby, only partially relevant for human beings of a more modern outlook. Exceptions, constituted by cases of contemporary sacrificial traditions, can be interpreted as fossilised survivals of primitive customs,

¹⁰ The notion of a sacrificial banquet was, however, prominent in the Vedic sacrifices: the priests invited the gods to come to the sacrifice and partake of the oblations offered through the medium of fire.

¹¹ There is a difference between a sacrifice performed mentally, and a sacrifice performed interiorly. The second category is constituted by such examples as the offering of the food into the breaths of the body, see JB, 1973, p. 320f.

¹² See, e.g. Burkert, 1972, p. 9f and Bell, 1992, p. 219.

¹³ This becomes thus an elaboration of, or rather a complement to, the conclusion in chapter two that the scholarly theories of religion often are dependent upon the larger theory of religion which they are part of, either explicitly or implicitly.

which still linger on, despite the fact that the intellectual development of the human species has made them no longer adequate. The evolutionist paradigm thus paves the way for a series of different sacrificial theories and thereby also several theories of action and ontologies of the self. Such a chronological series can, moreover, be converted into a synchronic system, according to which persons are more or less human, and in which sacrifices of different sorts (or absence of sacrifices) are linked to such levels of perfection. In the modern variants of evolutionism, as represented by Burkert and Staal, the argument is, however, that sacrifice or ritual is connected to a certain basic trait of human nature, a feature that is perhaps not always manifest, but which surfaces with a force of its own, irrespective of the volitional acts of the agents performing the rituals. In Burkert's theory, it was the violent nature of sacrifice, and also of social action in general, that constituted this fundamental quality, while Staal argued for the fundamental syntactic qualities of ritual, which are more basic, and therefore more genuine, than the purposes and meanings attributed to the rituals by the participants. In both these theories, the sacrificial act is largely disconnected from the conscious mental life of the agent. The same feature could be seen in the psychological theory of sacrifice proposed by Freud and the sociological theories of Durkheim and Mauss, a fact that implies specific views both on human acts and on the constitution of the human person.¹⁴

Similarly, according to the theories of Eliade and Schmidt, sacrifice points to fundamental qualities of the human person, which they regard as being of a religious nature, whence modern man, through the neglect of sacrifice (and therefore religion), has lost contact with something which is an essential part of human nature. However, the theory of Eliade, mainly through influence from the work of Rudolf Otto, has an inclination towards the emotional rather than the rational. But the intellectualist paradigm did not die with the British anthropologists of the 19th century, and e.g. Lawson and McCauley have argued in their cognitive theory of ritual that

¹⁴ Consider, e.g., the sentence below from the conclusion of Durkheim's book *Les formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse* (1912, p. 595): "...la vraie fonction de la religion n'est pas de nous faire penser, d'enrichir notre connaissance, d'ajouter aux représentations que nous devons à la science des représentations d'une autre origine et d'un autre caractère, mais de nous faire agir, de nous aider à vivre".

knowledge has a place in the explanation of actions and thus also in rituals and sacrifices.¹⁵

Our principal theoretical object is the shared knowledge about their religious systems (both the system of ritual acts and the accompanying conceptual scheme) of persons who are participants in those systems — on the assumption that an account of this shared system of knowledge will go a long way toward explaining many of the behaviours of participants that it inspires.¹⁶

This last stance is more in consonance with the picture gained through the correspondence system, which implies that the mental side of the action is of importance for the result of the action.¹⁷ Such a focus upon knowledge may be somewhat surprising, as the Vedic sacrifices were characterised by an extreme degree of complexity and dedication to details, which constituted a science of its own.¹⁸ But, perhaps, it is exactly this intense focus upon the minutiae of the acts — i.e. the discussions why a certain ritual detail should be performed instead of an almost identical procedure — that lead the *brāhmaṇa* sacrificial theologians to a similar intense inquiry into how these acts functioned.

In the *brāhmaṇas* and in the *upaniṣads* there is a shift towards a focus on the mental and the spiritual side of the action — although a pure spirit by definition has to stand above action, something which is borne out by the distinction between spirit (*puruṣa*) and soul (subtle body) in the philosophy of *sāṃkhya*.¹⁹

¹⁵ They argue, however, that traditional intellectualism focuses too narrowly upon religious thought as consisting of simple explanations. See e.g. Lawson, 1990, p. 36f.

¹⁶ Lawson, 1990, p. 5.

¹⁷ This stance is developed in the Bhagavad Gītā, in which the solution to the dilemma — between the option of acting and thus producing results (of a spiritual nature, cf. the breaths in the *brāhmaṇa* system), and the option of ceasing to perform action and, thereby, obtaining liberation — is to perform action without any desire for the result of the action (for a presentation of these two ideologies see Bailey, 1985). Hence, the mental attitude is considered as being of importance for the result of the action, even though the outer aspect is unchanged. Cf. the theory of ritual by Caroline Humphrey and James Laidlaw, in which ritual is defined as the manipulation of individual intentionality, “Action is ritualized if the acts of which it is composed are constituted not by the intentions which the actor has in performing them, but by prior stipulation.” Humphrey, 1994, p. 97.

¹⁸ Or rather a cluster of sciences (*vedāṅga*) such as grammar and astronomy.

¹⁹ See Werner, 1988.

The question of the relation between the ‘inner’ side and the outer aspect of action is also of crucial importance for scholarly sacrificial theories,²⁰ but an adequate explanation of sacrificial action has to take into account both the conscious and the sub- (or extra-) conscious, and investigate how these levels contribute to the formation of action, and thus also of sacrificial acts.

Moreover, theories of sacrifice are — through being connected to explanations of action and to theories of what a human person is — connected to the domain of morality and ethics; that is, they identify which actions can be performed, thereby defining the scope of human action, and also indicate which of these possible actions should and which should not be performed.²¹ This connection is perhaps, at first sight, not altogether obvious, but the connection between human nature and the actions fitting for man (and thus good) is close; a disclosure of new aspects of human nature, therefore, puts the appropriate actions in a new light, such as the revelation of the unity of *ātman* and *brahman*, the discovery of the subconscious, or the inescapable violent nature of man.

The tendency in both the *brāhmaṇas* and scholarly theories of sacrifice is, furthermore, that the three levels of sacrificial actions, viz. cause, efficacy and goal, tend to coincide. If, for example, the cause of sacrifice is psychic anguish or guilt, then the goal of the ritual is the appeasing of these disturbing feelings, and the efficacy is therefore dependent upon whether sacrifice can engage in therapeutic work. In the same vein, if the cause of sacrifice is located in the social realm, then the goal is, in all probability, to be found in the ritual’s achievement of effects in society, and the efficacy of sacrifice is thus dependent upon how well it can ritualise and channel societal factors. If the cause, on the other hand, is thought to be in the mind of the believer, in the sense that it is his direction towards a goal which constitutes the cause of the act, then it is not surprising if the goal is finally

²⁰ This is, e.g., borne out by an introductory book on action theory such as Lawrence Davis’s *Theory of Action* (Davis, 1979). Moreover, the centrality of this dichotomy is undergirded by Catherine Bell in her book *Ritual, Theory, Ritual Practice* (Bell, 1992). She argues, however, that the subject Ritual Studies can supply a synthesis between thought and action (Bell, 1992, p. 23).

²¹ That is, what has been called ‘the naturalistic fallacy’ by G. E. Moore (Moore, 1993, p. 65ff). For a defence of the legitimacy of such a leap from ‘is’ to ‘ought’, see McInerney 1992, p. 193.

pictured as having the same nature as the cause, that is, mental or spiritual, and thus the efficacy of the ritual is located precisely in its intentional aspect. Or, finally, if sacrifice is believed to be only a game without a specific goal, then the efficacy of sacrifice is dependent upon whether it follows the rules of the game, i.e. whether it is a successful game.

In this chapter we have tried to bring together the analysis of the *brāhmaṇa* reflections on sacrifice and the analysis of scholarly theories of sacrifice. This move has yielded, apart from all the differences between the discourses of the scholar and the cult practitioner, some insights into their similarities. One such common feature is that a theory of sacrifice often is connected to a general theory of action. In the Vedic context the development was from a theory of sacrifice to a theory of action, while in most scholarly theories the direction is from a general theory of action to a more specific theory of sacrificial action.

Summary

In the introduction two ways of approaching the question of sacrificial efficacy were delineated. The first was directed toward the detection of the general causes of sacrificial actions, causes which can be of a biological, psychological or social nature and which the practitioner of the sacrificial cult is usually unaware of. The second way, on the other hand, was more focused on understanding sacrificial actions through conscious motives, or beliefs, that accompany the rituals. The motives and beliefs of the persons engaged in a sacrifice are thereby considered as causes of the sacrificial actions. These two approaches resemble to some extent the classical distinction between explanation and understanding, but it was argued in the introduction that understanding presupposes a background of explanations, and that understanding, in a way, is a form of causal explanation, as indicated above.

A connection between general theories of sacrificial action and scholarly interpretations of specific sacrificial discourses is present in the former analyses of the Vedic sacrificial world-view. The efficacy of the intricate Vedic sacrifices, according to the *brāhmaṇa* texts, was mainly dependent on a web of correspondences between entities inside and outside the ritual enclosure. The possibility to formulate multitudes of such connections constituted the basis for the belief that it was possible to achieve a wide array of goals through sacrifices. These correspondences have been interpreted from the perspectives of different theories; for example, they have been considered as manifestations of a primitive mentality, in which the borderlines between objects are not clearly upheld and entities on very different levels of existence can be identified without any awareness of contradiction. Moreover, the Vedic correspondences have been interpreted, under the influence of certain ideas within the phenomenology of religion, as means for connecting the human world with supernatural powers.

The approach chosen for this study was to take the web of Vedic correspondences seriously and to continue the inventory of the correspondences that was initiated by Klaus Mylius, and thereby to deal

with the minute details of the system of correspondences. This basic research was necessary for the formulation of general conclusions, and also for indicating which directions of research could be fruitful to pursue. To investigate the correspondence system was further motivated by the theoretical position presented in Chapter 2, namely, that the world-views of sacrificial traditions are of importance for the explanation of sacrificial practices. Moreover, it was argued that basic questions of an ontological or metaphysical character can play an important role in the reflections on sacrifice made by the practitioners themselves — something which is denied in some scholarly theories, mainly due to a model of restricted rationality.

It was, however, emphasised that the issue discussed was not whether such disciplines as metaphysics or ontology are well founded, or whether they constitute illegitimate uses of reason. The issue was instead that the proper use of reason as defined by science can become a grid, a model of the human mind, which does not correspond to the use of reason within certain religious traditions. This could lead to a situation in which the ontological reflections of those engaged in the performance of sacrifices are treated as of no great significance for the actual ritual practice. The approach in this study tries, therefore, to avoid a projection of a limited use of reason on a culture that does not embrace such restraints. This is attempted mainly through the premise that the discourses of the cult practitioners on their own ritual performances, involving what could be called ontological questions, can be of importance for the actual ritual practice. That is, the point argued is not whether such discourses are well founded or not, but that such reflections may be important for the concrete practice of sacrifice.

In order to be able to proceed with the analysis of the system of correspondences in the *brāhmaṇa* texts, the material was at first limited to one *brāhmaṇa*, Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, *pañcikā* 1–5, which later in Chapter 5 was compared with Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa. Secondly, a thorough analysis was made in Chapter 3 of the ways in which the correspondences were expressed. The consideration of the formal aspects of the correspondences was judged necessary before the discussion of their system and its constituent principles. The analysis of the linguistic forms of the correspondences is decisive for their interpretation, a fact which is evinced

by the ways in which the efficacy of sacrifice, according to the *brāhmaṇa* texts, has been interpreted. This connection is especially apparent in the most frequent way of expressing a correspondence, viz. through a (pure) nominal sentence. It has variously been looked upon as an ellipsis (the elimination of copula) or as expressing a special aspect of a-temporality. The correspondences in form of nominal sentences have moreover often been labelled as identifications, and more recently as relations of resemblance, but it was argued in Chapter 3 that these are only two of the many relations that can be expressed through a nominal sentence in the *brāhmaṇas*. It seems also that the relationship between identification and predication in the semantics of the nominal sentences is more dynamic and ambiguous than static and clear-cut. The question of the difference in meaning between the sentences with and those without copula becomes acute when AiB uses both of these ways of expressing correspondences in the same text passage. The general pattern seems to be that when a correspondence is located in time, as in the beginning of time, a copula is used. When the relation is beyond time, in the sense of eternally valid, a nominal sentence is used. Of the words used for expressing correspondences *rūpa*, meaning form or symbol, is the most frequent. It is mainly used to pinpoint analogy, but in the context of the *sattra* sacrifices, it also seems to signify correspondence in general, and is therefore the emic concept coming closest to the meaning of correspondence.

The word order of the Vedic nominal sentences has been a controversial question because it cannot always be settled without reference to the actual textual context or the relationship between the entities to which the nouns refer, as this was imagined in the *brāhmaṇa* world-view. This makes it more promising to use notions like topic and comment, as was done by Gunilla Gren-Eklund, than the grammatical notions of subject and predicate. Topic and comment are moreover of use in the analysis of other ways of expressing correspondences, such as verbal sentences and myths. The question of word order is further complicated by the use of formulas in the text. The order of the words in these cases seems to be independent of which entity in the formula has been mentioned in the context preceding the instantiation of the formula. This feature makes it necessary first to make a distinction between sentence and discourse topic, and further to consider the text as built up of a hierarchy of topics.

The starting-point of the majority of the correspondences in AiB is quite naturally in the ritual realm, and entities within the categories *Ritual*, *Metres* and *Sattra* therefore constitute the topic in 82.7 % of all correspondences in AiB *pañcikā* 1–5. The comments, on the other hand, belong mostly to the categories of *Cosmos*, *Animals* (mostly cattle), *Varṇa* and *Man* — and of these *Man* is the largest category. Within the category of *Man*, the ‘breaths’ have a dominant position. They signify not merely the physical breath, but also all the vital powers of the human person, for example the senses and the mind. The correspondences common to AiB and KB displayed tendencies similar to those of AiB. The starting-point of the common correspondences was thus mainly in the ritual realm, and the primary comment category was *Man*. The importance of the breaths was also further substantiated.

The correspondences in AiB that function in two directions were rare. In most of these cases, the direction could not be settled with a high degree of certainty. Only one correspondence seemed to be two-directional in a clear way, viz. that between *vajra* and speech. The conclusion is therefore that the direction of the correspondences in AiB *pañcikā* 1–5 is generally constant: in most cases the relation has fixed starting and ending points, and a reciprocal relation is unusual. This fact could be explained as a result of the formulaic character of many of the correspondences, especially those expressed in the form of nominal sentences. But it could also be due to the material the *brāhmaṇa* author of AiB was commenting upon, namely ritual actions and objects. It was quite natural for the Vedic theologian to start from the ritual and then to formulate connections into other realms of the existing worlds. The ritual is thus both the anchor of classification and the matrix of sacrificial efficacy.

The material from KB did nevertheless in some respects change the previous conclusions about the directions of the correspondences. The two-way character of the correspondences was more pronounced in KB; the same correspondence, in the form of a nominal sentence, appeared once with entity X as topic and Y as comment, and with Y as topic and X as comment another time. This was not the case in AiB, where the inverted correspondences instead were often incorporated in ritual myths, in which the direction is hard to interpret. Moreover, correspondences appearing within AiB in solely one direction have, occasionally, another direction in

KB. Either this indicates a different way of looking upon the correspondence in KB, or it could be a consequence of the more general tendency in KB to use the directions of the correspondences in a more free way. This feature in itself could imply that the correspondences, and thereby also the basis of sacrificial efficacy, were continuously reflected upon. The logical outcome of a process in which interrelated objects more and more come to be considered as identical is some form of monism, and this tendency together with the focus upon the ‘breaths’ prefigures the views expressed later in the *upaniṣads*.

The high frequency of some of the correspondences in AiB were due to several factors. A correspondence could be part of a formula often containing a syllogistic way of reasoning; an example of this is AiB 5.4.4 *pānkto yajñāḥ pānktāḥ paśavaḥ paśūnām avaruddhyai*, “The sacrifice is fivefold; cattle are fivefold; (verily it serves) to win cattle.” These formulas were complete with premises and conclusion, ready to be used in any context, if there was just one entity in the text that could be brought into relation with one of the premises in the formula. The author of the *brāhmaṇa* text had a stock of these formulas ready to be used, with the aim of connecting the ritual with the desired results. The formulas made it easier to memorise the bulky *brāhmaṇa* texts, and also to supply a lost part of a particular argumentation. That is, if a part of an argumentation was forgotten, one could regain it through the use of the template. When the study was extended to KB the importance of the formulas was confirmed. These were sometimes independent of the entity commented upon, in the sense that the formula could be used with several different entities — in other words, in the formula one variable was supplied by the context. However, often a special characteristic was necessary for the triggering of the formula. It could be that five entities should be present in some way, e.g. that five verses were recited. An example of this was the formula based on the fivefold cattle, which was quoted above.

1. X [is] cattle	paśavo vai X
2. Cattle are fivefold	pānktāḥ paśavaḥ
3. It [leads] to the obtaining of cattle	paśūnām evāptyai

Another factor that contributed to the high frequency of a particular correspondence was that one of the entities in the correspondence was present in all the phases of the rituals; the paradigmatic case of this was the metres, which were used in the whole ritual by the *hotṛ* for his recitations. In AiB and KB, which are *ṛgvedic brāhmaṇas*, the metres tend to come into focus in nearly all ritual discourses. On the other hand, other correspondences were specific for a special ritual and therefore appeared only in the section which dealt with that ritual, even though they were frequently used in that section of the text. Finally, the high frequency of a correspondence in AiB could result from its belonging to the *dvādaśāha rūpa* system. This system was the reason why the category of *Sattra* had 337 topic positions, a number which can be compared with that of the second largest topic category, *Ritual entities*, which had 91. This feature was also present in KB, which, however, had a more elaborated system of correspondences to the days of the *navarātra*, i.e. the nine principal days of the *dvādaśāha*. The basis of this system was present also in other contexts within the *brāhmaṇas*, but the detailed structuring of *rūpas* to the *navarātra* days seems to be a special feature of the *ṛgvedic brāhmaṇas*.

One could have expected, on the basis of Brian K. Smith's research, to find many correspondences in AiB involving the social classes, i.e. the *varṇas*. However, they were seldom explicitly part of specific correspondences, while the *varṇa* system sometimes was an underlying regulating principle, as in the case of the systems of *rūpas* in the *dvādaśāha*. The low frequency of correspondences within the category of *Varṇa* was confirmed in the correspondences common to AiB and KB, even though the correspondence between *Brhaspati* and *brahman* was frequent with ten occurrences. The importance of the *varṇas* was thereby not contradicted, as evinced by several passages which were commented upon. Still, the social classes do not figure frequently in a direct way in the actual correspondences, but are represented mostly by entities belonging to other categories, as is the case, for example, with the priestly class and its metre, the *gāyatrī*.

The analysis of the material shared between AiB and KB has thus, in some respects, confirmed the conclusions based solely on AiB, and in other respects adjusted them. It was not possible to analyse all of these in detail in this study, but one of the most interesting features of the

correspondence system was its focus upon the vital principles — the so-called breaths of the human person.

The majority of the correspondences that involve breath, and which were common to AiB and KB, had their starting-point in the ritual realm. The direction of these correspondences was clear: the correspondences forged links between the ritual world and the vital functions of the human body, and the ‘soul’. Moreover, most of the occurrences were within the commentary to the morning *soma*-pressing and the animal sacrifice. However, in list 3 of Chapter 6, where all the correspondences to breath in AiB were displayed, another major group of correspondences to breath was discerned, viz. that between different gods and breath, or the breaths.

In the analysis of the correspondences to the breaths that are common to AiB and KB, two factors emerged that explain why certain correspondences were used in several *brāhmaṇa* texts:

1. The actual ritual performance contains explicit references to breath, through either words or actions. Examples: the *upaṃśu* and *antaryāma* libations; the consecration and laying down of the *vālakhilya* bricks.
2. Clear analogy. Examples: Vāyu and breath; the introductory and concluding sacrifices as connected with exhalation and inhalation.

The correspondences that were not covered by these explanatory principles were those of *vanaspati* and the offerings to the seasons. This could perhaps explain why these correspondences were not found outside the *ṛgvedic śākhās*.

When the analysis was extended to the ‘ad hoc’ correspondences of AiB, a broader spectrum of basic principles governing the formulation of correspondences was discovered. The principle of analogy played an important role, as with the correspondences common to the two *brāhmaṇas*. One major type of analogy was numerical congruence, in which the numbers 2, 3, 7 and 9 had a special place. Other types of analogy were based upon phonetic similarities, or the fact that the god in question fulfilled a function similar to one of those fulfilled by breath. However, the correspondences were also based on principles other than analogy, e.g. in the case of the god Tanūnapāt, who was regarded as the guardian of the body.

Through the analysis of the different correspondences of breath, it also became obvious that there were several parallels between the *brāhmaṇas* of *ṛgveda* and *yajurveda*, and that the *sāmaveda brāhmaṇas* did not contain the correspondences to breath that were common to AiB and KB, with the exception of that between Vāyu and breath. This could be due to differences in the ritual material treated, the *sāmaveda brāhmaṇas* being focused upon the singing of the *udgātr* and his assistants in the Vedic rituals.

Until now, the focus of the analysis has been upon the system of the correspondences and the principles governing that system. This focus has been necessary for the identification of the aims and concerns of those who have produced this elaborate web of correspondences, and also for discovering the basic principles that governed the formulation and use of the individual correspondences. Nevertheless, in the case of the breaths something more is present, which bears within itself the destruction of the system, and which is, in a sense, the short-circuiting of all the relations established with entities outside the ritual enclosure. The tendency is that the sacrificer also becomes the goal of the ritual activity. It is, however, not only the sacrificer considered as self, as *ātman*, that is intended, but the focus is upon the constituent principles of the self, the breaths. The efficacy is thereby both dependent upon the self — as knowledge of the correspondences is a prerequisite for the attaining of the fruits of the ritual actions — and, at the same time, directed towards it: to the inner principles of the self, among which mind, and also somewhat contradictorily *ātman*, have a place. Thus, in one sense, the correspondences to the breaths short-circuit the efficacy of sacrifice since they also make the principles of sacrificial efficacy the goal of the correspondences. However, the final result of this process, that is, the breakdown of the correspondence system, is not effectuated in the *brāhmaṇas*. To observe such a development we have to turn instead to the end of the Veda, the *upaniṣads*, and in a second step beyond the Veda. This task falls thereby outside the scope of this study, but nevertheless indicates an interesting direction for future research.

In the last chapter, entitled ‘Sacrifice as an act’, two basic questions were presented as tools for the analysis of the predominance of correspondences to the breaths. The first was the question of the nature of human acts,

which, at first sight, may appear to be too general for the concerns of the *brāhmaṇas*. A central question when dealing with human acts is, however, the kind of causality operating in them. The connection between the sacrificial act and its effect is thus a question of the special mechanisms of causality, which are made possible through the ritual. The concern of ritual efficacy is, thereby, a gateway to the more general question of how human acts achieve their ends. This leads to the conclusion that discourses on sacrificial acts (*karman*) become almost by necessity a pondering upon human acts in general (*karman*).

The second question of importance for the correspondence system was the inquiry into what a human person really is. This issue was interrelated with the former question, as the Vedic investigation of the efficacy of the sacrificial acts was centred upon the vital principles of man. Hence, an inquiry into the basis of the efficacy of the act becomes, at the same time, a question of the foundation of the human person (*ātman*) — the agent (*kartr*) of the act.

The two questions delineated above, the nature of the human agent and the nature of its acts, are not only operative in a religious theory of sacrifice, such as the Vedic, but are also of importance in scholarly theories that embrace a methodological agnosticism, or outright materialism. A theory of sacrifice is thus, according to the observations above, predisposed to become a theory of human actions in general, and thereby also a theory of the human person — due to the fact that the consideration of action is intrinsically connected with the question of the constitution of the agent. However, in the Vedic context the development was from a theory of sacrifice to a theory of action, while in most scholarly theories the direction is from a general theory of action to a more specific theory of sacrificial action.

To conclude, in the consideration of the efficacy of sacrifice all, or at least, all the major, causes of human actions — and their mutual dependency — have to be taken into consideration. In this study, the focus has been upon the world-view in which the sacrificial acts are embedded, and more specifically upon the role of ontological questions, and it was argued that this aspect cannot be omitted from the consideration of sacrificial acts, without depriving both the explanation and the interpretation of sacrificial traditions of an important instrument.

APPENDIX 1

Correspondences in AiB pañcikā 1–5

A single word in Sanskrit is written in the stemform. Two words or more are given in nominative, or, if it is a phrase, with the cases that are given in AiB.

An entity that is written within quotation marks is a quotation in AiB from another source, mostly ṚV.

Dvandva compounds that are conjugated in dual will be given in dual nom. Also nouns that refer to two entities will be written in dual.

ANIMALS

Cattle (*paśu*) — Fat *pīva* (2.3.10—1), Agni (2.6.9—1), Pañkti (4.3.1—1), Bṛhatī (4.3.2—1), Jagatī (1.5.20, 1.21.15, 1.28.11, 3.18.14, 3.25.2, 4.3.4—6), Pairing *mithuna* (4.21.6, 5.16.19, 5.17.5, 5.18.18, 5.19.5, 5.20.18, 5.21.8—7), Strength *vāja* (5.8.9—1), Food *anna* (5.19.7, 5.21.8—2)

Cow (*go*) — The Manotā of the gods (2.10.4—1), Sinīvālī (3.48.3—1), Jagatī (3.48.3—1)

Ox, not yoked (*anaḍvān vimuktaḥ*) — Offspring sitting in the house *śālāsadāḥ prajāḥ* (1.14.4—1)

Ox, yoked (*anaḍvān yuktaḥ*) — Offspring travelling *cakriyāḥ prajāḥ* (1.14.4—1)

Teat (*stana*), one — The arrow as an unit *iṣu* (1.25.5—1)

Teats (*stana*), two — The arrow consisting of two parts: point *śalya* and shaft *tejana* (1.25.5—1)

Teats (*stana*), three — The arrow consisting of three parts: point *anīka*, socket *śalya*, and shaft *tejana* (1.25.5—1)

Teats (*stana*), four — The arrow consisting of four parts: point *anīka*, socket *śalya*, shaft *tejana* and feathers *parṇa* (1.25.4—1)

the Victim (*paśu*) — Yajamāna (2.11.5—1)

——'s Breath (*prāṇa*) — Wind *vāta* (2.6.13—1)

——'s Body (*ātman*) — Plants *oṣadhi* (2.6.11—1)

——'s Body (*śarīra*) — Earth *prthivī* (2.6.13—1)

——'s Breast (*vakṣas*) — Eagle *śyena* (2.6.15—1)

——'s Ear (*śrotra*) — Quarters *dīś* (2.6.13—1)

- ’s Front legs (*bāhu*) — Two hatches *praśas* (2.6.15—1)
 —’s Forefeet (*doṣan*) — Spikes *śala* (2.6.15—1)
 —’s Eye (*caṅśus*) — Sun *sūrya* (2.6.13—1)
 —’s Knees (*aṣṭhīvat*) — Oleander leaves *srekaparṇa* (2.6.15—1)
 —’s Life (*asu*) — Atmosphere *antarikṣa* (2.6.13—1)
 —’s Offal (*ūvadhyā*) — Plants *ośadhi* (2.6.16, 2.11.9—2)
 —’s Omentum (*vapā*) — Seed *retas* (2.14.2—1)
 —’s Shoulders (*aṃsa*) — Two tortoises *kaśyapa* (2.6.15—1)

COSMOS

- Atmosphere (*antarikṣa*) — This [earth] *iyam* (3.31.9—1)
 Day (*ahar*) — Br̥hat sāmān (5.30.4—1)
 Day and night (*ahorātre*) — The wheels of the year *cakra* (5.30.1—1)
 Dawn and night (*uśāsānaktā*) — Day and night *ahorātre* (2.4.10—1)
 East (*prācī dik*) — Brahma-splendour *brahmavarcasa* (1.8.1—1), Brilliance *tejas* (1.8.1—1)
 Earth (*pṛthivī*) — Kuhū (3.48.3—1), Anuṣṭubh (3.48.3—1)
 Heaven (*div*) — This [earth] *iyam* (3.31.9—1), Anumati (3.48.3—1), Gāyatrī (3.48.3—1)
 Heaven and earth (*dyāvāpṛthivī*) — Oblation wagons of the gods *devānām havirdhāne* (1.29.4—1)
 Heavenly world (*svargo lokah*) — The day *ahar* (5.24.7—1), Omkāra (5.32.2—1)
 Heavenly worlds, 3 below the sun (*svargā lokā avastāt*) — Three saptadaśa stomas performed on the three svarasāmān-days before the viṣuvat (4.18.5—1)
 Heavenly worlds, 3 above the sun (*svargā lokā parastāt*) — Three saptadaśa stomas performed on the three svarasāmān-days after the viṣuvat (4.18.5—1)
 “Light” (*jyotis*) — Yonder [sun] *asau* (4.10.4—1)
 Night (*rātri*) — Anuṣṭubh (4.6.2—1), Rathaṃtara sāmān (5.30.4—1)
 North (*udañc, uttara*) — Soma (1.8.7—1)
 Ocean (*samudra*) — Speech *vāc* (5.16.7—1)
 Ṛta — The eye *caṅśus* (2.40.6—1)
 Seasons (*ṛtu*) — The brothers of king Soma *bhrātṛ* (1.13.18—1)
 South (*dakṣiṇā dik*) — Food *annādya* (1.8.3—1)
 the Sun (*yo ‘sau tapati*) — Omkāra (5.32.2—1)
 Waters (*āpah*) — Seed *retah* (1.3.3—1), Soma (1.7.10—1), Cattle *paśu* (1.8.5—1)
 West (*pratyāñc*) — Cattle *paśu* (1.8.5—1)
 Wilderness (*araṇya*) — Inserted verses *dhāyyā* (3.31.2—1)
 Year (*saṃvatsara*) — A thousand, offspring and prosperity *sahasra, toka, puṣṭi* (2.41.9—1), Agni Vaiśvānara (3.41.1 & 2—2)
 Zenith (*ūrdhvā dik*) — Heaven *svarga* (1.8.9—1)

GODS, DEMONS AND THEIR BELONGINGS

Aditi — East *prācī dik* (1.7.4—1), Earth *iyam* (1.8.16, 3.31.9—2), Support *pratiṣṭhiti* (1.8.14—1), Sky *dīv* (3.31.9—1), Atmosphere *antarikṣa* (3.31.9—1), Mother *mātr* (3.31.10—1), Father *pitṛ* (3.31.10—1), Son *putra* (3.31.10—1), All-gods *viśve devāḥ* (3.31.11—1), The five folks *pañcajanāḥ* (3.31.11—1), What is born *jāta* (3.31.12—1), What is to be born *janitva* (3.31.12—1)

Āditya — Breath *prāṇa* (5.31.3—1)

Ādityas — Breaths *prāṇa* (3.29.3—1), Cows (go) (4.17.1—1)

Agni — Gāyatrī (1.1.7, 2.5.2—2), South *dakṣiṇā dik* (1.7.4, 1.8.3—2), Soma pavamāna (2.37.5—1), Insight *keta* (5.25.7—1)

— burning forwards (*pravān* √*dah*) — Vāyu (3.4.3—1)

— burning making two (*dvaidha*) — Indra-vāyū (3.4.4—1)

— going up and down (*ud* and *ni* √*hr̥ṣ*) — Mitrā-varuṇau (3.4.5—1)

— terrible to touch (*ghorasamsparsā*) — Varuṇa (3.4.6—1)

— served with friendliness (*mitrakṛtya, upa* √*ās*) — Mitra (3.4.6—1)

— kindled with two arms and two firesticks (*bahū, araṇī, √manth*) — Aśvins (3.4.7—1)

— burning with a loud noise (*uccairghoṣa*) — Indra (3.4.8—1),

— being one carried to many places (*vi* √*hr̥*) — All-gods *viśve devāḥ* (3.4.9—1)

— burns, roaring, uttering speech (√*dah*, √*sphūrj*, *vāc* √*vad*) — Sarasvatī (3.4.10—1)

Agni gārhapatya — Ahir budhnya (3.36.5—1)

“Agni, the good kindled” (*susamidh*) — Vāyu (2.34.3—1)

Agnī-ṣomau — In and out breathing *prāṇāpānau* (1.8.12—1), The two eyes *cakṣuṣī* (1.8.14—1)

All-Gods (*viśve devāḥ*) — Limbs *aṅga* (3.2.9, 3.3.8—2)

All Gods (*sarvā devatāḥ*) — Agni (1.1.4, 2.3.9—2), Viṣṇu (1.1.4—1), Soma (2.3.9—1), The waters *āpaḥ* (2.16.1—1), Forms, bodies of Agni *tanu* (3.4.2—1)

Anumati — Gāyatrī (3.47.3—1)

Aśvins — Hearing *śrotra* (3.2.7, 3.3.6—2)

Bharata — Breath *prāṇa* (2.24.8—1)

Bṛhaspati — Brahman (1.13.4, 1.19.1 & 3, 1.21.1, 1.30.5, 2.38.9, 4.11.1—7)

Deities (*devatā*), 7 — 7 breaths in the head *śiṛṣan prāṇāḥ* (3.3.1—1)

Dhatṛ — The vaṣaṭcall *vaṣaṭkāra* (3.47.2—1)

Goddesses, three (*devī*) — Inhalation, expiration and crossbreathing *prāṇa, apāṇa, vyāṇa* (2.4.12—1)

Gods (deva) — Truth *satya* (1.6.7—1)

—, 3 — Three threefold worlds *trayas trivṛtas lokāḥ* (2.17.17—1)

Hotṛs, divine (*daivyā hotārā*) — Inhalation and expiration *prāṇāpānau* (2.4.11—1)

- Indra — Strength *vīrya* (3.2.8, 3.3.7—2), The cup for Mahendra *graha* (3.21.2—1), Midday pressing *mādhyam̐dinasavana* (3.21.2—1), Niṣkevalya (3.21.2—1), Triṣṭubh (3.21.2—1), Ṛṣṭhaḥ sāmahaḥ (3.21.2—1), Viśvakarman (4.22.9—1)
 “Indra, the generous overflowing one” (*indro maghavā virapsī*) — This [earth] *iyam* (3.38.8—1)
- Indra’s two bay steeds (*harī*) — Ṛc and sāman *rksāme* (2.24.6—1)
 — vajra — Aponāpṭṛ (2.16.4—1), Triṣṭubh (2.2.33, 2.16.4—2), Speech *vāc* (2.16.4, 4.1.4—2)
- Indra-vāyū — Expiration and inhalation *prāṇāpānau* (3.2.5, 3.3.4—2)
- Jātavedas — Vāyu (2.34.12—1), The third soma-pressing (2.39.10—1), Breath *prāṇa* (2.39.11—1)
- Kuhū — Anuṣṭubh (3.47.5—1)
- The Manotā of the gods — Agni (2.10.4—1), Speech *vāc* (2.10.4—1)
 (all the) Manotās — Agni (2.10.4—1)
- Maruts — Breaths *prāṇa* (3.16.1—1), Cattle *paśu* (3.19.1—1)
- Mātariśvan — Breath *prāṇa* (2.38.6—1)
- Mitra — The day *ahar* (4.10.9—1)
- Mitrāvaruṇau — Sight *cakṣus* (3.2.6, 3.3.5—2)
- Pathyā — From east to west *purās, paścā* (1.7.6—1)
- Pāvīravī — Sarasvatī and Speech *vāc* (3.37.8—1)
- Prajāpati—The year *saṃvatsara* (1.1.14, 1.13.33, 1.16.44, 1.28.41, 1.29.24, 2.17.2, 2.39.7—7), 17 sāmīdhenī verses (1.1.14, 4.26.5—2), Cosmos consisting of 21 parts: 12 months, 5 seasons, 3 worlds and Āditya (1.30.29—1), Viśvakarman (4.22.9—1), Vāyu (4.26.11—1)
- Pūṣan — Cattle *paśu* (2.24.7—1)
- Rākā — Triṣṭubh (3.47.4—1)
- Rakṣas — Blood *asṛj* (2.7.1—1)
- Sādhyā gods —The Metres *chandās* (1.16.38—1)
- Sarasvatī — Speech *vāc* (2.24.8, 3.1.10, 3.2.10, 3.3.9—4)
- Savitṛ — North *udīcī dik* (1.7.4—1), Instigation *prasava* (1.8.12 & 14, 1.30.3—3), Breath *prāṇa* (1.19.4, 3.29.4—2)
- “Seers, divine, guardians of the body, born of fervour” (*rṣayo daivayāśas tanūpāvānas tanvas tapojās*) — Breaths *prāṇa* (2.27.5 & 6 & 7—3)
- Sinīvālī — Jagatī (3.47.5—1)
- Serpent queen (*sarparājñī*) — This [earth] *iyam* (5.23.2—1)
- Soma — West *pratīcī dik* (1.7.4—1), Glory *yaśas* (1.13.8—1) Embryo of earth and heaven *garbha* (1.26.5—1), The lordly power *kṣatra* (2.38.9—1), Plants *ośadhi* (3.40.5—1)
- Sūrya — Dhātṛ (3.48.2—1), The vaṣatcall *vaṣatkāra* (3.48.2—1), Brahma-splendour *brahmavarcasa* (4.10.1—1)
- Tanūnapāt — Breath *prāṇa* (2.4.5—1)
- Tvaṣṭṛ — Speech *vāc* (2.4.13—1)

Uṣas — Rākā (3.48.3—1), Triṣṭubh (3.48.3—1), The colour red *aruṇa* (4.9.2—1)
 Varuṇa — The night *rātri* (4.10.9—1)
 Vāyu — Breath *prāṇa* (3.3.3—1), Leader of the sacrifices *praṇīr yajñānām* (2.34.6—1)
 Viṣṇu — Sacrifice *yajña* (1.15.4—1)
 Viśvakarman — The year *saṃvatsara* (4.22.9—1)

MAN

Breath (*prāṇa*) — Vāyu (2.26.6, 3.2.4—2), “The youth well clad” *yuvā suvāsaḥ* (2.2.30—1)
 Breaths below (*prānāḥ avāñcaḥ*) — The word: purified *pūta* (1.20.4—1), Seed, urine and excrements *retas, mūtra, puriṣa* (1.20.4—1)
 Eye (*caḥsus*) — Truth *satya* (1.6.10—1)
 Father (*pitṛ*) — Breath *prāṇa* (2.38.6—1), This [earth] *iyam* (3.31.10—1)
 Life (*āyus*) — Breath *prāṇa* (2.38.13—1)
 Manly force (*vājina*) — Power *indriya* (1.13.14—1), Strength *vīrya* (1.13.14—1)
 Man (*puruṣa*) — ṚV 1.89 *vaiśvadeva* (3.31.3—1), Gāyatrī (4.3.1—1), Uṣṇih (4.3.2—1)
 Man’s members within (*antara, aṅga*) — The hymns *sūkta* (3.31.3—1)
 — joints (*parva*) — Inserted verses *dhāyyā* (3.31.3—1)
 Men (*manuṣya*) — Untruth *anṛta* (1.6.7—1)
 Man (*nara*) — Offspring *prajā* (2.4.6—1)
 Mind (*manas*) — Yonder [world] *adas* (5.33.2—1)
 Mother (*mātṛ*) — This [earth] *iyam* (3.31.10—1)
 the Peoples (*prajāḥ*) — Vaiśvadeva (3.31.2—1)
 Queen (*rāṣṭrī*) — Speech *vāc* (1.19.2—1)
 Seed (*retas*) — Breath *prāṇa* (2.38.6 & 13, 3.2.4—3)
 Son (*putra*) — This [earth] *iyam* (3.31.10—1)
 Speech (*vāc*) — Brahman (2.15.15, 4.21.1—2), Vajra (2.21.1—1), Indra (2.26.6—1), Sacrifice *yajña* (5.24.6—1), This [earth] *iyam* (5.33.2—1)
 Speech and mind (*manas, vāc*) — Pairing of the gods *devānām mithunam* (5.23.5—1)
 Strength (*vayas*) — Breath *prāṇa* (1.28.31—1)
 Womb (*yonī*) — Speech *vāc* (2.38.13—1)

METRES

Anuṣṭubh — Heaven *svarga* (1.5.7 — 1), Cosmos as consisting of 64 parts (1.5.8—1), Speech *vāc* (1.28.15, 3.15.1, 4.3.1 & 2 & 3 & 4—6), The very furthest distance *paramā parāvat* (3.15.1—1), Vajra (4.3.1 & 2 & 3 & 4—4)
 Bṛhatī — Prosperity *śrī* (1.5.11 — 1), Glory *yaśas* (1.5.11 — 1), Breaths *prāṇa* (3.14.2 & 2, 4.10.1—3)

- Gāyatrī — Brilliance *tejas* (1.5.2, 1.28.3 — 2), Brahma-splendour *brahmavarcasa* (1.5.2, 1.28.3—2), The first soma-pressing *prātaḥsavana* (3.12.2, 3.13.1, 3.27.1—3), Agni and the Vasus (3.13.1—1), Brahman (3.34.10, 4.11.15 & 18—3)
- Jagatī — The third soma-pressing *ṭṛtīyasavana* (3.12.4, 3.13.1—2), All-gods *viśve devāḥ* and Ādityas (3.13.1—1)
- Metre, (*chandas*) of the parucchepa verses — The mounting *rohita* (5.10.1—1)
- Metres (*chandas*) — "Anointed singers" *añjāyo vāghataḥ* (2.2.17—1), The limbs of Prajāpati *aṅga* (2.18.2—1), Cattle *paśu* (4.21.6—1)
- , 7 — The seven worlds of the gods *devaloka* (2.17.12—1), Seven tame animals *grāmyāḥ paśavaḥ* (2.17.14—1)
- Pañkti — The (fivefold) sacrifice *pāñkto yajñāḥ* (1.5.13 — 1)
- Two Syllables are left over (*akṣare atiricyete*) — The two breasts of speech: truth and falsehood *satya, anṛta* (4.1.6—1)
- Triṣṭubh — Force *ojas* (1.5.17, 1.28.5—2), Power *indriya* (1.4.11, 1.5.17, 1.17.11, 1.28.5—4), Strength *vīrya* (1.5.17, 1.21.10,12; 1.28.5, 4.3.3, 4.11.15—6), 11 [verses] (2.2.33—1), Second soma-pressing *madhyam̐dina* (3.12.3, 3.13.1—2), Indra and the Rudras (3.13.1—1)
- Uṣṇih — Life *āyus* (1.5.5 — 1)
- Verses,
- with 2 padas *dvīpadā* — Man *puruṣa* (4.10.18, 5.17.10, 5.19.12, 5.21.13—4)
- repeated (*punaḥpada*) — Hook *aṅkuśa* (5.11.1—1)
- 9 (pāda) — 9 breaths *prāṇa* (1.20.1—1)
- 21 — Man, consisting of 21 parts *puruṣa* (1.19.11—1)
- 100 — Life consisting of 100 years *āyus* (2.17.1, 4.19.7—2), 100 strengths *vīrya* (2.17.1, 4.19.7—2), 100 powers *indriya* (2.17.1, 4.19.7—2)
- 360 — Sacrifice *yajña* (2.17.2—1), The year *saṃvatsara* (2.17.2—1)
- 720 — Offspring *prajā* (2.17.4—1), Cattle *paśu* (2.17.4—1)
- 800 — A non-brahmin *abrāhmaṇa* (2.17.6—1), Someone ill-spoken of *duroktokta* (2.17.6—1), Someone sacrificing while seized by defilement *sāmalagr̥hīta* (2.17.6—1)
- 1000 — Heaven *svarga* (2.17.8—1)
- Unlimited number — Prajāpati (2.17.9—1), All desires *kāma* (2.17.9—1)
- by Jamadagni — The victim *paśu* (4.26.8—1)
- Virāj — Food *anna* (1.5.23, 4.11.18, 5.19.7, 5.21.8 — 4), Five metres (1.5.2 — 1)

RITUAL ENTITIES

- Adhvaryu — Sāman (5.25.10—1)
- After-offerings, (*anuyāja*) — Offspring *prajā* (1.11.3—1), The breaths below the head *avāñc* (1.17.14—1)
- Agnīdh — Knowledge *vijñāta* (5.25.8—1)

- The Agnihotra-milk, being in the cow — Rudra (5.26.6—1)
 ——— when the calf is going to drink it (*upāva* √*srj*) — Vāyu (5.26.6—1)
 ——— when being milked (*duhyamāna*) — Aśvins (5.26.6—1)
 ——— when milked (*dugdha*) — Soma (5.26.6—1)
 ——— when on the fire (*adhi* √*śri*) — Varuṇa (5.26.6—1)
 ——— when swelling up (*samudanta*) — Pūṣan (5.26.6—1)
 ——— when pouring over (*vi* √*syand*) — Maruts (5.26.6—1)
 ——— when bubbling (*bindumant*) — The Allgods (5.26.6—1)
 ——— when covered with a film (*śarogṛhīta*) — Mitra (5.26.6—1)
 ——— when removed (*ud* √*vas*) — Sky and earth *dyāvāpṛthivī* (5.26.6—1)
 ——— when it is ready (*prakrānta*) — Savitṛ (5.26.6—1)
 ——— when it is being taken (√*hr*) — Viṣṇu (5.26.6—1)
 ——— when put (*upa* √*sad*) — Bṛhaspati (5.26.6—1)
 ——— the first libation (*pūrvahuti*) — Agni (5.26.6—1)
 ——— The next libation (*uttara*) — Prajāpati (5.26.6—1)
 ——— The offering (*huta*) — Indra (5.26.6—1)
 Agnihotras, 1440 — 1440 *yajusmatī* bricks (5.28.10—1)
 Agniṣṭoma — Gāyatrī (3.39.4—1), The year *Samvatsara* (3.39.6, 4.12.8—2), Agni
 (3.41.1 & 2, 3.43.1—3), The one who gives heat here *yo vā eṣa tapati* (3.44.1—
 1), The fellows of the wheel of the gods *pradhī* (4.15.6—1)
 Āhavanīya — Sacrifice *yajña* (5.24.12, 5.26.3—2), The heavenly world *svargo lokah*
 (5.24.12, 5.26.3—2)
 Ājya śāstra — The inner reins of sacrifice *antarau raśmī* (2.37.1—1)
 Altar (*vedī*) — Speech *vāc* (5.25.5—1), Earth *pṛthivī* (5.28.1—1)
 Antelope skin, black (*kṛṣṇājina*) — Placenta *jarāyu* (1.3.17-18—1)
 Anurūpa — Offspring *prajā* (3.23.7, 3.24.3—2)
 Āpri verses — Brilliance *tejas* and Brahma-splendour *brahmavarcasa* (2.4.2—1)
 Atirātra, concluding — The other side (shore) of the year *pāra* (4.14.3—1), The ascent
 of the year *udrodhana* (4.14.5—1), Upward-breathing *udāna* (4.14.7—1)
 Atirātra, introductory — This side of the year *avāra* (4.14.3—1), The descent of the
 year *avarodhana* (4.14.5—1), Forward-breathing *prāna* (4.14.7—1)
 Bahiṣpavamāna — The mouth of sacrifice *mukha* (2.22.8—1)
 Bhūr, bhuvaḥ, svar — The internal fastenings of the veda *antaḥśleṣa* (5.32.6—1)
 Bṛhat sāman — Raivata sāman (4.13.6—1), Mind *manas* (4.28.1—1), Āditya
 (5.30.4—1)
 Bṛhat and Rathamṭara sāman — The two ships of sacrifice *yajñasya nāvau* (4.13.1—
 1), Two feet *pāda* (4.13.2—1), Two wings *pakṣa* (4.13.3—1), Pairing of the gods
devānām mithunam (5.22.12—1)
 Butter (*ghṛta*)— Milk of the woman *payas* (1.1.10—1), Vajra (1.26.3, 2.23.6—2)
 Butter, drops (*stoka*) — All gods *sarvadevatya* (2.12.2 & 18—2)
 Butter, fragrant (*surabhi ghṛtam*) — Men *manuṣya* (1.3.5—1)
 Butter, fresh (*navanīta*) — Embryos *garbha* (1.3.5—1)

- Butter, half-melted (*āyuta*)— The forefathers *pitara* (1.3.5—1)
 Butter, melted (*ājya*) — Gods *deva* (1.3.5—1), “Divine sweetness” *madhu daivyam* (2.2.4—1), Ambrosia *amṛta* (2.14.6—1), Intelligence *citta* (5.25.4—1)
 Cake (*purolāṣa*) — Victim *paśu* (2.9.1—1)
 The Cake’s chaff (*kiṃśāru*) — The hair of the victim *roman* (2.9.2—1)
 — Husks (*tuṣa*) — The skin of the victim (2.9.2—1)
 — Polishings (*phalīkaraṇa*) — The blood of the victim *asṛj* (2.9.2—1)
 — Pounded grains and fragments (*piṣṭa, kikkasa*) — The flesh of the victim *māṃsa* (2.9.2—1)
 — Substantial parts (*sāra*) — The bones of the victim *asthi* (2.9.2—1)
 Cake, made of rice (*apūpa*) — Power *indriya* (2.24.9—1)
 Call (*āhāva*) — Brahman (2.33.1—1), Speech *vāc* (4.21.1—1)
 Cauldron (*gharma*) — Penis *śísna* (1.22.14—1), Divine pairing *devamithuna* (1.22.14—1)
 Cauldron’s handles (*śapha*) — Testicles *śapha*¹ (1.22.14—1)
 “Charioteer of the offerings” (*rathīr adhvarāṇām*) — Yonder [sun] *asau* (2.34.7—1)
 Concluding sacrifice (*udayanīya*) — Inhalation *udāna* (1.7.2—1), Common *samāna* (1.7.2—1)
 The Consecrated’s hut (*dīkṣitavimitam*) — The womb of the consecrated *yoni* (1.3.11—1)
 The Consecrated’s garment (*vāsa*) — Caul *ulba* (1.3.16—1)
 “The Crosser, the bearer of the oblation” (*tūrṇir havyaavāt*) — Vāyu (2.34.9—1)
 Divākīrtiya sāmans — Five ropes *raśmi* (4.19.3—1)
 Dūrohana — Heaven *svargo lokaḥ* (4.20.1, 4.21.1—2)
 Enclosing sticks (*paridhi*) — The quarters *dis* (5.28.1—1)
 Evayāmarut hymn — Divine and human support *pratiṣṭhā daivyā ca mānuṣyā* (5.15.3—1)
 Expression of approval (*āgur*) — Vajra (2.28.5—1)
 Fore-offerings (*prayāja*) — Breaths *prāṇa* (1.11.3—1), Breaths in the head *śīṛṣan prāṇāḥ* (1.17.14—1)
 Fore-offerings and after-offerings — Divine armour *devavarman* (1.26.1—1)
 Gaurvīta sāman — Brilliance *tejas* (4.2.1—1), Brahma-splendour *brahmavarcasa* (4.2.1—1)
 Gold (*hiraṇya*) — Ambrosia *amṛta* (2.14.6—1)
 Guest reception (*ātithya*) — Viṣṇu (1.15.4—1)
 — with seven padas — The head of sacrifice with seven breaths *śīro yajñasya, sapta prāṇāḥ* (1.17.9, 1.25.1—2)

¹ The translation follows from the context. First, the cauldron is correlated to the penis *sa yo gharman tac chīśnam* which is followed by *yau śaphau tau śaphau*, “The two handles [are] the handles [testicles].”

- Hotṛ — Common *samāna* (1.7.2—1), The speech of sacrifice *vāg yajñasya* (2.5.9, 2.28.6—2), Vācaspati (5.25.11—1)
- “Hotṛ, chosen by man” (*manuvṛta*) — Agni here *ayam* (2.34.5—1)
- “Hotṛ, the god-chosen” (*devavṛta*) — Yonder [sun] *asau* (2.34.4—1)
- “Hotṛ, uncrossed” (*atūrta*) — Agni here *ayam* (2.34.8—1)
- Hotṛ’s goblet (*camasa*) — Body (or self) *ātman* (2.30.5—1)
- Hotṛ’s muttering (*hotṛjapa*) — The pouring of seed *retas* √*sic* (2.38.1—1)
- Hymn (*sūkta*) — The people *viś* (2.33.1 & 1 & 2 & 3, 3.19.8 & 9—6), Houses *gṛha* (3.23.7, 3.24.13—2)
- Initiation (*dīkṣā*) — Ṛta (1.6.6 — 1), Truth *satya* (1.6.6 — 1)
- Introductory sacrifice (*prāyaṇīya*) — Expiration *prāṇa* (1.7.2—1), Common *samāna* (1.7.2—1)
- Inserted verses (*dhāyyā*) — The suture of the sacrifice *syūma yajñasya* (3.18.6—1), The wife *patnī* (3.23.7, 3.24.5—2), The root of the sacrifice *mūla* (3.31.4—1)
- Kindling wood (*idhma*) — The trees *vanaspati* (5.28.1—1)
- Kindling sticks (*samidh*) — Breaths *prāṇa* (2.4.4—1)
- Libations, for two deities (*dvidevatya*) — Breaths *prāṇa* (2.26.1, 2.27.1, 2.28.1 & 2 & 5, 2.30.1—6)
- Libations, for two deities: Indra and Vāyu — Speech *vāc* and breath *prāṇa* (2.26.2—1)
 ——— Mitra and Varuṇa — Eye *cakṣus* and mind *manas* (2.26.2—1)
 ——— Aśvins — Ear *śrotra* and self *ātmā* (2.26.2—1)
- Libations, Upamśu and Antaryāma — Expiration and inhalation *prāṇāpāna* (2.21.1—1)
- Litanies (*uktha*) — Cattle *paśu* (4.1.3, 4.12.5—2)
- Mahānāmnī, the first — This world *ayaṃ lokaḥ* (4.4.2—1)
- Mahānāmnī, the second — The atmosphere *antarikṣaloka* (4.4.2—1)
- Mahānāmnī, the third — Yonder world *asau lokaḥ* (4.4.2—1)
- Mahāvṛata day — Caturviṃśa day (4.14.1—1)
- Maitrāvaruṇa priest — The mind of the sacrifice *mano yajñasya* (2.5.9, 2.28.6—2)
- Milk (*payas*) — Seed *retas* (1.22.14)
- The Morning litany (*prātaranuvāka*) — The head of sacrifice *śiras* (2.21.1—1)
- Mush (*karambha*) — Food *anna* (2.24.7—1)
- Nābhānediṣṭha — The seed of yajamāna *retas* (5.15.3—1)
- Nivid — The lordly power *kṣatra* (2.33.1 & 1 & 2 & 3, 3.19.8 & 9—6), The embryos of the litanies *garbā ukthānām* (3.10.1—1), The ornaments of the litanies *peśa* (3.10.5—1), Deities connected with the sun *sauryā devatāḥ* (3.11.1—1)
- Oblation (*havis*) — Breath *prāṇa* (5.25.9—1)
- Offering spoon (*sruc*) — Thought *citti* (5.25.3—1)
- Offering verse (*yājyā*) — Rain and lightning *vṛṣṭi, vidyut* (2.41.10—1), The root of the sacrifice *mūla* (3.31.4—1)
- Ointment (*āñjana*) — Brilliance in the eyes *tejo ’kṣyoḥ* (1.3.7—1)
- The O-sound (*nyūñkha*) — Food *anna* (5.3.5—1)

- consisting of four syllables (*akṣara*) — Cattle with four feet *paśu* (5.3.6–1)
- consisting of three syllables — Three threefold worlds *trayas trivṛto lokāḥ* (5.3.7–1)
- consisting of two syllables — Man’s two supports, i.e. legs *dvipraṭiṣṭhe* (5.3.9–1)
- consisting of one syllable — Speech *vāc* (5.3.8–1)
- Pakayajñas — Sacrificial food *iḷā* (3.40.2–1)
- Pap, made of rice (*parivāpa*) — Food *anna* (2.24.9–1)
- Potsherds, nine (*kapāla*) — Nine breaths *prāṇa* (1.15.3–1)
- eleven — Indra (2.23.5–1)
- Pragātha — Cattle *paśu* (3.19.1, 3.23.7, 3.24.9–3)
- Praise (*śaṃsa*) — Speech *vāc* (2.4.6–1)
- Praūga śastra — The inner reins of sacrifice *antarau raśmī* (2.37.1–1), The self of yajamāna *adhyātma* (3.2.3–1)
- Pururuc, with 12 padas — 12 months *māsa* (2.41.2–1)
- Rathambara sāman — Śākhara sāman (4.13.6–1), Speech *vāc* (4.28.1–1), Agni (5.30.4–1)
- Recitation, by three verses (*tripadya*) — Heaven *asau lokaḥ* (4.21.2–1)
- Recitation, by verses (*pacchas*) — Cattle *paśu* (2.18.3–1), This world *ayam lokaḥ* (4.21.2–1)
- Recitation, by half verses (*ardharcaśas*) — Support *pratiṣṭhā* (2.18.4–1), Atmosphere *antarikṣa* (4.21.2–1)
- Recitation to Vaiśvānara — Vajra (3.14.3–1)
- Ṛtupraisa — Speech *vāc* (5.9.3–1)
- Rice grains (*taṇḍula*) — Milk of the man *payas* (1.1.10–1)
- ṚV 1.120.1–9 — Entrails of the sacrifice *yajñasyāntastya* (1.21.5–1)
- ṚV 2.12 — The power of Indra *indrasyendriya* (5.2.2–1)
- ṚV 10.181.1–3 — The bodies of the cauldron *gharmatanu* (1.21.2–1)
- Sacrifice (*yajña*) — Yajamāna (1.28.30–1), Prajāpati (2.17.2, 4.26.11–2), Waters *ap* (2.20.11–1), A chariot of the gods *devaratha* (2.37.1–1), Indra (5.34.6–1)
- fivefold (*pāñkta*) — Fivefold cattle *paśu* (3.23.5, 5.4.4, 5.18.20, 5.19.6, 5.20.19, 5.21.8–6)
- to the seasons (*ṛtuyāja*) — Breaths *prāṇa* (2.29.1 & 6–2)
- with three pressings (*savana*) — The anūbandhyā victim (2.24.4–1)
- with five pressings (*savana*) — The victim on the upavasatha-day (2.24.4–1)
- Sacrifice’s two paths (*vartanyau*) — Mind and speech *manas, vāc* (5.33.2–1)
- Sacrifice (*medha*) — Victim *paśu* (2.6.4–1)
- Sacrificial food (*iḷā*) — Food *anna* (2.4.7–1), Cattle *paśu* (2.9.11, 2.10.11, 2.30.1–3)
- Sacrificial post (*yūpa*) — Vajra (2.1.3 & 4; 2.3.3–3), Yajamāna (2.3.7–1), Yonder sun *asav ādityaḥ* (5.28.1–1)
- made of bilva-wood — Food *annādyā* (2.1.6–1), Light *jyotis* (2.1.8–1), Prosperity *puṣṭi* (2.1.6–1)

- made of khadira-wood — Heaven *svarga* (2.1.5—1)
- made of palāśa-wood — Brilliance *tejas* (2.1.10—1), Brahma-splendour *brahmavarcasa* (2.1.10—1)
- under the name of Vanaspati — Breath *prāṇa* (2.4.14, 2.10.8—2)
- Śastra — Speech *vāc* (3.44.5—1)
- The Silent praise (*tuṣṇīmśamsa*) — The eyes of the soma-pressings *cakṣūṃṣi savanānām* (2.32.1—1), The eye of the sacrifice *cakṣus* (2.32.3—1), The root of sacrifice *mūla* (2.32.4—1)
- *bhūr, agnir jyotir jyotir agniḥ* — The eyes of the first pressing *prātaḥsavana* (2.32.1—1)
- *indro jyotir bhuvo jyotir indraḥ* — The eyes of the second pressing *mādhyam̐dina savana* (2.32.1—1)
- *sūryo jyotir jyotiḥ svaḥ sūryaḥ* — The eyes of the third pressing *ṭṭīyasavana* (2.32.1—1)
- with six padas — six seasons *ṛtu* (2.41.1—1)
- Ṣoḍaśin — Vajra (4.1.2 & 3 & 4—3), Speech *vāc* (4.1.4—1), The word “male” *vṛṣan* (4.4.12—1)
- Soma-pressing, the first — The word: drink $\sqrt{pā}$ (4.4.9—1)
- Midday (*madhyam̐dina*) — Yajamānas self *ātman* (3.18.14—1)
- the third — The word: to be drunk \sqrt{mad} (3.29.2 & 4, 4.4.11—3)
- Sprinkling water (*prokṣaṇī*) — The waters *ap* (5.28.1—1)
- Stotriya — The self *ātman* (3.23.7, 3.24.1—2)
- the twenty-first — The sun *so ‘sau tapati* (3.41.4—1), Yajamāna (3.41.4—1), The divine lordly power *daivam̐ kṣatram* (3.41.4—1), Strength *sahas* (3.41.4—1), Force *bala* (3.41.4—1)
- Strew (*barhis*) — Object of thought *ādhīta* (5.25.6—1), The plants *oṣadhi* (5.28.1—1)
- Strew (*barhis*) of kuśa-grass — Cattle *paśu* (2.4.8—1)
- Strew of darbha grass (*prastara*) — Yajamāna (2.3.7—1)
- Svāhākṛti — Support *pratiṣṭhā* (2.4.15—1)
- Svāhākāra — The end *anta* (5.20.11—1)
- Sviṣṭakṛt — Support *pratiṣṭhā* (2.10.10—1)
- Ukthya — Month *māsa* (3.41.1, 4.12.6—2)
- Ukthyas, four — The nave of the wheel of the gods *nabhya* (4.15.6—1)
- Upasad, the first — This world *ayam̐ lokaḥ* (1.23.2—1), Iron *ayas* (1.23.1—1), Sadas (1.23.1—1), Agni (3.18.7, 3.32.4—2)
- Upasad, the second — Atmosphere *antarikṣa* (1.23.2—1), Silver *rajata* (1.23.1—1), Agnīdh’s altar *āgnīdhra* (1.23.1—1), Soma (3.18.7, 3.32.4—2)
- Upasad, the third — Heaven *div* (1.23. 2—1), Gold *harita* (1.23.1—1), Sacrificial wagons *havirdhāna* (1.23.1—1), Viṣṇu (3.18.7, 3.32.4—2)
- Upasads, indefinite number — The neck of sacrifice *yajñasya grīvā* (1.25.1—1)
- Upasad, two — Day and night *ahorātre* (1.23.6—1)
- Upasad, 3*2 — 6 seasons *ṛtu* (1.23.3—1)

- Upasad, 6*2 — 12 months *māsa* (1.23.4—1)
 Upasad 12*2 — 24 half-months *ardhamāsa* (1.23.5—1)
 Upavakṛ — Mind *manas* (5.25.12—1)
 Upayamanī — The thigh bones *śronikapāle* (1.22.14—1)
 Vairāja sāmān — Bṛhat sāmān (4.13.6—1)
 Vairūpa sāmān — Ratham̐tara sāmān (4.13.6—1)
 Vaiśvadeva uktha — The five peoples *pañcajana* (3.31.5—1)
 Vālahilyāḥ — The breaths of yajamāna *prāṇa* (5.15.3—1)
 Vāmadevya sāmān — The world of yajamāna *yajamānaloka* (3.46.7—1), The world of immortality *amṛtaloka* (3.46.7—1), Heaven *svargaloka* (3.46.7—1)
 Vaṣaṭkāra — A vessel of the gods *devapātra* (3.5.1—1), Vajra (3.6.1, 3.7.2, 3.8.2—3), Force *ojas* (3.8.6—1), Strength *sahas* (3.8.6—1), Speech *vāc* (3.8.9—1), Expiration and inhalation *prāṇāpānau* (3.8.9—1)
 ——— containing the word six (*ṣaṣ*, nom. *ṣaṭ*) — The seasons *ṛtu* (3.6.2—1)
 ——— containing the syllable *vau* — Yonder [sun] *asau* (3.6.5—1)
 ——— hider of his abode (*dhāmachad*) — Offspring and cattle *prajā, paśu* (3.7.5—1)
 ——— the second (*anuvaṣaṭkāra*) — Conclusion *saṁsthā* (2.28.3, 2.29.7, 3.29.3 & .4—4)
 ——— who have failed with the syllable *ṣaṭ* (*ava* √*rādh*) — Empty *rikta* (3.7.6—1)
 Vṛṣākapi hymn — The body of the yajamāna *ātman* (5.15.3—1)
 Yajamāna — “Lord of the sacrifice” *medhapati* (2.6.4—1), Prajāpati (2.18.2—1)
 Yajñāyajñīya — Support *pratiṣṭhā* (3.14.3—1)

SATTRA

- Abhiplava Ṣaḍaha — The wheel of the gods *devacakra* (4.15.6—1)
 Āyus day — Yonder world *asau lokaḥ* (4.15.1—1)
 Caturviṁśa day — The head *śiras* (4.13.2 & 3—2)
 Chandoma, the first, occupying position seven after the six days of a *prṣṭhya ṣaḍaha* within a *daśarātra* — The word: hither *ā* (5.16.1 & 11, 5.17.11—3), The word: forward *pra* (5.16.1 & 11, 5.17.1 & 3 & 7 & 8 & 14—7), The word: yoke *yukta* (5.16.3—1), The word: wagon *ratha* (5.16.3 & 17—2), The word: swift *āśu* (5.16.3—1), The word: drink *piba* (5.16.3 & 28—2), The deity is mentioned in the first pada *yat prathame pade devatā nirucyate* (5.16.3—1), This world *ayam lokaḥ* (5.16.3—1), The word: born *jāta* (5.16.4 & 13, 5.17.9—3), That which is unexpressed *anirukta* (5.16.4, 5.17.16—2), The tense: Future *karisyat* (5.16.5—1), That which is a symbol of the first day *prathamasyāhno rūpam* (5.16.5 & 12—2), Triṣṭubh (5.16.10 & 11 & 16, 5.17.2—4), Jagatī (5.16.18—1), Bṛhat sāmān (5.16.20—1), Ratham̐tara in place *āyatana* (5.16.27—1), Ratham̐tara (5.17.6—1), Gāyatrī (5.17.17—1)
 Chandoma, the second, eight day in daśarātra — Not having the word: forward, or the word: hither *neti na preti* (5.18.1—1), The word: stand *sthita* (5.18.1—1), The

word: upright *ūrdhva* (5.18.3 & 8, 5.19.9—3), The word: towards *prati* (5.18.3 & 8—2), The word: between *antar* (5.18.3 & 8—2), The word: manly *vṛṣan* (5.18.3—1), The word: grow *vṛdhan* (5.18.3, 5.19.16—2), The deity is mentioned in the middle pada *madhyame pade* (5.18.3—1), Atmosphere *antarikṣa* (5.18.3—1), That which has Agni twice *dvyagni* (5.18.4 & 6—2), The word: great *mahat* (5.18.4 & 12 & 13 & 14 & 16, 5.19.1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 10 & 13 & 15 & 18—14), Double invocation *dvihūta* (5.18.4 & 8—2), The word: again *punar* (5.18.4, 5.19.11—2), The present tense *kurvat* (5.18.4—1), That which is a symbol of the second day in the pṛṣṭhya ṣaḍaha *dvitīyasyāhno rūpam* (5.18.5 & 10—2), Triṣṭubh (5.18.7 & 9 & 15, 5.19.2—4), Jagatī (5.18.17, 5.19.4—2), Bṛhat in place *āyatana* (5.18.23—1), Bṛhat (5.19.8—1), Gāyatrī (5.19.14 & 19—2)

Chandoma, the third, the ninth day in daśarātra — That which has the same endings *samānodarka* (5.20.1 & 16, 5.21.19—2), The word: horse *aśva* (5.20.3—1), The word: end *anta* (5.20.3—1), That which is repeated *punarāvṛtta* (5.20.3—1), That which is alliterated *punarnirṛtta* (5.20.3—1), The word: stay *rata* (5.20.3—1), The word: thrown around *pariyasta* (5.20.3—1), The word: three *tri* (5.20.3, 5.21.12 & 14—3), That which is a symbol of the end *antarūpa* (5.20.3 & 11 & 13, 5.21.2 & 4 & 6 & 10 & 16—8), The deity is mentioned in last pada *uttame pade* (5.20.3—1), Yonder world *asau lokaḥ* (5.20.3—1), The word: pure *śuci* (5.20.4 & 8, 5.21.11—3), The word: truth *satya* (5.20.4 & 8, 5.21.3—3), The word: to dwell $\sqrt{kṣi}$ (5.20.4 & 8, 5.21.2 & 17—4), The word: gone *gata* (5.20.4 & 6 & 8, 5.21.1—4), The word: dwelling *okas* (5.20.4 & 8—2), Past tense *kṛta* (5.20.5—1), That which is a symbol of the third day *trītyasyāhno rūpam* (5.20.5 & 10—2), Triṣṭubh (5.20.7 & 9 & 15, 5.21.5—4), Jagatī (5.20.17, 5.21.7—2), Rathaṃtara in place *āyatana* (5.20.21—1), Rathaṃtara (5.21.9—1), Gāyatrī (5.21.15 & 21—2)

Chandomas — Cattle *paśu* (5.16.19, 5.17.5 & 10, 5.18.18 & 20, 5.19.5 & 6 & 7 & 12, 5.20.18 & 19, 5.21.8 & 8 & 8 & 13—15), The tongue, palate and teeth *jihvā, tālu, danta* (5.22.1—1), That within the nostrils *antaram nāsikayoḥ* (5.22.2—1), The black in the eye *antaram akṣnaḥ kṛṣṇam* (5.22.3—1), That within the ear *anataram karṇasya* (5.22.4—1)

Dvādaśāha — Gāyatrī with wings *pakṣa*, eyes *caḥṣus*, light *jyotis*, and brilliance *bhāsa* (4.23.5—1), Bṛhatī (4.24.6—1)

Dvādaśāha: two agniṣṭomas — The two eyes of the Gāyatrī bird *caḥṣus* (4.23.5—1)

—— two atirātras — The two wings of the Gāyatrī bird *pakṣa* (4.23.5—1)

—— first three days, ascending (*ūrdhvo vai prathamā trayahaḥ*) — Fire burning upwards *agnir ūrdhva uddīpyate* (4.25.10—1)

—— second set of three days, transverse (*tiryac*) — Water *ap* and wind *vāyu*, transverse (4.25.10—1)

—— Tenth day (*daśamam ahar*) — That which makes speech distinct *vācam vyākāroti*, that by which he discerns sweet and not sweet *yena svādu cāsvādu ca*

- vijānāti* (5.22.1—1), By which he discerns scents *yenaiva gandhān vijānāti* (5.22.2—1), The pupil by which he sees *kanīnikā yena paśyati* (5.22.3—1), By what he hears *yenaiva śṛṇoti* (5.22.4—1), Prosperity *śrī* (5.22.5—1)
- third set of three days, descending (*arvāñc*) — Yonder [sun] *asau*, rain *vṛṣṭi* and stars *nakṣatra*, descending (4.25.10—1)
- ukthyas eight — The body of the Gāyatrī bird *ātman* (4.23.5—1)
- Go day — The atmosphere *antarikṣa* (4.15.1—1)
- Jyotis day — This world *ayaṃ lokah* (4.15.1 & 4—2), Yonder world *asau lokah* (4.15.4—1)
- Prṣṭhya Ṣaḍaha — The mouth *mukha* (5.22.1—1), The nostrils *nāsikā* (5.22.2—1), The eye *akṣi* (5.22.3—1), The ear *karṇa* (5.22.4—1)
- Prṣṭhya Ṣaḍaha, the first day — Agni (4.29.1—1), Trivṛt stoma (4.29.1—1), Rathamṭara *sāma* (4.29.1 & 13, 4.30.3—3), Gāyatrī (4.29.1—1), The word: hither *ā* (4.29.3 & 6 & 12 & 14, 4.30.1 & 6—6), The word: forward *pra* (4.29.3 & 5 & 9 & 11, 4.30.5 & 6 & 11 & 14—8), The word: yoke *yukta* (4.29.3, 4.30.4—2), The word: wagon *ratha* (4.29.3 & 7—2), The word: swift *āsu* (4.29.3—1), The word: drink *piba* (4.29.3 & 7 & 15—3), The deity is mentioned in the first pada *yat prathame pade devatā nirucyate* (4.29.3 & 8 & 10, 4.30.7 & 10—5), This world *ayaṃ lokah* (4.29.3—1), The tense: Future *karisyat* (4.29.3—1)
- Prṣṭhya Ṣaḍaha, the second day — Indra (4.31.1—1), Pañcadaśa stoma (4.31.1—1), Bṛhat *sāman* (4.31.1 & 11 & 12, 4.32.2—4), Triṣṭubh (4.31.1—1), Not having the word: forward, or the word: hither *neti na preti* (4.31.3—1), The word: stand *sthita* (4.31.3—1), The word: upright *ūrdhva* (4.31.3 & 7, 4.32.3—3), The word: towards *prati* (4.31.3—1), The word: between *antar* (4.31.3 & 6, 4.32.4—3), The word: manly *vṛṣan* (4.31.3 & 10, 4.32.1 & 5 & 6 & 8 & 9—7), The word: grow *vṛdhan* (4.31.3 & 5 & 6 & 9, 4.32.11—5), The deity is mentioned in the middle pada *madhyame pade* (4.31.3—1), Atmosphere *antarikṣa* (4.31.3—1), The present tense *kurvat* (4.31.3, 4.31.4—2)
- Prṣṭhya Ṣaḍaha, the third day — The All-gods *viśve devāḥ* (5.1.1, 5.2.6—2), Saptadaśa stoma (5.1.1—1), Vairūpa *sāman* (5.1.1—1), Jagatī (5.1.1—1), That which has the same endings *samānodarka* (5.1.3 & 12, 5.2.1 & 17—4), The word: horse *aśva* (5.1.3 & 10—2), The word: end *anta* (5.1.3, 5.2.8 & 11 & 14 & 15—5), That which is repeated *punarāvṛtta* (5.1.3—1), That which is alliterated *punarninṛtta* (5.1.3 & 13 & 14, 5.2.9—4), The word: stay *rata* (5.1.3—1), The word: thrown around *pariyasta* (5.1.3 & 16—2), The word: three *tri* (5.1.3 & 13 & 17 & 21—4), That which is a symbol of the end *antarūpa* (5.1.3—1), The deity is mentioned in last pada *uttame pade* (5.1.3—1), Yonder world *asau lokah* (5.1.3—1), Past tense *krta* (5.1.3—1), Rathamṭara in its place *āyatana* (5.1.19—1)
- Prṣṭhya Ṣaḍaha, fourth day — Speech *vāc* (5.4.1, 5.4.2—2), Ekaviṃśa stoma (5.4.1—1), Vairāja *sāman* (5.4.1—1), Anuṣṭubh (5.4.1 & 6—2), The word: hither *ā* (5.4.2

- & 10, 5.5.7—3), The word: forward *pra* (5.4.2 & 10, 5.5.8 & 9 & 10—5), The word: yoke *yukta* (5.4.2—1), The word: wagon *ratha* (5.4.2—1), The word: swift *āśu* (5.4.2—1), The word: drink *piba* (5.4.2—1), The deity is mentioned in the first pada *yat prathame pade devatā nirucyate* (5.4.2—1), This world *ayaṃ lokaḥ* (5.4.2—1), The word: born *jāta* (5.4.2 & 22, 5.5.2 & 12 & 16—5), The word: call *hava* (5.4.2 & 13 & 14 & 16—4), The word: bright *sūkra* (5.4.2 & 10, 5.5.10—3), That which is by Vimada *vaimada* (5.4.2 & 3. 5.5.1—3), That which is sounded *viriphita* (5.4.2 & 3, 5.5.1—2), That which has various metres *vichandas* (5.4.2, 5.5.11 & 14 & 17—4), That which is deficient *ūna* (5.4.2—1), That which is redundant *atirikta* (5.4.2—1), The future *karisyat* (5.4.2—1), That which is a symbol of the first day *prathamasyāhno rūpam* (5.4.2 & 12—2), Jagatī (5.4.5—1), Gāyatrī (5.4.7 & 17, 5.5.5—3), Bṛhat (5.4.19 & 21—2)
- Prṣṭhya Ṣaḍaha, fifth day — The cow *go* (5.6.1—1), Triṇava stoma (5.6.1—1), Śākvara sāman (5.5.1, 5.7.1—2), Pañkti (5.6.1 & 5 & 5 & 10 & 11, 5.8.1 & 2—7), Not having the word: forward, or the word: hither *neti na preti* (5.6.2 & 13—2), The word: stand *sthita* (5.6.2—1), The word: upright *ūrdhva* (5.6.4—1), The word: towards *prati* (5.6.4—1), The word: between *antar* (5.6.4—1), The word: manly *vṛṣan* (5.6.4, 5.7.5—2), The word: grow *vṛdhan* (5.6.4, 5.7.5—2), The deity is mentioned in the middle pada *madhyame pade* (5.6.4—1), Atmosphere *antarikṣa* (5.6.4—1), The word: milked *dugdha* (5.6.5—1), The word: udder *ūdha* (5.6.5—1), The word: cow *dhenu* (5.6.5—1), The word: dappled *pṛṣṇi* (5.6.5, 5.7.5—2), The word: to be drunk *√mad* (5.6.5 & 10 & 11 & 12, 5.7.5, 5.8.2 & 3—7), That which is a symbol of cattle *paśurūpa* (5.6.5 & 6, 5.7.8, 5.8.4 & 8 & 9 & 10 & 14—8), That which has an addition *adhyāsa* (5.6.5 & 6, 5.7.8, 5.8.10 & 14—5), Jagatī (5.6.5 & 6—2), Bṛhat (5.6.5 & 7—2), That which is beautiful *vāma* (5.6.5, 5.8.7—2), The word: oblation *havis* (5.6.5, 5.8.11—2), The word: form *vapus* (5.6.5, 5.8.12—2), The present tense *kurvat* (5.6.5—1), That which is a symbol of the second day *dvitīyasyāhno rūpam* (5.6.5 & 9—2), “Of the five peoples” *pāñcajanya* (5.6.8—1), Gāyatrī (5.6.14, 5.8.5—2), Having five padas *pañcapada* (5.6.11, 5.8.1 & 2—3), Rathamṭara (5.7.7, 5.8.6—2)
- Prṣṭhya Ṣaḍaha, sixth day — Field of the gods *devakṣetra* (5.9.1—1), Dyaus (5.12.1—1), Trayastriṅśa stoma (5.12.1—1), Raivata sāman (5.12.1 & 14—2), Aticchandas (5.12.1 & 4 & 5 & 8, 5.13.1 & 7—6), That which has the same endings *samānodarka* (5.12.2 & 9, 5.13.2 & 5 & 10, 5.15.8—6), The word: horse *aśva* (5.12.2—1), The word: end *anta* (5.12.2 & 6 & 10 & 12, 5.13.3 & 8—6), That which is repeated *punarāvṛtta* (5.12.2, 5.15.5—2), That which is alliterated *punarninṛtta* (5.12.2 & 17, 5.15.5—3), The word: stay *rata* (5.12.2—1), The word: thrown around *pariyasta* (5.12.2—1), The word: three *tri* (5.12.2, 5.13.11—2), That which is a symbol of the end *antarūpa* (5.12.2—1), The deity is mentioned in last pada *uttame pade* (5.12.2—1), Yonder world *asau lokaḥ* (5.12.2—1), Connected with Parucchepa *pārucchepa* (5.12.3 & 4 & 5 & 8, 5.13.1—5), What has seven padas *saptapada* (5.12.3 & 4 & 5 & 8, 5.13.1—5),

- The Nārāsaṃsa (5.12.3, 5.13.11—2), The Nābhānediṣṭha (5.12.3—1), Past tense *kṛta* (5.12.3—1), That which is a symbol of the third day *trīyasyāhno rūpam* (5.12.3 & 7—2), Gāyatrī (5.12.13, 5.13.6—2), Bṛhat (5.12.16—1)
- Ṣaḍaha, the first — Six seasons *ṛtu* (4.16.1—1)
- Ṣaḍaha, the second — Twelve months *māsa* (4.16.2—1)
- Ṣaḍaha, the third — Nine breaths and nine worlds of heaven *prāṇa, svargā lokāḥ* (4.16.3—1)
- Ṣaḍaha, fourth — 24 half-months *ardhamāsa* (4.16.4—1)
- Ṣaḍaha, fifth — Virāj (4.16.5—1)
- Svarasāmans — These worlds *ime lokāḥ* (4.19.1—1)
- Viṣuvat — Man *puruṣa* (4.22.1—1), The head [of a man] who is on a level *prabāhuk sataḥ śiraḥ* (4.22.1—1)
- Viṣuvat, the first half of (*pūrvō ‘rdhaḥ*) — The right side of man *dakṣiṇo ‘rdhaḥ* (4.22.1—1)
- Viṣuvat, the second half of (*uttaro ‘rdhaḥ*) — The left side of man *uttaro ‘rdhaḥ* (4.22.1—1)

VARNA

- Brahman — The ear (or hearing) *śrotra* (2.40.4—1), The Moon *candramas* (2.41.6—1)
- Brāhmaṇa — Gāyatrī (1.28.3—1)
- Within the peoples (*antaram janatāḥ*) — Inside of the hymns *sūkta* (3.31.2—1)
- Rājanya — Triṣṭubh (1.28.5—1)
- Vaiśya — Jagatī (1.28.11—1)

MISCELLANEOUS

- "Anointed singers" (*añjayo vāghataḥ*) — Metres *chandās* (2.2.17—1)
- Arrow's bow (*dhanu*) — Butter *ājya* (1.25.2—1)
- feathers (*parṇa*) — Varuṇa (1.25.2—1)
- shaft (*tejana*) — Viṣṇu (1.25.2—1)
- socket (*śalya*) — Soma (1.25.2—1)
- point (*anīka*) — Agni (1.25.2—1)
- Boat, named "Sutarman" (*sutarmā nauḥ*) — Sacrifice *yajña* (1.13.29—1), The black antelope skin *kṛṣṇājina* (1.13.29—1), Speech *vāc* (1.13.29—1)
- "Destroyer" (*khāda*) — The end *anta* (5.12.10—1)
- The word: discerning (*vicakṣaṇa*) — Eye *cakṣus* (1.6.9 — 1)
- "Distance" (*parāvata*) — The end *anta* (5.2.11, 5.21.16—2)
- Doors (*dur*) — Rain *vr̥ṣṭi* (2.4.9—1)
- "That which belongs to the door" (*durya*) — Houses *gr̥ha* (1.13.24—1)

- Eating (*bhakṣa*) — Conclusion *saṁsthā* (3.29.3 & 4—2)
 Fame (*śravas*) — Sacrifice *yajña* (3.38.11—1)
 Food (*annādya*) — Virāj (4.16.5—1)
 “Forward” (pra) — Breath *prāṇa* (2.40.1—1), Atmosphere *antarikṣa* (2.41.3—1)
 “Gone” (*gata*) — The end *anta* (5.13.8, 5.21.10—2)
 “Great” (*māhina*) — This [earth] *iyam* (3.38.11—1)
 “Greatness” (mahat) — The word: end *anta* (5.2.8, 5.12.6—2)
 He that blows here (*yo ‘yaṁ pavate*) — Sacrifice *yajña* (5.33.2—1)
 “Highest” (*paramam*) — The end *anta* (5.21.4—1)
 the Holder (*yantrī*) — Inhalation *apāṇa* (2.40.5—1), Vāyu (2.41.7—1)
 “King of beings” (*rājā januṣām*) — This [earth] *iyam* (3.38.10—1)
 The horse chariot sounding aloud and noisy (*uccairghoṣa upabdimān asvarathaḥ*) —
 Lordly power *kṣatra* (4.9.3—1)
 “to Lead away” (*vi√nī*) — To stride *vi√kram* (3.18.13—1)
 “Much” (*bahu*) — The end *anta* (5.2.15, 5.15.6—2)
 “the Net” (*nidhā*) — Snares *pāśa* (3.19.17—1)
 Not to be spoilt (*māduṣa*) — Connected with man *mānuṣa* (3.33.6—1)
 Nourishment (*pitu*) — Food *anna* (1.13.13—1), Sacrificial fee *dakṣiṇā* (1.13.13—1)
 “The one seeing the light” *svardrk* — Yonder [sun] *asau* (4.10.7—1)
 “Praise” (*dhiṣaṇā*) — The end *anta* (5.2.14—1)
 Prosperity (*śriyā*) — Head *śiras* (4.13.2 & 3—2)
 “Protection” (*śarma*) — Speech *vāc* (2.40.3—1)
 “Radiant” (*dīdāya*) — Mind *manas* (2.40.2—1), He who yonder gives heat *yo ‘sau tapati* (2.41.4—1)
 the Rich ones (*revatyā*) — All deities *sarvā devatāḥ* (2.16.1—1)
 “the Singer” (*jaritrī*) — Yajamāṇa (3.38.11—1)
 Sound (*svara*) — Cattle *paśu* (3.24.9—1)
 “Standing” (*sthita*) — The end *anta* (5.13.3 & 9, 5.20.13—3)
 to Stride (*vi√kram*) — Viṣṇu (3.18.13—1)
 Towards (*abhi*) — Forward *pra* (5.17.3—1)
 “the True supporter of the folk, the unequalled” (*satyā carṣaṇīdhṛd anarvā*) — This
 [earth] *iyam* (3.38.9—1)
 Udumbara tree — Strength *ūrj* (5.24.3—1), Food *annādya* (5.24.3—1)
 “That which is unbroken” (*achidra*) — Seed *retas* (2.38.7—1)
 Web (*tantu*) — Offspring *prajā* (3.11.19, 3.38.5—2)
 What is born (*jāta*) — This [earth] *iyam* (3.31.12—1)
 What is to be born (*janitva*) — This [earth] *iyam* (3.31.12—1)
 Who (*ka*) — Prajāpati (2.38.13—1)
 “Won” (*jita*) — The end *anta* (5.12.12, 5.21.6—2)

APPENDIX 2

Correspondences in KB not noted by K. Mylius

ANIMALS

Cattle (*paśu*) — Bṛhatī (29.3.11—1), Jagatī (30.1.25—1)

GODS, DEMONS AND THEIR BELONGINGS

Aditi — Support *pratiṣṭhā* (1.5.25)

Brhaspati — Brahman (12.10.17)

METRES

Tristubh — Strength *vīrya* (11.2.24, 30.9.23)

Pañkti, fivefold — Fivefold sacrifice *yajña* (1.3.32–33, 1.5.2–3, 13.1.14–15, 18.9.28–29, 19.4.17–18, 25.12.4–5)

RITUAL ENTITIES

Libation to Savitr (*sāvitragraha*) — Breath *prāṇa* (16.2.32)

Libations for two deities (*dvidevatya*) — Breaths *prāṇa* (13.4.18, 13.5.4 & 15 & 25)

Libations, Upamśu and Antaryāma — Expiration and inhalation *prāṇāpāna* (12.5.1 & 5 & 9)

Praūga śastra — Breath *prāṇa* (14.5.3)

Sacrificial post (*yūpa*) made of *bilva* wood — Food *annādya* (10.1.11)

——— made of *khadira*-wood — Heaven *svarga* (10.1.12)

——— made of *palāśa*-wood — Brahma-splendour *brahmavarcasa* (10.1.10)

SATTRA

Prsthya Sadaha, fifth day — Pañkti (23.5.30, 23.6.35 & 37, 29.5.6, 30.2.21), Cattle *paśu* (23.6.6 & 9 & 12 & 15 & 21 & 33)

Chandomas — Cattle *paśu* (30.8.10 & 14)

APPENDIX 3

Table 14. The distribution of the correspondences to breath that are common to AiB and KB

Ritual	Frequency of correspondences	
	AiB	KB
The four-monthly sacrifices		1
Dīkṣā		1
The introductory sacrifice	3	2
Prātaranuvāka		1
The animal sacrifice	2	2
The upāṃśu and antaryāma libations	1	3
The libations to the seasons	2	3
The libations for the pairs of gods	6	7
The praūga śastra	1	
The third soma-pressing		1

Bibliography

Primary Sources (Texts and Translations)

The Daily Evening and Morning Offering (Agnihotra) according to the Brāhmaṇas, 1976, trans. H. W. Bodewitz. E. J. Brill: Leiden.

The Aitareya Brahmanam of the Rigveda, 1863, ed. and trans. Martin Haug. Government Central Book Depôt: Bombay.

Das Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, 1879, ed. Theodor Aufrecht. Adolph Marcus: Bonn.

The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa of the Rgveda with the Commentary of Sāyaṇa Āchārya, 1895–1906, ed. Satyavrata Sāmaśramī. Bibliotheca Indica, new series 134, 4 vols. The Asiatic Society of Bengal: Calcutta.

The Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra with the Commentary of Devatrāta, 1986–1990, general ed. of 1st Vol. Ranbir Singh Bawa, general ed. of 2nd Vol. Bhraj Bihari Chaubey. Panjab University Indological Series Vols. 31 and 35. Vishveshvaranand Vishva Bandhu Institute of Sanskrit and Indological Studies, Panjab University: Hoshiarpur.

Āśvalāyana-Śrautasūtra, 1994, trans. Klaus Mylius. Reihe Texte und Übersetzungen, Vol. 3. Institut für Indologie: Wichtrach.

Atharvaveda (Śaunaka), 1960–62, ed. Vishva Bandhu. Viśveśvarānand Indological Series, Vols. 13–16. Viśveśvarānand Vedic Research Institute: Hoshiarpur.

Atharva-Veda Samhitā, 1905, trans. William Dwight Whitney. Harvard Oriental Series, Vols. 7 and 8. Harvard University: Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Ghosh, Batakrishna, ed., 1935, *Collection of the Fragments of Lost Brāhmaṇas*. Modern Publishing Syndicate: Calcutta.

Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa of the Sāmaveda, 1954, ed. Raghu Vira. Sarasvatī-Vihāra Series, ed. Raghu Vira, Vol. 31. International Academy of Indian Culture: Nagpur.

Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa I, 1–65: Translation and Commentary with a Study Agnihotra and Prāṇāgnihotra, 1973, trans. H. W. Bodewitz. E. J. Brill: Leiden.

The Jyotiṣṭoma Ritual: Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa I, 66–364, 1990, trans. H. W. Bodewitz. E. J. Brill: Leiden.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Tales of Sex and Violence : Folklore, Sacrifice, and Danger in the Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa*, 1987 (first edn., 1985, Chicago), trans. Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty. Motilal Banarsidass: Delhi.
- Kaṣīṭhala-Kaṭha-Saṃhitā*, 1932, ed. Raghu Vira. Mehar Chand Lachman Das Sanskrit and Prakrit Series, Vol. 1. Mehar Chand Lachman Das: Lahore.
- Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, 1978, trans. H. G. Ranade. Ranade Publication Series, Vol. 1. H. G. Ranade: Pune.
- Kauṣītaki-Brāhmaṇa*, 1887, ed. B. Lindner. Jena.
- Ṛgvedāntargataṃ Śāṅkhāyanabrāhmaṇam*, 1911. Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series, No. 65. Poona.
- Kauṣītaki-Brāhmaṇa*, 1968, ed. Sreekrishna E. R. Sarma. Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Supplementband 9, 1. Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH: Wiesbaden.
- Kāṭhakam: Die Saṃhitā der Kaṭha-śākhā*, 1900–1909, ed. Leopold von Schroeder, 2 vols. F. A. Brockhaus: Leipzig.
- Maitrāyanī Saṃhitā*, 1923, ed. Leopold von Schroeder, 2 vols. F. A. Brockhaus: Leipzig.
- Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa*, 1934–35, ed. A. Chinaswāmi Śāstri. Kāshi Sanskrit Series, No. 105, 2 vols. Sanskrit Series Office: Benares.
- Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa, the Brāhmaṇa of Twenty Five Chapters*, 1931, trans. Wilhelm Caland. Bibliotheca Indica, New Series, work No. 255. The Asiatic Society of Bengal: Calcutta.
- Rig Veda: A Metrically Restored Text with an Introduction and Notes*, 1994, ed. Barend A. van Nooten and Gary B. Holland. Harvard Oriental Series, ed. Michael Witzel, Vol. 50. Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies: Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Der Rig-Veda aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt*, 1951, trans. Karl Friedrich Geldner. Harvard Oriental Series, Vol. 33–35. Harvard University Press: Cambridge Massachusetts.
- Rig-Veda Brāhmaṇas*, 1920, trans. Arthur Berriedale Keith. Harvard Oriental Series, Vol. 25. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Ṣaḍviṃśabrāhmaṇam vijñāpanabhāṣyasahitam*, 1908, ed. W. H. Julius. E. J. Brill: Leiden.
- Ṣaḍviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa*, 1956, trans. W. B. Bollée. diss. at the University of Utrecht.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, 1964 (reprint of the edition from 1849), ed. Albrecht Weber. The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, work No. 96. The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office: Varanasi.
- The Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, According to the Text of the Mādhyandina School*, 1963 (reprint of the first edition 1882–1900), trans. Julius Eggeling. Sacred Books of the East, Vol. 12, 26, 41, 43, 44. Motilal Banarsidass: Delhi.
- Die Taittirīya-Saṃhitā*, 1872, ed. Albrecht Weber. Indische Studien, ed. Albrecht Weber, Vols. 11 and 12. F. A. Brockhaus: Leipzig.
- The Veda of the Black Yajus School entitled Taittiriya Sanhita*, 1914, trans. Arthur Berriedale Keith. Harvard Oriental Series, Vols. 18 and 19. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, 1908–1913, ed. Mahadeva Sastri. Government Oriental Library Series, Bibliotheca Sanskrita, Nos. 36, 38, 41–42. Government Oriental Library: Mysore.
- The Early Upaniṣads, Annotated Text and Translation*, 1998, trans. Patrick Olivelle. South Asia Research Series, ed. Richard Lariviere. Oxford University Press: New York, Oxford.

Secondary Sources

- Ahern, Emily M., 1979, “The Problem of Efficacy: Strong and Weak Illocutionary Acts”, *Man*, N.S., Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 1–17.
- Allen, Douglas, 1998, *Myth and Religion in Mircea Eliade*. Theorists of Myth, ed. Robert Segal, Vol. 11. Garland Publishing: New York.
- Alvira, Tomas, Clavell, Luis and Melendo, Tomas, 1991, *Metaphysics*. Sinag-tala Publishers: Manila. (Translation from Spanish; first Spanish edn. 1982.)
- Anttonen, Veikko and Pyysiäinen, Ilka, 1999, “Method and Theory in Finland, an IAHR regional meeting, University of Turku, August 4–7, 1997”, *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion* 11, pp. 71–74.
- Bailey, Greg, 1985, *Materials for the Study of Ancient Indian Ideologies: Pravṛtti and Nivṛtti*. Pubblicazioni di “Indologica Taurinensia”, Vol. 19. Indologica Taurinensia: Torino.
- Barbosa da Silva, Antonio, 1982, *The Phenomenology of Religion as a Philosophical Problem*. Diss. at the Faculty of Theology, University of Uppsala. Studia Philosophiae Religionis 8, eds. Hans Hof and Hampus Lyttkens. Liber: Lund.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beck, David, 2000, “Semantic Agents, Syntactic Subjects, and Discourse Topics: How to locate Lushootseed sentences in space and time”, *Studies in Language* 24:2, pp. 277–317.
- Belier, W. Wouter, 1999, “Durkheim, Mauss, Classical Evolutionism and the Origin of Religion”, *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion*, 11–1, pp. 24–46.
- Bell, Catherine, 1992, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Benveniste, E., 1950, “La phrase nominale”, *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, Vol. 46, fasc. 1, No. 132, pp. 19–36.
- Bergström, Lars, 1990, “Explanation and Interpretation of Action”, *International Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 3–15.
- Bhide, V. V., 1979, *The Cāturmāsya Sacrifices*. Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, No. 5, class B. University of Poona: Pune.
- Biardeau, Madeleine and Charles Malamoud, 1976, *Le sacrifice dans l’Inde ancienne*. Presses Universitaires de France: Paris.
- Biese, Y. M., 1931, “Der Gebrauch von *As* und *Bhū* im Aitareyabrāhmaṇa”, *Arctos* Vol. 2, fasc. 1, pp. 44–65.
- Blezer, H. W. A., 1992, “Prāṇa. Aspects of Theory and Evidence for Practice in Late-Brāhmaṇical and Early-Upaniṣadic Thought”, in *Ritual, State and History in South Asia*, ed. A. W. van den Hoek, Memoirs of the Kern Institute, No. 5, pp. 20–49. E. J. Brill: Leiden.
- Bodewitz, H. W., 1986, “Prāṇa, Apāṇa and other Prāṇa-s in Vedic Literature”, *The Adyar Library Bulletin*, 50, pp. 326–348.
- 1992, “King Prāṇa”, in *Ritual, State and History in South Asia*, ed. A. W. van den Hoek, Memoirs of the Kern Institute, No. 5, pp. 50–64. E. J. Brill: Leiden.
- 2000a, “Classifications and Yonder World in the Veda”, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens*, ed. Gerhard Oberhammer, Vol. 44, pp. 19–58.
- 2000b, “Distance and death in the Veda”, *Études Asiatiques* 54:1, pp. 103–118.
- unpublished manuscript, “Vedic Conceptions of the Soul”.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bosch, Lourens P. van den, 1999, “Friedrich Max Müller: His Contribution to the Science of Religion”, in *Comparative Studies in History of Religions: Their Aim, Scope, and Validity*, ed. Erik Reenberg Sand, Jørgen Podemann Sørensen, pp. 11–39. Museum Tusulanum Press: Copenhagen.
- Boyer, Pascal, 1999, “Cognitive Aspects of Religious Ontologies”, in *Approaching Religion*, Vol. 1, ed. Tore Ahlbäck, pp. 53–71. The Donner Institute for Research in Religious and Cultural History: Åbo.
- 2000, “Functional Origins of Religious Concepts: Ontological and Strategic Selection in Evolved Minds”, *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 195–214.
- Brandewie, Ernest, 1983, *Wilhelm Schmidt and the Origin of the Idea of God*. University Press of America: Lanham.
- Brereton, Joel, 1981, *The R̥gvedic Ādityas*. American Oriental Series, Vol. 63. American Oriental Society: New Haven.
- 1986, “‘Tat Tvam Asi’ in Context”, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 136, pp. 98–109.
- Brown, George William, 1990 (reprint from 1919 in JAOS), “Prana and Apana”, *Yoga Mimamsa*, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 50–61.
- Brown, Gillian and George Yule, 1983, *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Bryant, Edwin, 2001, *The Quest for the Origins of Vedic Culture: The Indo-Aryan Migration Debate*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Burkert, Walter, 1972, *Homo Necans: Interpretationen altgriechischer Opferriten und Mythen*. Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, ed. Walter Burkert and Carsten Colpe, Vol. 32. Walter de Gruyter: Berlin.
- Caland, Wilhelm and V. Henry, 1906–07, *L’Agniṣṭoma: description complète de la forme normale du sacrifice de Soma dans le culte védique*. Ernest Leroux: Paris.
- Callender, J. B., 1984, *Studies in the Nominal Sentence in Egyptian and Coptic*. University of California Publications, Near Eastern Studies, Vol. 24. University of California Press: Berkeley.
- Carter, Jeffrey, ed., 2003, *Understanding Religious Sacrifice: A Reader*. Continuum: London.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Clooney, X., Francis, 1985, "Sacrifice and its Spiritualization in the Christian and Hindu Traditions: a Study in Comparative Theology", *Harvard Theological Review* 78, pp. 361–380.
- Connolly, Peter, 1992, *Vitalistic Thought in India*. Sai Garib Dass Oriental Series, Vol. 159. Sri Satguru Publications: Delhi.
- Cunningham, Graham, 1999, *Religion and Magic: Approaches and Theories*. New York University Press; New York.
- Dahlgren, Sven-Olof, 1996, *Word Order in Arabic*. Diss., University of Göteborg, Department of Oriental Languages, Arabic Section: Göteborg.
- Dandekar, R. N., 1997, *Select Writings 5, Indological Miscellanea*. The Late Smt. Rakhumabai Vitthal Shikhare Publication Series, Vol. 1. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute: Pune.
- Davis, H. Lawrence, 1979, *Theory of Action*. Prentice-Hall: New Jersey.
- DeMarinis, Valerie, 1996, "A Psychotherapeutic Exploration of Religious Ritual as Mediator of Memory and Meaning: A Clinical Case Presentation of the Therapeutic Efficacy of Incorporating Religious Ritual into Therapy", in *Religious and Social Ritual: Interdisciplinary Explorations*, ed. Michael Aune and Valerie DeMarinis, pp. 235–266. State University of New York Press: New York.
- Delbrück, B., 1878, *Die altindische Wortfolge aus dem Śatapathabrāhmaṇa dargestellt*. Syntaktische Forschungen, Vol. 3. Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses: Halle.
- 1888, *Altindische Syntax*. Syntaktische Forschungen, Vol. 5. Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses: Halle.
- Dik, C. Simon, 1989, *The Structure of the Clause*. The Theory of Functional Grammar, part 1, in Functional Grammar Series. Foris Publications: Dordrecht.
- Drees, Willem B., 1996, *Religion, Science and Naturalism*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Durkheim, Émile, 1912, *Les formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse*. Libraire Félix Alcan: Paris.
- Eliade, Mircea, 1967, *Myths, Dreams and Mysteries: The Encounter between Contemporary Faiths and Archaic Realities*. Harper & Row: New York. (Trans. Philip Mairet; 1st French edn. 1957.)
- 1969a, "A New Humanism", in *The Quest: History and Meaning in Religion*, pp. 1–11. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1969b, “The Quest for the ‘Origins’ of Religion”, in *The Quest: History and Meaning in Religion*, pp. 37–54. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago.
- 1974, *The Myth of the Eternal Return: or, Cosmos and History*. Bollingen Series, Vol. 46. Princeton University Press: Princeton. (Fourth printing of the translation from French; first French edn. 1949.)
- Evans-Pritchard, E. E., 1956, *Nuer Religion*. Clarendon Press: Oxford.
- Faivre, Antoine, 1994, *Access to Western Esotericism*. State University of New York Press: New York. (Translated from French, book one first French edn. 1986, book two 1992.)
- Farace, John Dominic, 1982, *The Sacred-Profane Dichotomy: a Comparative Analysis of its Use in the Work of Émile Durkheim and Mircea Eliade as far as Published in English*. Diss. at the Rijksuniversitet of Utrecht.
- Findly, Ellison Banks, 1987, “Breath and Breathing”, in *Encyclopedia of Religion*, ed. Mircea Eliade, Vol. 2, pp. 302–308. Macmillan Publishing Company: New York.
- Firth, Raymond, 1963, “Offering and Sacrifice: Problems of Organisation”, *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. 93, pp. 12–24.
- Flood, Gavin, 1999, *Beyond Phenomenology: Rethinking the Study of Religion*. Cassell: London.
- Foley, John Miles, 1988, *The Theory of Oral Composition: History and Methodology*. Indiana University Press: Bloomington.
- Frawley, David, 1994, *The Myth of the Aryan Invasion of India*. Voice of India: New Delhi.
- Frege, Gottlob, 1892, “Über Sinn und Bedeutung”, *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik*, 100, pp. 25–50.
- Freud, Sigmund, 1913, *Totem und Tabu: Einige Übereinstimmungen im Seelenleben der Wilden und der Neurotiker*. Offprint from *Imago*, Vol. 1 & 2, 1912/13. Hugo Heller & Cie.: Leipzig.
- Gadamer, 1995, *Truth and Method*. Continuum: New York. (2nd revised edn., translated from German; 1st German edn. 1960.)
- Gonda, Jan, 1950, *Notes on Brahman*. J. L. Beyers: Utrecht.
- 1960a, *Veda und älterer Hinduismus*. Die Religion Indiens, Vol. 1, Die Religionen der Menschheit, ed. Christel Matthias Schröder, Vol. 11. W. Kohlhammer Verlag: Stuttgart.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1960b, *Ellipsis, Brachylogy and other Forms of Brevity in Speech in the R̥gveda*. Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, afd. Letterkunde. N.V, part 67, No. 4. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij: Amsterdam.
- 1963, *The Vision of the Vedic Poets*. Disputationes Rheno-Trajectinae, ed. J. Gonda, Vol. 8. Mouton & Co: The Hague.
- 1965a, “Bandhu- in the Brāhmaṇas”, *Adyar Library Bulletin* 29, pp. 1–29.
- 1965b, *Savayajñas*. Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, part 71, No. 2. N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij: Amsterdam.
- 1969, “Āyatana,” *Adyar Library Bulletin* 23, pp. 1–79.
- 1974, *The Dual Deities in the Religion of the Veda*. Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, Vol. 81. North-Holland Publishing Company: Amsterdam.
- 1975a, “Pratiṣṭhā”, *Sanskrit Word Studies*, in Selected Studies, Vol. II, pp. 338–374. E. J. Brill: Leiden.
- 1975b, *Vedic Literature. A History of Indian Literature*, ed. Jan Gonda, Vol. 1, fasc. 1. Otto Harrassowitz: Wiesbaden.
- 1976, *Triads in the Veda*. Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, Vol. 91. North-Holland Publishing Company: Amsterdam.
- 1984, *Prajāpati and the Year*. Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, Vol. 123. North-Holland Publishing Company: Amsterdam.
- Gotō, Toshifumi, 1987, *Die “I. Präsensklasse” im Vedischen: Untersuchung der vollstufigen thematischen Wurzelpräsentia*. Veröffentlichen der Kommission für Linguistik und Kommunikationsforschung, eds. Manfred Mayrhofer and Wolfgang U. Dressler, Vol. 18. Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: Wien.
- 2001, “Review of Chlodwig Werba’s *Verba Indoarica. Die primären und sekundären Wurzeln der Sanskrit-Sprache. Pars I: Radices Primariae*”, *Kratylos* 46, pp. 62–72.
- Grapard, Allen, 1991, “Rule-governed Activity vs. Rule-creating Activity”, *Religion* 21, pp. 207–212.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Grassman, Hermann, 1996, *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*. Otto Harrasowitz: Wiesbaden. (Sixth revised and enlarged edn. by Maria Kozińska; first edn. 1873.)
- Gren-Eklund, Gunilla, 1978, *A Study of Nominal Sentences in the Oldest Upaniṣads*. Diss. at the University of Uppsala. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Vol. 3. Almqvist & Wiksell International: Stockholm.
- Guiraud, Charles, 1962, *La phrase nominale en grec: d'Homère à Euripide*. Librairie C. Klincksieck: Paris.
- Gundel, Jeanette, 1977, *Role of Topic and Comment in Linguistic Theory*. Ohio State University.
- Günter, Thomas, 1995, "The Problem of Ritual Efficacy in Modern Society: The German Chains of Lights, December, 1992", *Journal of Ritual Studies*, Vol. 9, pp. 45–63.
- Göhler, Lars, 1990, *Zu philosophischen-metodologischen Grundlagen der Erforschung des vedischen Opferrituals*. Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe XIX, abt. A, Volkskunde, Vol. 35. Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main.
- Habermas, Jürgen, 1994, *Knowledge and Human Interests*. Blackwell Publishers: Oxford. (Reprint of the third edn. of the translation from German made 1972; first German edn. 1968.)
- Hanegraaff, Wouter J., 1995, "Empirical Method in the Study of Esotericism", *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion*, 7–2, pp. 99–129.
- Hanks, Patrick, ed., 1989, *Collins Concise Dictionary Plus*. Collins: London.
- Haugen, Odd Einar, 2000, "Fem argument mot filologien", *Den Fornnordiska Texten*, Gothenburg Old Norse Studies, Vol. 2, pp. 17–26. Litteraturvetenskapliga Institutionen, Göteborgs Universitet: Göteborg.
- Heesterman, J. C., 1957, *The Ancient Indian Royal Consecration*. Mouton & Co: The Hague.
- 1985, *The Inner Conflict of Tradition*. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago.
- 1991, "Hinduism and Vedic Ritual", *History of Religion*, 30, pp. 290–305.
- 1993, *The Broken World of Sacrifice*. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago.
- Heil, John and Alfred Mele, eds., 1993, *Mental Causation*. Clarendon Press: Oxford.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Hengeveld, Kees, 1992, *Non-verbal Predication: Theory, Typology, Diachrony*. Functional Grammar Series, eds. Machtelt Bolkestein, Simon Dik, Casper de Groot, Lachlan Mackenzie, Vol. 15. Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin.
- Henninger, Joseph, 1987, "Sacrifice", in *Encyclopedia of Religion*, ed. Mircea Eliade, Vol. 12, pp. 544–557. Macmillan Publishing Company: New York.
- L'Hermitte, René, 1978, *La phrase nominale en russe*. Bibliothèque russe, l'Institut d'études slaves, Vol. 41. Publications de la Sorbonne: Paris.
- Hillebrandt, Alfred, 1897, *Ritual-litteratur: Vedische Opfer und Zauber*, in *Grundriss indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde*, Vol. 3, part 2. Verlag von Karl J. Trübner: Strassburg.
- 1977, *Das altindische Neu- und Vollmondsopfer in seiner einfachsten Form*. Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt: Graz. (Reprint of the first edn. from 1879.)
- Hoffmann, Karl, 1992, "Die magische Weltanschauung im Veda", *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*, ed. Sonja Glauch, Vol. 3, p. 709. Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag: Wiesbaden.
- Horton, Robin, 1964, "Ritual Man in Africa", *Africa* 34, pp. 85–104.
- 1977, "African Traditional Thought and Western Science," in *Rationality*, ed. Wilson R. Bryan, pp. 131–171. Basil Blackwell: Oxford.
- 1993, "Neo-Tylorism: Sound Sense or Sinister Prejudice?" in Horton, Robin, *Patterns of Thought in Africa and the West: Essays on magic, religion and science*, pp. 53–62. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Hubert, Henri and Marcel Mauss, 1898, "Essai sur la nature et la fonction du sacrifice", *L'Année sociologique*, 2, pp. 29–138.
- Humphrey, Caroline and James Laidlaw, 1994, *The Archetypal Actions of Ritual: A Theory of Ritual Illustrated by the Jain Rite of Worship*. Clarendon Press: Oxford.
- Idinopulos, Thomas and Yonan, Edward, eds., 1994, *Religion and Reductionism: Essays on Eliade, Segal, and the Challenge of the Social Sciences for the Study of Religion*. Studies in the History of Religions, Numen Bookseries, ed. H.G. Kippenberg, Vol. 62. E. J. Brill: Leiden.
- James, E. O., 1920, "Sacrifice", in *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. James Hastings, Vol. 11, pp. 1–7. T. & T. Clark: Edinburgh.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Jamison, Stephanie, 1996, *Sacrificed Wife/Sacrificer's Wife*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Jarvie, C. and Joseph Agassi, 1970, "The Problem of the Rationality of Magic", in *Rationality*, ed. Bryan Wilson, pp. 172–193. Basil Blackwell: Oxford.
- Jarvie, C., 1995, "The Justificationist Roots of Religious Relativism", in *Relativism and Religion*, ed. Charles, Lewis, pp. 52–67. Macmillan Press: Houndmills.
- Jones, W. T., 1972, "Worldviews: Their Nature and Their Function", *Current Anthropology*, Vol. 13, issue 1, pp. 79–91.
- Kant, Immanuel, 1977, *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics that Will Be Able to Come Forward as Science*. Hackett Publishing Company: Indianapolis/Cambridge. (Translated from German; first German edn. 1783.)
- Keith, Arthur, Berriedale, 1925, *The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads*. Harvard Oriental Series, Vols. 31 and 32. Harvard University Press: Cambridge Massachusetts.
- Kippenberg, Hans G., 1998, "Survivals: Conceiving of Religious History in an Age of Development", in *Religion in the Making: The Emergence of the Sciences of Religion*, ed. Arie L. Molendijk, Studies in the History of Religions, Numen Book Series, ed. H. G. Kippenberg, Vol. 63, pp. 297–312. Brill: Leiden.
- Kosman, Admiel, 1998, "Breath, Kiss and Speech as the Source of the Animation of Life: Ancient Foundations of Rabbinic Homilies on the Giving of the Torah as the kiss of God", in *Self, Soul and Body in Religious Experience*, ed. A. I. Baumgarten, Studies in the History of Religions, ed. H.G. Kippenberg, Vol. 78, pp. 96–124. Brill: Leiden.
- Krick, Hertha, 1982, *Das Ritual der Feuergründung (Agnýādheya)*. Veröffentlichungen der Kommisson für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 399, Vol. 16. Verlag der Östereichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: Wien.
- Kümmel, Martin, 2000, *Das Perfekt im Indoiranischen*. Reichert Verlag: Wiesbaden.
- Kupfer, Katharina, 2000, "Kopula- und Nominalsätze im R̥gveda", in *Indoarisch, Iranisch und die Indogermanistik*, eds. Bernhard Forssman, Robert Plath, pp. 285–293. Reichert Verlag: Wiesbaden.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Kuppevelt, J. van, 1994, "Topic and Comment", in *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, ed. R. E. Asher, pp. 4629–4633. Pergamon Press: Oxford.
- Lang, Andrew, 1997, *The Making of Religion. The Early Sociology of Religion*, ed. Bryan Turner, Vol. 4. Routledge: London. (Reprint of the original edn. from 1898.)
- Lawson, Thomas and Robert McCauley, 1990, *Rethinking Religion: Connecting Cognition and Culture*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Lawson, Thomas, 1996, "Theory and the New Comparativism, Old and New", *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion*, Vol. 8-1, pp. 31–35.
- Leach, Edmund, 1989, *Culture & Communication: the Logic by which Symbols are Connected*. Themes in the Social Sciences, ed. Jack Goody, Vol. 1. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. (11th reprint of the first edn. in 1976.)
- Lévi, Sylvain, 1966, *La doctrine du sacrifice dans les Brāhmaṇas*. Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Section des Sciences Religieuses, Vol. 73. Presses Universitaires de France: Paris. (Second edn.; first 1898.)
- Lévi-Strauss, C., 1962, *La Pensée Sauvage*. Libraire Plon: Paris.
- 1980, *Myth and Meaning*. Routledge & Kegan Paul: London. (Reprint of the first edn. in 1978.)
- Lévy-Bruhl, Lucien, 1985, *How Natives Think*. Princeton University Press: Princeton, New Jersey. (Translation from French; first French edn. 1910.)
- Li, N. Charles, ed., 1976, *Subject and Topic*. Academic Press: New York.
- Lincoln, Bruce, 1985, *The Tyranny of Taxonomies*. Center for Humanistic Studies Occasional Papers, No. 1. Center for Humanistic Studies, University of Minnesota.
- 1998, "På spaning efter den germanska krigsguden. Georges Dumézil, politik och forskning under det sena 1930-talet", *Svensk Religionshistorisk Årsskrift*, Vol. 7, pp. 9–35.
- Lübcke, Poul, 1991a, "Fenemenologin och hermeneutiken i Tyskland", in *Vår tids filosofi*, ed. Lübcke, Poul, Vol. 1, pp. 30–176. Forum: Stockholm. (Second Swedish edn. of the translation from Danish; first Danish edn. 1982.)
- 1991b, "Filosofin i Tyskland efter Hegel", in *Vår tids filosofi*, ed. Lübcke, Poul, Vol. 1, pp. 15–29. Forum: Stockholm. (Second Swedish edn. of the translation from Danish; first Danish edn. 1982.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Lübcke, Paul, ed., 1993, *Filosofilexikonet*. Forum: Stockholm. (Translation from Danish; first Danish edn. 1983.)
- Lubin, Timothy, 2001, “Veda on Parade: Revivalist Ritual as Civic Spectacle”, *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, Vol. 69, issue 2, pp. 377–408.
- Ludvik, Catherine, 2000, “Sarasvatī-Vāc: The Identification of the River with Speech”, *Études Asiatiques* 54:1, pp. 119–130.
- Macdonell, Arthur Anthony, and Arthur Berriedale Keith, 1958, *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*. Motilal Banarsidass: Varanasi. (Reprint of the first edn. 1912.)
- 1995, *A Vedic Grammar for Students*. Motilal Banarsidass: Delhi. (Reprint of the first edn. 1916.)
- Mack, Burton L., 1991, “Staal’s Gauntlet and the Queen”, *Religion* 21, pp. 213–218.
- Malamoud, Charles, 1996, *Cooking the World: Ritual and Thought in Ancient India*. Oxford University Press: Oxford. (Translated from French by David White, 1st French edn. 1989.)
- Martin, Luther, 2001, “Comparativism and Sociobiological Theory”, *Numen*, Vol. 48, No. 3, pp. 290–308.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred, 1986, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. Indogermanischer Bibliothek, II. Reihe, Wörterbücher, 2 vols. Carl Winter Universitätsverlag: Heidelberg.
- McInerny, Ralph, 1992, *Aquinas on Human Action*. The Catholic University of America Press: Washington.
- Mehra, B. S., 1994, *Śrauta Sacrifices in the Atharva-Veda*. Sanjay Prakashan: Delhi.
- Meillet, A., 1906–1908, “La phrase nominale en Indo-européen”, *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 14, pp. 1–26.
- Mendelson, E. M., 1972, “Worldview”, in *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, ed. David Sills, Vol. 15, pp. 576–579. Macmillan Company & The Free Press: New York. (Reprint edn. of the original 1968.)
- Migron, Saul, 1999, “‘Possession of (Ritual) Achievement’ in Vedic Prose”, *Indo-Iranian Journal*, Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 3–31.
- Milbank, John, 1996, “Stories of Sacrifice”, *Modern Theology*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 27–56.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Minkowski, Christopher, 1991, *Priesthood in Ancient India: A Study of the Maitrāvaruṇa Priest*. Publications of the de Nobili Research Library, Vol. 18. Institut für Indologie der Universität Wien.
- Monier-Williams, Monier, 1995, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Motilal Banarsidass: Delhi. (Reprint of the edn. from 1899.)
- Moore, G. E., 1993, *Principia Ethica*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. (Second edn., revised version; first edn. 1903.)
- Mylius, Klaus, 1968, “Die Identifikationen der Metren in der Literatur des Ṛgveda”, *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig, Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe* 17, Heft 2/3, pp. 267–271.
- 1970, “Zur absoluten Datierung der Mittelvedischen Literatur”, in *Neue Indienkunde, New Indology: Festschrift Walter Ruben zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Horst Krüger, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung, No. 72, pp. 421–431. Akademie-Verlag: Berlin.
- 1976, “Die vedischen Identifikationen am Beispiel des Kauṣītaki-Brāhmaṇa”, in *KLIO Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte*, Heft 1, Band 58, pp. 145–166.
- 1993, “Wesen und Funktion der Hotṛ-Formeln”, *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 72/73, the Amṛtamahotsava vol., pp. 113–135.
- 1995, *Wörterbuch des altindischen Rituals*. Institut für Indologie: Wichtrach.
- 1997, *Wörterbuch Sanskrit-Deutsch*. Langenscheidt: Leipzig. (Fifth edn.; the first 1975.)
- Nikolaeva, Irina, 2001, “Secondary Topic as a Relation in Information Structure”, *Linguistics* Vol. 39-1, pp. 1–49.
- Nordgren, Anders, 1994, *Evolutionary Thinking: An Analysis of Rationality, Morality and Religion from an Evolutionary Perspective*. Diss. at the University of Uppsala. *Studia Philosophiae Religionis* 17, eds. Dick Haglund, Eberhard Herrmann. Almqvist & Wiksell: Stockholm.
- Nozick, Robert, 1993, *The Nature of Rationality*. Princeton University Press: Princeton, New Jersey.
- Oguibénine, Boris, 1998, *Essays on Vedic and Indo-European Culture*. Mlbd Series in Linguistics, ed. Dhanesh Jain, Vol. 12. Motilal Banarsidass: New Delhi.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Oldenberg, Hermann, 1915, *Die Lehre der Upanishaden und die Anfänge des Buddhismus*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen.
- 1919, *Vorwissenschaftliche Wissenschaft: Die Weltanschauung der Brāhmaṇa-Texte*. Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht: Göttingen.
- 1993, *The Religion of the Veda*. Motilal Banarsidass: Delhi. (Translation of the second German edn. 1916; first edn. 1894.)
- Olsson, Tord, 1972, *Lévi-Strauss och totemismens teoretiker*. Diss. at Lund University.
- Ong, Walter, 1972, “Comments”, *Current Anthropology* Vol. 13, issue 1, pp. 98–102.
- 1989, *Orality and Literacy*. Methuen & Co.: London. (Reprint, first edn. 1982.)
- Paden, William, 1994, “Before ‘the Sacred’ Became Theological: Durkheim and Reductionism”, in *Religion and Reductionism: Essays on Eliade, Segal, and the Challenge of the Social Sciences for the Study of Religion*, Studies in the History of Religions, ed. H. G. Kippenberg, Vol. 62, pp. 198–210. E. J. Brill: Leiden.
- 1996, “Elements of a new Comparativism”, *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion*, Vol. 8-1, pp. 5–13.
- 1999, “Reconceiving the Category of the Sacred”, in *Comparative Studies in History of Religions*, ed. Erik Reenberg Sand, pp. 93–108. Museum of Tusculanum Press: Copenhagen.
- Parpola, Asko, 1979, “On the Symbol Concept of the Vedic Ritualists”, in *Religious Symbols and their Functions*, ed. Haralds Biezais, pp. 139–153. Almqvist & Wiksell International: Stockholm.
- 1999, “Conceptual Categories and their Classification in Middle Vedic Texts”, in *Categorisation and Interpretation*, ed. Josephson, Folke, *Meijerbergs arkiv för svensk ordforskning*, Vol. 24, pp. 5–22. Göteborg.
- Papineau, David, 1993, *Philosophical Naturalism*. Blackwell Publishers: Oxford.
- Payne, Richard K., 1996, “Realizing Inherent Enlightenment”, in *Religious and Social Ritual: Interdisciplinary Explorations*, ed. Michael Aune and Valerie DeMarinis, pp. 71–104. State University of New York Press: New York.
- Penner, Hans, 1985, “Language, Ritual and Meaning”, *Numen*, Vol. 32, pp. 1–16.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Philips J., Robert, 1992, “Reflections on Resemblance, Ritual and Religion by Brian K. Smith”, *Journal of Ritual Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 188–190.
- Pike, Kenneth, 1999, “Etic and Emic Standpoints for the Description of Behavior”, in *The Insider/Outsider Problem in the Study of Religion*, ed. Russell T. McCutcheon, pp. 28–36. Cassell: London. (Reprint; first published 1967.)
- Pinault, Georges-Jean, 2001, “Védique *tanū-* et la notion de personne en indo-iranien”, *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, Vol. 96, fasc. 1, pp. 181–206.
- Polanyi, Michael, 1975, *Meaning*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago.
- Potter, Karl, 1981, “Introduction to the Philosophy of Advaita Vedānta”, in *Advaita Vedānta up to Śaṅkara and his Pupils*, ed. Karl Potter, Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, ed. Karl Potter, Vol. 3, pp. 3–100. Princeton University Press: Princeton.
- Prince, Ellen, 1981, “Toward a Taxonomy of Given-New Information”, in *Radical Pragmatics*, ed. Peter Cole, pp. 167–255. Academic Press: New York.
- Raja, Kunhan, 1940, “The Commentaries on the Aitareya *Brāhmaṇa*”, *Adyar Library Bulletin* 3, pp. 17–25, 63–67, 145–151.
- Rau, Wilhelm, 1973, *Metalle und Metallgeräte im vedischen Indien*. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlung der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse, nr. 8. Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur: Mainz.
- Renou, Louis, 1947, *Les écoles védiques et la formation du Veda*. Cahiers de la Société Asiatique, Vol. 9. Imprimerie Nationale: Paris.
- 1953, “Quelques termes du R̥gveda”, *Journal Asiatique* 241, fasc. No. 2.
- 1978, “‘Connexion’ en védique ‘cause’ en bouddhique”, in *L’Inde fondamentale*, pp. 149–153. Hermann: Paris. (Reprint of an article originally published in 1946.)
- Ricoeur, Paul, 1992, *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences: Essays on Language, Action and Interpretation*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. (Translated from French by John Thompson; reprint of the 1st edn. 1981.)
- Rosolato, Guy, 1987, *Le sacrifice: repères psychoanalytiques*. Presses Universitaires de France: Paris.
- Sand, Erik Reenberg, 2001, “Riter og myter i vedisk tradition”, *Religionsvidenskabeligt Tidsskrift*, No. 38, pp. 19–32.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Scharfe, Hartmut, 1996, “Bartholomae’s Law Revisited or how the Ṛgveda is Dialectally Divided”, in *Veda-Vyākaraṇa-Vyākhyāna, Festschrift Paul Thieme*, ed. Hanns-Peter Schmidt, pp. 351–377. Dr. Inge Wezler Verlag für Orientalistische Fachpublikationen: Reinbeck.
- Schayer, Stanislav, 1925, “Die Struktur der magischen Weltanschauung nach dem Atharva-Veda und den Brāhmaṇa-Texte”, *Zeitschrift für Buddhismus* 6, pp. 259–99.
- Schieffelin, Edward, 1985, “Performance and the Cultural Construction of Reality”, *American Ethnologist*, Vol. 12, No. 4, pp. 707–724.
- Schmidt, Wilhelm, 1926, *Der Ursprung der Gottesidee*, Vol. 1. Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung: Münster. (Second edn.; first edn. 1912.)
- 1929, *Der Ursprung der Gottesidee*, Vol. 2. Verlag der Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung: Münster.
- 1933, *Der Ursprung der Gottesidee*, Vol. 4. Verlag der Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung: Münster.
- 1935, *Der Ursprung der Gottesidee*, Vol 6. Verlag der Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung: Münster.
- 1937, *Handbuch der Methode der kulturhistorischen Ethnologie*. Verlag der Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung: Münster.
- Schwab, Julius, 1886, *Das altindische Thieropfer*. Verlag von Andreas Deichert: Erlangen.
- Scorniola, R., 1994, “Topic, Focus, and Word Order”, in *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, ed. R. E Asher, pp. 4633–4640. Pergamon Press: Oxford.
- Segal, Robert, 1990, “The Concept of Survival: of the Useless or of the Useful?” *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion* 2/2, pp. 253–258.
- 1993, “Paralleling Religion and Science: the Project of Robin Horton”, *Annales of Scholarship* 10, pp. 177–198.
- 1995, “Tylor’s Anthropomorphic Theory of Religion”, *Religion* 25, pp. 23–30.
- 1999, “In Defense of Reductionism”, in *The Insider/Outsider Problem in the Study of Religion*, ed. Russel T. McCutcheon, pp. 139–163. Cassel: London. (Originally published 1983 in *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*.)
- Sharpe, Eric J., 1986, *Comparative Religion: a History*. Duckworth: London. (Second edn.; first edn. 1975.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Siewierska, A., 1994, "Word Order and Linearization", in *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, ed. R. E. Asher, pp. 4993–4999. Pergamon Press: Oxford.
- Smart, Ninian, 1999, "Foreword", in *Approaches to the Study of Religion*, ed. Peter Connelly, pp. ix–xiv. Cassel: London.
- Smith, Brian K., 1991, Review of *Rules Without Meaning* by Frits Staal, *Journal of Ritual Studies*, 5/2, pp. 141–143.
- 1994, *Classifying the Universe*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- 1996a, "Re-envisioning Hinduism and Evaluating the Hindutva Movement", *Religion*, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 119–128.
- 1996b, "Ritual Perfection and Ritual Sabotage in the Veda", *History of Religions* Vol. 35, No. 4, pp. 285–306.
- 1998, *Reflections on Resemblance, Ritual, and Religion*. Motilal Banarsidass: Delhi. (First Indian edn., originally published 1989 by Oxford University Press.)
- Smith, Frederick M., 1987, *The Vedic Sacrifice in Transition*, in Bhandarkar Oriental Series, Vol. 22. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute: Poona.
- 2000, "India goes West: Report on a Vedic Soma Sacrifice in London in July 1996", *History of Religions* Vol. 39, No. 3, pp. 247–267.
- Smith, Robertson William, 1997, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites*. The Early Sociology of Religion, ed. Brian S. Turner, Vol. 6. Routledge: London. (Reprint of the first edn. from 1889.)
- Sørensen, Jesper, 2000, *Essence, Schema, and Ritual Action*. Diss. at the Department for the Study of Religion, Faculty of Theology, University of Aarhus.
- 2001, "Magi og rituel effikacitet — en kognitiv tilgang", *Religionsvidenskabeligt Tidsskrift*, No. 38, pp. 59–71.
- Staal, Frits, 1983, *Agni: the Vedic Ritual of the Fire Altar*, 2 vols. Asian Humanities Press: Berkeley.
- 1989, *Rules without Meaning, Ritual, Mantras and the Human Sciences*. Toronto Studies in Religion, ed. Donald Wiebe, Vol. 4. Peter Lang: New York.
- 1991, "Within Ritual, about Ritual and Beyond", *Religion* 21, pp. 227–234.
- 1992, "Agni 1990", in *Ritual, State and History in South Asia, Essays in Honour of J.C. Heesterman*, ed. A. W. van den Hoek, pp. 650–670. E. J. Brill: Leiden.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1993, “From Meanings to Trees”, *Journal of Ritual Studies*, 7/2, pp. 11–32.
- Stassen, Leon, 1997, *Intransitive Predication*. Clarendon Press: Oxford.
- Stenmark, Mikael, 1994, *Rationality in Science, Religion and Everyday Life*. Diss. Uppsala University: Uppsala.
- Stout, Jeffrey, 1987, “Naturalism”, in *Encyclopedia of Religion*, ed. Mircea Eliade, Vol. 10, pp. 314–318. Macmillan Publishing Company: New York.
- Strathern, J. Andrew and Pamela J. Stewart, 1997, “The Efficacy-Entertainment Braid Revisited: From Ritual to Commerce in Papua New Guinea”, *Journal of Ritual Studies* 11.1, pp. 61–70.
- Strenski, Ivan, 1991, “What’s Rite?” *Religion* 21, pp. 219–225.
- 1996, “Between Theory and Speciality: Sacrifice in the 90s”, *Religious Studies Review*, Vol. 22, No.1.
- 1997, “The Social and Intellectual origins of Hubert and Mauss’s Theory of Ritual Sacrifice”, in *India and Beyond: Aspects of Literature, Meaning, Ritual and Thought*, ed. Dick van der Meij, Studies from the International Institute for Asian Studies, ed. Paul van der Velde, pp. 511–537. Kegan Paul International: London.
- Sussman, Robert, 1999, “The Myth of Man the Hunter, Man the Killer and the Evolution of Human Morality”, *Zygon* Vol. 34, No. 3, pp. 453-471.
- Thapar, Romila, 1990, *A History of India*, Vol. 1. Penguin Books: London.
- Thite, Ganesh, 1975, *Sacrifice in the Brāhmaṇa-Texts*. University of Poona: Pune.
- Thomassen, Einar, 1999, “Is Philology Relevant?” in *Approaching Religion*, ed. Tore Ahlbäck, Vol. 1, pp. 245–252. The Donner Institute for Research in Religious and Cultural History: Åbo.
- Thompson, G. Laurence, 1978, “Efficacy and Afficacy in Chinese Religion”, *Society for the Study of Chinese Religions Bulletin*, Vol. 6, No. 6, pp. 31–49.
- Tikkanen, Bertil, 1999, “The Category of Subject in Pāṇini and in Western Linguistics”, in *Categorisation and Interpretation*, ed. Josephson, Folke, *Meijerbergs arkiv för svensk ordforskning*, Vol. 24, pp. 57–78. Göteborg.
- Tilak, Keshav Sunanda, 1990, *Cultural Gleanings from the Brāhmaṇa Literature*. Yaska: New Delhi.
- Turner, Victor, 1962, *Chihamba the White Spirit*. The Rhode-Livingstone Papers, No. 33. Manchester University Press: Manchester.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Tylor, Edward B., 1903, *Primitive Culture*, 2 vols. John Murray: London. (Fourth edn.; first 1871.)
- Śāstrī, Viśva-Bandhu, 1935–36, *A Vedic Word-Concordance: The Brāhmaṇas and the Āraṇyakas*, The Śānta-Kuṭī Vedic Series, ed. Viśva-Bandhu Śāstrī, Vol. 2, parts 1 and 2. Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute: Hoshiarpur.
- Verpoorten, J.-M., 1977, *L'ordre des mots dans l'Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa*. Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, fasc. 216. Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres": Paris.
- 1981, Review of *A Study of Nominal Sentences in the oldest Upaniṣads* by Gunilla Gren-Eklund, *Indo-Iranian Journal* Vol. 23, pp. 44–45.
- Walsh, W. H., 1967, "The Nature of Metaphysics", in *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Paul Edwards, Vol. 5, pp. 300–306. Collier-Macmillan: London.
- Weber-Brosamer, Bernhard, 1988, *Annam: Untersuchungen zur Bedeutung des Essens und der Speise im vedischen Ritual*. Religionswissenschaft und Theologie 3. Schäuble Verlag: Rheinfelden.
- Werner, Karl, 1988, "Indian Concepts of Human Personality in Relation to the Self", *Journal of Royal Asiatic Society*, pp. 73–97.
- Wezler, Albrecht, 1996, "Zu den sogenannten Identifikationen in den Brāhmaṇas", in *Festschrift Paul Thieme*, pp. 485–543. Dr. Inge Wezler, Verlag für Orientalische Fachpublikationen: Reinbeck.
- Whitaker, Jarrod, 2002, "Ritual Ontology and Metaphysics vs. Ritual Performance: An Account of Magic in the Atharvaveda", in *The Vedas: Texts, Language and Ritual, 3rd International Vedic Workshop, Leiden, May 30–June 2, 2002, Book of Abstracts*, ed. Arlo Griffiths and Jan E. M. Houben, pp. 52–53.
- Widell, Peter, 1991, "Habermas: enheten av teori och praxis" in *Vår tids filosofi*, ed. Lübcke, Paul, Vol. 1, pp. 268–276. Forum: Stockholm.
- Widengren, Geo., 1969, *Religionsphänomenologie*. Walter de Gruyter & Co.: Berlin. (First German edn., based on the second Swedish edn. from 1953, first publ. 1945.)
- Witzel, Michael, 1979, *On Magical Thought in the Veda*. Universitaire Pers Leiden: Leiden.
- 1987, "On the Localisation of Vedic Texts and Schools", in *India and the Ancient World*, ed. Gilbert Pollet, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 25, pp. 173–213. Department Oriëntalistiek: Leuven.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1996, “How to Enter the Vedic Mind?”, in *Translating, Translations, Translators from India to the West*, ed. Enrica Garzilli, pp. 163–175. Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Harvard University: Harvard.
- 1997a, “Introduction”, in *Inside the Texts Beyond the Texts: New Approaches to the Study of the Vedas*, ed. Michael Witzel, Harvard Oriental Series, Opera Minora, Vol. 2, pp. v–xix. Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Harvard University: Cambridge.
- 1997b, “The Development of the Vedic Canon and its Schools: The Social and Political Milieu”, in *Inside the Texts Beyond the Texts: New Approaches to the Study of the Vedas*, ed. Witzel, Michael, Harvard Oriental Series, Opera Minora, Vol. 2, pp. 257–345. Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Harvard University: Cambridge.
- 2001, “Autochthonous Aryans? The Evidence from Old Indian and Iranian Texts”, *The Electronic Journal of Vedic Studies* 7-3, pp. 1–93.
- Zysk, Kenneth, 1993, “The Science of Respiration and the Doctrine of the Bodily Winds in Ancient India”, *JAOS* 113.2, pp. 198–213.

Index of Tables

Table 1.	Different ways of expressing correspondences in AiB 1.1–5, 2.1–5, 3.1–5, 4.1–5 and 5.1	64
Table 2.	The direction of the correspondences in AiB	123
Table 3.	The connections between the categories in AiB	126
Table 4.	The most frequent correspondences in AiB.....	134
Table 5.	The threefold structure of the nine principal days of the <i>dvādaśāha</i> in AiB	144
Table 6.1	The special characteristics of the nine principal days in the <i>dvādaśāha</i> in AiB.....	145
Table 6.2	The special characteristics of the nine principal days in the <i>dvādaśāha</i> in AiB.....	145
Table 7.	The direction of the correspondences common to AiB and KB	158
Table 8.	The connections between the categories.....	160
Table 9.	The most frequent correspondences in AiB and KB	170
Table 10.	The correspondences of the <i>abhiplava śadaha</i> in KB	172
Table 11.	The correspondences of the <i>pr̥ṣṭhya śadaha</i> in KB	173
Table 12.	The correspondences to breath in AiB.....	200
Table 13.	The distribution of the correspondences which have breath as comment and are common to AiB and KB.	212
Table 14.	The distribution of the correspondences to breath that are common to AiB and KB.....	253

The Efficacy of Sacrifice

Correspondences in the Ṛgvedic Brāhmaṇas

Clemens Cavallin

Sacrifice is a major topic in the study of religious rituals, and one of the issues debated is its possible efficacy. In this study, the need for multiple approaches is acknowledged, but the focus is on the world-view in which a sacrificial practice is embedded, and more specifically on the basic ontological questions that are of importance for it.

The tradition considered in detail is that of the Vedic *brāhmaṇa* texts. In them, the efficacy of sacrifices is mainly explained through numerous correspondences between entities within and outside of the ritual enclosure. In this study, an inventory of all the correspondences in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa *pañcikā* 1–5 is made. Moreover, an examination of their linguistic characteristics is undertaken, and especially of the most frequent form, the nominal sentence. Based on this fundamental research some features of the system of correspondences are analysed. It is shown, for example, that the directions of the correspondences are mainly from the ritual realm to categories such as Cosmos, *Varṇa*, Animals and Man. Of these, Man constitutes the most important category, and within it a prominent place is occupied by the ‘breaths’ — the vital powers of man. It is argued that the frequent use of breath, or the breaths, as the goal of the sacrificial rituals, initiates a process that undermines the complex system of correspondences. Thus, the correspondence system carries within itself the destruction of the intricate links drawn between the different levels of the Vedic Cosmos.