



Research Article

Valentina Ferrero* and Tiziana Pontillo*

“Anti-historical Collective Memory of the Past” in the Brahmanical Interpretation of Vrātya Doctrines (*Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa* 2.53–68)

<https://doi.org/10.1515/asia-2025-0033>

Received May 5, 2025; accepted August 18, 2025

Abstract: The aim of this article is to analyse a long passage from the *Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa*, i.e., a late Vedic source of the Sāmaveda branch in order to elucidate the embedding strategy the texts adopted after the Śrauta Reform to merge different Indo-Aryan (ritual and speculative) notions in an original manner. Previous research has also shown that the Sāmaveda Brāhmaṇas were especially focused on keeping trace of unorthodox heroically oriented cultures, i.e., of cultures not representative of the Śrauta mainstream, which was instead committed to placing the values of the priestly class at the core and top of social hierarchy. The selected passage (JB 2.53–68) does not marginalise the pattern of the Sattra sacrifice and the doctrine of how to prevent the decay of what is granted by sacrifices (*iṣṭāpūrtasya [...] akṣiti*), but rather compares it with the Śrauta sacrificial horizon and ultimately encapsulates it in the latter. The ultimate purpose of this research is to relocate the plurality of a specific Asian history, namely the multifaceted earliest Indo-Aryan matrix, by means of a philological and linguistic method applied to Vedic sources.

Keywords: earliest Indo-Aryan cultures; Vedic sources; Vrātyas; Śrauta reform; culture embedding strategies

This paper is the result of a joint work discussed and shared by both authors. However, Valentina Ferrero is responsible for §§ 1; 3; 5; 7; 9; 11 and Tiziana Pontillo for §§ 2; 4; 5; 6; 8; 10; 12. All translations are the authors' unless otherwise noted. Finally, we would like to explicitly recognise our debt to the anonymous reviewer for the Journal, who improved our translations of several passages with insightful suggestions and corrections.

***Corresponding authors:** **Valentina Ferrero**, University of Cagliari, Cagliari, Italy; and Jagiellonian University Kraków, Kraków, Poland, E-mail: ferrerovalentina13@gmail.com; and **Tiziana Pontillo**, Literature, Languages and Cultural Heritage Department, University of Cagliari, Via Università, 40, 09123, Cagliari, Italy, E-mail: pontillo@unica.it

1 Introduction

The present article is part of a broader research project that Cagliari's School of Indology has been conducting in collaboration with scholars from other universities since 2007. The project's aim – within the general perspective of the reconstruction of the earliest Indo-Aryan culture through philological and linguistic methods – is to pinpoint the embedding and marginalisation strategies the promoters of the so-called “Śrauta Reform” adopted to deal with other cultures that may actually have coincided with their own in the past. This reform took place in the seventh century BCE or later¹ and represented an important socio-cultural change which supplanted, among other things, the agonistic pattern of sacrifice, in favour of the highly professional and predictable modalities of a sacrificial arena dominated by Brahmins. This led to the development of the Varṇāśrama system, a new hierarchical and rigid social organisation based on birth rights and duties, within which the Brahmins were placed at the highest level of society. The underlying working hypothesis consists in considering the so-called Vrātyas mentioned in Vedic and post-Vedic sources as the epigones of a group of ancient Indo-Aryans, which is quite a different position for instance from the reference volume on the Vrātyas authored by Falk in 1986. It is probable that this group never abandoned the practice of performing agonistic sacrifices which, since they preceded the so-called Brahmanical Reform, followed a non-classical pattern.² In fact, their behaviour came to be stigmatised as foreign and unprecedented in the Brahmanical sources because, in our view, the Śrauta strategy allowed the protagonists of the new mainstream culture to rid themselves forever of any unpleasant facets of their common Indo-Aryan past, marginalising and attributing negative features to the Vrātyas alone. By ascribing their aggressive behaviour exclusively to the latter group, they were able to erase all traces of this hostile demeanour, within a program of systematic “anti-*vrātya* propaganda”³ that runs parallel to the emerging culture of non-violence.

As Bronkhorst explained in 2016, it is clear that the Brahmins “re-invented” their values and traditions within the new Indo-Aryan context, according to a dynamic that has been clearly identified in modern and contemporary universal history. In particular, Hobsbawm studied the historical dynamic of the so-called “invented tradition” which commonly consists in a “set of practices, normally governed by overtly or tacitly accepted rules and of a ritual or symbolic nature, which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behaviour by repetition”, automatically implying continuity with the past, even when this set of practices had only recently

1 See Amano 2022: 91.

2 See e.g. Heesterman 1993.

3 See Hock 2016; Neri/Pontillo 2024.

been established.⁴ In fact, the lengthy tradition claimed by the Śrauta Reform was actually only a recently adopted “philological revision” of ancient institutions and beliefs. Thus, in our opinion, it can actually be described as a “construction of powerful forms of anti-historical collective memory of the past”, in line with an analysis e.g. Chakrabarty devoted to post-colonialist history.⁵

Up till now this trend of research on the Brahmanical linguistic and socio-cultural mediation program, and on its assumed reworking of the collective memory of the Vrātya phenomenon, has mainly concentrated on studying how old lexemes,⁶ compounds,⁷ and formulas⁸ changed as an outcome of this very program. The present paper considers the explicit cultural embedding procedure that is recounted in JB 2.53–68, in a dialogue between Keśin Dārbhya,⁹ a Vrātya king of the *Pañcālas* (who is also mentioned as the leader of the *Pañcālas* in both JB 2.122 and KS 30.2)¹⁰, and another deceased king called Yajñasena.¹¹

Ultimately Keśin Dārbhya’s ascetic doctrine becomes part of the Sacrificer’s classical consecration (i.e., the *Dikṣā*), which clearly belongs to the Śrauta-reformed ritual system but *de facto* is made up of several ascetic observances. The final outcome of this merger of different but cognate traditions is the creation of the so-called *Kaiśinī Dikṣā*, also attested in KB 7.4, ŚāṅkhB 5.4, VādhAn 4.20–21. This special *Dikṣā* has already been the object of Kulkarni’s interesting contribution to the study of Vrātyas in Vedic sources in 2016, even though she does not translate or comment on the entire JB passage. Ranade actually translated the whole JB in 2019, but the mentioned section of this intriguing *Sāmavedic Brāhmaṇa* seems to call for a further accurate interpretation, since it includes among other things several *hapax legomena*; rhetorical stratagems such as extended Vedic homologies, and pre-scientific

4 Hobbsawm 1983: 1.

5 Chakrabarty 2000: 40.

6 See e.g. *setu* (Neri/Pontillo 2018), *dakṣiṇā* (Candotti et al. 2020; 2021), *vicakṣaṇa* (Candotti/Pontillo 2022).

7 See e.g. *śarataṭpa* (Dore/Pontillo 2013; Pontillo 2016), *iṣṭāpūrta* (Pontillo 2019a), *yogakṣema* (Neri/Pontillo 2019a, 2019b).

8 See e.g. *devayāna pathin* (Pontillo 2019b) and *brahmā bhū-* (Neri/Pontillo 2015; 2016).

9 Keśin is also the name of another unorthodox figure, namely the long-haired *ṛṣi* protagonist of RV 10.136, who has often been a person of interest for scholars. See e.g. Bloomfield (1893: 167; 1897: 626; 1899: 89). In particular, Dore (2015: 57–68; 2016: 200–205) advances the interpretation of all these sources as focusing on the extolment of the superior knowledge that allows these god-like human beings to attain a permanent divine status, rather than as mere praise of the Sun god. The Keśin was compared with the *Ekaṅvrātya* in the fifteenth *kāṇḍa* of the ŚS, with the ascetic *per antonomasia*, the *Brahmacārin* in ŚS 11.5, and even connected by Werner in 1977 with heterodox cultures such as *Mahāyāna Buddhism*.

10 See Candotti/Pontillo 2015: 196 fn. 72.

11 The name is plausibly a *bahuvrīhi* compound meaning “having sacrifice as his army”.

patterns of connecting *similia similibus* to create a magic pattern of interpretation of the world.¹² However what makes JB 2.53–68 especially noteworthy is the fact that the Vrātya protagonist is not a condemned outsider as in the majority of Brahmanical sources, but rather is presented as the bearer of a valuable doctrine and considered in a favourable light like the Ekavrātya in Book 15 of the ŚS (the Vrātyakāṇḍa)¹³ and the *divya*-Vrātyas questioned by King Pṛthu Vainya in the JUB,¹⁴ which are also important exceptions to the overall picture.

The JB section here analysed is another capital piece of evidence indicating that the society so often contemptuously labelled as “Vrātya” might instead have once been an esteemed society that, above all, may have had a marked influence on Indo-Aryan culture. Nonetheless, at some point it came into conflict with the Brahmanical culture, which transmitted the memory of this related but distant Vrātya world by absorbing it and often submitting it to a sort of *damnatio memoriae*. The piece of culture that we will try to put back into the course of history is just a small step towards healing the enormous debt contracted in the recognition of the plurality of Asiatic traditions. This should prevent us from making the same old mistake – which, as Spivak¹⁵ noticed, can still be made today – of not respecting the “plural Asia” with its several cultural matrices that have played a role in creating its historically complex and fascinating reality.

2 An Exchange of Knowledge Between a King and a Previous Deceased King (JB 2.53–56)

The first segment of the JB section devoted to the Kaiśinī Dikṣā is already contained in a linguistically-oriented article, i.e., Pontillo 2022, but JB 2.53–56 will partly be reconsidered here by quoting some selected passages with their translation in order to comment on them within a cultural perspective.¹⁶ The relevant contents also elucidate the general context of the whole section. The scene opens on King Keśin Dār̥bhya and King Yajñasena. Keśin has just been consecrated supposedly to perform a sacrifice as patron, while Yajñasena has been transformed into a wild golden goose¹⁷ and is sitting on the post in the sacrificial arena. He shows scarce respect for Keśin, his successor as head of the Pañcālas and, indeed, even questions his

¹² See also Parpola 1979: 140–141.

¹³ See Neri/Pontillo 2023.

¹⁴ See Candotti/Pontillo forthc.

¹⁵ Spivak 2008: 3; 238.

¹⁶ As for the linguistic and philological notes, see Pontillo 2022.

¹⁷ Royal roles might have ensured a supermundane, Gandharva-like bird status (Koskikallio 1999: 314 fn. 44; 352–356). *hansa* is a proper name in Ranade’s translation (2019: 607).

consecrated status,¹⁸ claiming that he, King Yajñasena, is the bearer of the true knowledge of consecration. However, he acknowledges that Keśin possesses a special knowledge of how to prevent the decay of what is granted by sacrifices (*iṣṭāpūrtasya* [...] *akṣiti-*). They thus decide to exchange their respective knowledge.

(from JB 2.53) *keśī ha dārbhyo darbhapaṇayor didikṣe. atha ha sutvā yajñaseno haṃso hiraṇmayo bhūtvā yūpa upaviveśa. taṃ ha keśīn iti nāmnābhyuvāda. sa ha cukrodha sthaviro 'smi pañcālānāṃ rājā. sa u vai dikṣito 'smi. ko nu mā3m heyān nāmnaivābhivaditum arhatīti.*

Keśin Dārbhya consecrated himself indeed on Darbha[-grass] and Paṇa[-leaves]. Then Yajñasena, who had pressed Soma in the past, after assuming the semblance of a golden wild goose, sat on the sacrificial post. Thus, he addressed him by name: “Keśin!”. Therefore, he became angry [and said]: “I am a venerable king of the Pañcālas. Indeed, I am a consecrated man. Thus, who deserves to address me simply by such a name?”.

sa hovāca mā krudhaḥ. abhivaditā te tenāsmi yad ahaṃ etasyai viśas tvatpūro rājāsam. abhivadito vāva te tenāsmi yad adikṣito 'si. iṣṭāpūrtasya tvam akṣitiṃ vettha. dikṣām ahaṃ veda. samprabravāvahā iti.

He replied: “Do not become angry! I will address you by this [name] because I was king of this community before you. I will address you just by this [name] because you are not consecrated. You know the imperishableness of that which has been granted by sacrifices,¹⁹ I know the consecration. Let us explain [these two objects of knowledge] to one another!”.

Yajñasena devotes a short paragraph in JB 2.53 to this consecration which consists in four double cosmic homologies for the consecrated man (i.e., the *dikṣita*) and the consecration (i.e., the *dikṣā*): fire, wind, sun and Prajāpati for the former and earth, intermediate space, sky and the faculty of thinking for the latter. In this way the ritual utterance of the *dikṣita* at the beginning of the *dikṣā* is clearly explained.

Instead, a lengthy esoteric teaching is imparted by Keśin Dārbhya. A sort of “self-offering” pattern of sacrifice is explained in JB 2.54: the Sacrificer offers several individual faculties and body parts (the faculty of thinking, speaking, breathing, seeing, hearing, his hair and his *ātman*) to specific officiants (Brahman, Hotṛ, Adhvaryu, Udgatṛ, Hotrakas, Prasarpakas and Sadasya respectively) in order to be compensated with the gift of some permanent elements of nature (namely the moon, fire, wind, sun, cardinal points, plants and trees and ether respectively). The pattern of this explanation can be grasped in the first passage about the first “self-offering”.

¹⁸ Keśin Dārbhya is also disrespected in a passage from the *Maitrayaṇī Saṃhitā* (see Amano 2013: 1075).

¹⁹ This translation of the compound *iṣṭāpūrta* is discussed in Pontillo 2019a.

(from JB 2.54) *atha hetara uvāca. brahmane dadad brūyād brahman manas te dadāni tad anena niṣkrīṇāni²⁰ brahmann idam dadānīti yad dāsyān syāt. sa yan mano dadāti candramā vai manas candramasam evāsmāi tad dadāti. tad yāvac candramā na kṣīyate tāvad asya tad dattaṃ na kṣīyate.*

Then the other one (i.e., Keśin) replied: “When giving to the Brahman, one should say: ‘O Brahman, may I give you my faculty of thinking! Let me redeem it by means of this (i.e., an offering)! O Brahman, let me give [you] this!’, i.e., what he (i.e., the officiant) may be going to give [him]. Since he gives him his faculty of thinking – indeed the faculty of thinking is the moon – this gives the moon to him. As long as the moon is not consumed, that which he has given is not consumed.”

[...]

saīṣeṣṭāpūrtasyākṣītiḥ. sa ya evam etām iṣṭāpūrtasyākṣītiṃ veda na hāsyēṣṭāpūrtaṃ kṣīyate.

“This is the imperishableness of the *iṣṭāpūrta*. The *iṣṭāpūrta* of the one who knows such an imperishableness of the *iṣṭāpūrta* is not consumed.”

This doctrine is almost consistent with the common logic of the sacrificial arena that includes all the officiating priests and the patron of the sacrifice, since each given faculty is assigned to a specific priest. Nevertheless, the sacrificial mechanism is replaced by the ascetic effort of offering and then redeeming oneself at the end of one’s life by attaining a permanent divine state through the merits gained by means of sacrifices (i.e., through the *iṣṭāpūrta*). The reader is led to reflect on the shared and divergent elements of this complex exchange between an individual who gives several parts of himself (by renouncing them) to various priests in order to retrieve them on a cosmic level, and the pattern of the mainstream Brahmanical sacrifice, where officiants who carry out a sacrificial offering on behalf of the Sacrificer are distinguished from the latter who offers a priestly gift to the officiants.

JB 2.55 seems to be inspired by the same comparison between two cultures: a *sattra* that lasts one year is introduced in an announcement made by the pupil of an outstanding master (i.e., Dantāla Dhaumya), i.e., Hṛtvāśaya Āllakeya. The latter is going to perform a *Sattra* when he has just concluded the phase of his life dedicated to the study of Sāmaveda (presumably assimilated to the Brahmacharya’s stage of life), i.e., to the specific *Śaṃhitā* of the Vedic branch to which the JB also belongs, within the mentioned embedding strategy.

Special emphasis is placed on the plurality of the participants in the event, especially on those who take part in the consecration (i.e., the *dīkṣā*). While in the

20 Within the concept of self-immolation of the Sacrificer, which is assumed to be a part of the *sattra*, at least in its prototypical version (Falk 1986: 37; Bronkhorst 2016: 37), offerings are considered the Sacrificer’s chance to redeem his life (*niṣkrī-*).

classical sacrificial arena only one person (i.e., the single patron of sacrifice) is the consecrated (*dikṣita*), in this case the sacrifice consecrates several people (*dikṣante*).

(from JB 2.55) [...] *te ha sma yāvantas saṃpādayanti, te ha sma dikṣante*. [...]

As many people were consecrated²¹ as could afford it.

The plural agency of *sattras* is explicitly underlined in another two important Yajurvedic sources, namely in TS 7.4.9 and KB 15.1.23–26, which use the intriguing phrase *ātmādakṣiṇam sattrām*,²² in order to explain that the participants in the *sattra* offer themselves as *dākṣiṇā*, i.e., as the best they are able to offer, in other words the magnificence of all their deeds – including sacrificial actions,²³ and thus reach the heavenly world. We consider that this comparison between the classical orthodox sacrificial arena and the special pattern of *sattra* is an explicit method of embedding the *Sattra* in the orthodox system: indeed, orthodox *Sattras* later found a place within the Śrautasūtras.²⁴

Another important highlight is given to the social status of the participants, in particular the text seems to intentionally use the word *brāhmaṇa* in an ambiguous way to refer to both the standard Śrauta system and to the horizon of the pre-Śrauta reform.

(from JB 2.55) *tat sattraṃ bhavati, yat tam eva brāhmaṇaṃ kṛtvotiṣṭhanti yenābrāhmaṇoktena saha dikṣante. tasmād abrahmaṇoktena saha dikṣeta. tasya ha smāsyā rājanyabandhoḥ sārḍū-lājinam maṇim hiraṇyam upāvahitam bhavati*. [...]

This is a *Sattra*, in so far as they [only] rise up after appointing him as *brāhmaṇa*, with whom – provided he is called non-*brāhmaṇa* – they consecrate themselves. Therefore, consecration has to be made together with one who is not called *brāhmaṇa*. Then the tiger skin and the golden gem of this member of a warrior family used to be carried there.

In our opinion, at the beginning of the passage the word *brāhmaṇa* is used as a designation that will be obtained at the end of the *sattra* by just one of the participants, but then the word appears twice more to denote the name of a man belonging to the classical first social class (*varṇa*), i.e., a *brahmin*. The membership of the so-called *varṇāśrama* which in the classical social system is the second class (i.e., that of

²¹ Here indeed we find a phrase made up of *ha sma* + present indicative form, which commonly denotes a repeated and habitual action in the past (see Delbrück [1888] 1968: 502; Amano 2019: 17). We have translated the other occurrences in line with such an analysis, but here the English language prefers a simple past.

²² Analysed in Pontillo 2023.

²³ See Candotti et al. 2020; 2021.

²⁴ See Amano 2016: 63–64.

warriors) is further emphasised by mentioning two elements of the chieftain's *paraphernalia* (with reference to *Hṛtvāśaya Āllakeya*), i.e., a tiger skin and a golden gem.²⁵ Even *Hṛtvāśaya Āllakeya's* teacher²⁶ – whose name *Somaśuṣma Sātyayajñi Prācīnayogya* only occurs at the beginning of JB 2.56²⁷ – is a warrior, as the following text specifies:

(from JB 2.55) [...] *saṃvatsarāya dīkṣiṣye, 'nu mā śādḥiti. tasmai ha sma rājanyabandhave vaktavyaṃ manyante.* [...]

"I will be consecrated for a *Ṣaṃvatsara*[-*Sattra*]! Instruct me!" They used to consider that this had to be said to a member of a warrior family.²⁸

It is noteworthy that JUB 3.40–2 contains a long list of proper names consisting in the chain of masters (deities and *ṛṣis*) who, from the god *Brahmán* to the god *Prajāpati* onwards, passed on the knowledge of the hymn composed in *Gayatrī* stanzas (i.e., *gāyatrasāman*) which had allowed them to attain immortality. Our character (with the two names reversed, i.e., *Āllakeya Hṛtvāśaya*) is also part of this list, precisely as a disciple of *Somaśuṣma Sātyayajñi Prācīnayogya*. We infer that these two characters also belong to the rank of chieftains, i.e., they are plausibly *rājarṣis*. The warrior status of both is well-tuned to the situation introduced by JB 2.53–4,

25 This pattern of sacrifice seems to closely recall that of the *Rājasūya*, i.e., the ceremony of legitimation as inauguration or merely annual confirmation of the chieftain/king (*rājan*) in one of the earliest attestations, i.e., TS 1.8.16, where this *rājan* is designated as *brahmán* and identified with four different gods, i.e., *Savitṛ*, *Indra*, *Mitra* and *Varuṇa*: *bráhmā3n tvám rājan brahmāsi savitāsi satyāsavo* "O *brahmán*! O king, you are the *brahmán*, you are *Savitṛ*, of true impulse." In turn the *rājan* gives a wooden sword to each of the members of the group that surrounds him inviting all of them to fight against his enemies, like *Indra's* thunderbolts against *Vṛtra*. Thus, the ceremony clearly consists in a reciprocal legitimation of the leader and the members of his loyal retinue, as if they were all members of a group, in which the one with greatest authority is legitimised to represent all the others as *primus inter pares* and extolled as a god. This socio-political context is also well-represented in the *Ṛgveda* and *Atharvaveda* but is not suitable for a world dominated by birth rights as might be the picture outlined by the *varṇāśrama* system and the privileges that come with it.

26 It is interesting to note that, at the beginning of JB 2.55, *Hṛtvāśaya Āllakeya* is defined as a resident pupil of *Dantāla Dhaumya*, while at the beginning of the *Sattra*, he asks a second teacher to instruct him.

27 JB 2.56: *sa ha tathaiva palyayamānas somaśuṣmaṃ sātyayajñim ājagāma. taṃ hovāca prācīnayogya saṃvatsarāya dīkṣiṣye* [...] "Then, going around, he reached *Somaśuṣma Sātyayajñi*. He said to him: 'Oh *Prācīnayogya*, I will be consecrated for a *Ṣaṃvatsara*[-*Sattra*].'"

28 We do not believe that *rājanyabandhu* is used pejoratively here as sometimes happens with the term *brahmabandhu* "one who is a brahmin only because of birth". Thus, in our opinion, the comment in brackets in *Ranade's* translation (2019, vol. 2: 611) is incomprehensible: "I will consecrate for the year, please guide me". This is to be usually said (sarcastically), verily to an unworthy king." It is noteworthy that *Ranade* (2019, vol. 2: 611) translates the previous occurrence (here quoted above) as "the friend of a prince", without any hint of sarcasm.

where two chieftains, i.e., Yajñasena and Keśin Dārbhya (and not Brahmins), are teaching a doctrine in a quasi-Upaniṣadic framework.

The teaching imparted to the *dīkṣita*, which spans almost all of JB 2.56 and beyond, up to the end of JB 2.68, is made up of a series of consistent Vedic homologies and a couple of paretymologies. Indeed, it ultimately sounds very close to some Upaniṣadic passages on the essence of psychophysical individuality (*ātman*). The phrase (*devayāna-pathin-*) is used to define the one-year Sattrā as being the way to gain access to heaven. The same phrase also occurs in JB 2.60 and Pontillo (2019b) attempted to show that there was a direct relationship between this phrase and the after-death, without any priestly intermediary, which thus pertained to a culture different from the Brahmanical mainstream. God Prajāpati is identified with the Puruṣa living in the intermediate space (*antarikṣa-ākāśa-*) and the noun *puruṣa* seems to be used as a quasi-synonym for *ātman*, i.e., the well-known term of Sāṃkhya philosophy that denotes an unborn (with no beginning or cause) transcendent male spiritual principle and which, as a pure and static consciousness, makes knowledge possible by “illuminating” the female principle of nature (Prakṛti), the primordial matter which is also unborn and unmanifest but dynamic. The Puruṣa is unique but fragmented into a plurality of individualities which are pure, conscious light which is devoid of action and can only be recognised as Puruṣa through knowledge and asceticism.²⁹

3 *adhyātma*-Interpretation of the Introductory Atirātra and the Middle Day in the Sattrā (JB 2.57–59)

The elucidation of the Sattrā continues with an explanation of two different stages in the long sacrificial session – the Atirātra and the middle day of the Sattrā – which both make special reference to psychophysical individuality, namely as an *adhyātma*-interpretation. Indeed, many homologies take into account several body parts and human faculties.

Session JB 2.57–58 describes a complex ritual which seems to match that described as part of the Gavāmāyana-Sattrā (elsewhere called Saṃvatsara) in Murakawa (2000: 113 – Table 1), which includes:

- one Prāyaṇīya-atirātra (one day),
- one Caturvīṃśa-ārambhaṇīya (one day),

²⁹ The imagery of the “*puruṣa*-in-the-eye” appears in JB 2.56 and also in JB 2.60 and 63.

- four Abhiplava-ṣaḍahas (twenty-four days) plus the Pṛṣṭhya-ṣaḍaha (six days), all repeated five times (for a total number of one hundred and fifty days),
- three Abhiplava-ṣaḍahas (eighteen days) and another Pṛṣṭhya-ṣaḍaha (six days),
- one Abhijit (one day),
- three Svarasāmans (three days),
- one Viṣuvat as the middle day of the year (one day),
- three reversed Svarasāmans (three days),
- one Viśvajit (one day),
- one reversed Pṛṣṭhya-ṣaḍaha (six days) and four reversed Abhiplava-ṣaḍahas (twenty-four days), all repeated five times (one hundred and fifty days),
- two Abhiplava-ṣaḍahas (twelve days),
- one Āyusṭoma (one day),
- one Goṣṭoma (one day),
- one Daśarātra (ten days including a Pṛṣṭhya-ṣaḍaha of six days, three Chandomas for three days and the final tenth day).

The whole ritual programme should precede the Mahāvratā.³⁰ JB 2.57 might refer to a ritual structure developing around the middle day (*viṣuvat*), i.e., the summer solstice day, as the Black Yajurveda versions of the Sattrā suggest.

The very first stage (in JB 2.57) regards a one-day Soma sacrifice containing an overnight performance (i.e., the Prāyaṇīya-*atirātra*), which takes place on the first day of the Sattrā. A probable hint at the ritual of the second day follows, namely the Caturviṃśa-*ārambhaṇīya*, with the identification of this ritual with language as the means with which the sacrifice can be performed. The relevant teaching includes a complex homology whose core is breath and language.³¹ All in all, the homology seems to point to the assertion that perceptible reality is included in language which is the true agent of sacrificial actions, and we suppose that a scientifically correct relationship between breath and language is probably implied.³²

30 We are extremely grateful to the anonymous reviewer of the present article who informed us of this correspondence.

31 The Agniṣṭoma hymns are also performed and permit access to heaven by means of breath and language. See below JB 2.60.

32 The background notion might be that of the well-known Atharvavedic hymn *Rgveda* 10.125, where the actions of men and gods are intrinsically linked to Vāc, which in stanza 8 is also compared with the wind that blows forward. A crucial role was also assigned to Vāc in JB 2.54, where among other things it is identified with both the Dikṣita and the Dikṣā before the problematic clause *vāg idaṃ sarvaṃ kṣiyati* translated as “speech is all that exists or dwells here” by Ranade 2019: 609, and as “language consumes all this” by Pontillo 2022: 384. Indeed, the former introduces an unjustified relative pronoun, while the latter assumes with no evidence that the verb was *kṣayati* and not *kṣiyati*.

(JB 2.57) *prāṇa eva prāyaṇīyo 'tirātraḥ. prāṇo hīdaṃ sarvaṃ prāṇayata.*³³ *tad yat prāṇayata tasmāt prāṇaḥ. vāg evārambhaṇīyam ahaḥ. vācā hi sarvas saṃvatsaras sarve yajñakratava ārabdhāḥ. tasmād ārambhaṇīye 'han sarvāṇi rūpāṇi kriyante. sarvāṇi ha rūpāṇi vāci.*

The introductory Atirātra is breath indeed. Breath indeed animated (*prāṇ-*) the whole universe. Since it animated [the latter], therefore it is [called] breath (*prāṇa-*). The day [of the sacrifice] which has to be undertaken is language. Indeed, the whole year, all sacrificial initiatives are undertaken by means of language. Therefore, all the visible appearances are realised when the day has to be undertaken. All the visible appearances are indeed within the language.

Then four six-day Soma rituals, namely the so-called Abhiplavas (lit. “the rites that swim towards, that approach”), are described simply with all their parts, basically consisting of Soma-pressings. There is explicit mention of the ritual pattern explained by Murakawa (2000: 113 – Table 1), made up of four Abhiplava-ṣaḍahas plus one Pṛṣṭhya-ṣaḍaha, all repeated five times (for a total number of one hundred and fifty days), and then other three Abhiplava-ṣaḍahas plus another Pṛṣṭhya-ṣaḍaha.

(JB 2.57 continues) *āyam eko 'bhiplavo 'yam eko 'yam eko 'yam ekaḥ. tasyāsyābhiplavasyedaṃ prathamam ahaḥ. tasyedaṃ eva prātassavanam idaṃ mādhyandīnaṃ savanam idaṃ tṛtīyasavanam.*

This Abhiplava is one [*ṣaḍaha*], this (i.e., the second Abhiplava) is another one [*ṣaḍaha*], this (i.e., the third Abhiplava) is another one [*ṣaḍaha*], this (i.e., the fourth Abhiplava) is another one [*ṣaḍaha*]. This is the first day of the Abhiplava. The [Soma-]pressing in the early morning, the [Soma-]pressing at midday, and the third [Soma-]pressing (i.e., the pressing of the evening) indeed belong to this (i.e., to the first day of the Abhiplava).

idam eva dvitīyam ahaḥ. tasyedaṃ eva prātassavanam idaṃ mādhyandīnaṃ savanam idaṃ tṛtīyasavanam.

This is precisely the second day. The [Soma-]pressing in the early morning, the [Soma-]pressing at midday, and the third [Soma-]pressing indeed belong to this (i.e., to the second day of the Abhiplava).

idam eva vairūpaṃ tṛtīyam ahaḥ. tasyedaṃ eva prātassavanam idaṃ mādhyandīnaṃ savanam idaṃ tṛtīyasavanam.

This is precisely the third day devoted to the [Sāman] named after Virūpa. The [Soma-]pressing in the early morning, the [Soma-]pressing at midday, and the third [Soma-]pressing indeed belong to this (i.e., to the third day of the Abhiplava).

³³ For the several steps involved in the current emendation, i.e., *prāṇayata* instead of *prāṇeta*, see Ehlers 1988: 11–12. Ranade's edition (2019, vol. 2: 612) seems to ignore such a proposal.

idaṃ eva vairājaṃ caturtham ahaḥ. tasyedaṃ eva prātassavanam idaṃ mādhyandinaṃ savanam idaṃ tṛtīyasavanam.

This is precisely the fourth day devoted to the [Sāman] named after Virāj. The [Soma-]pressing in the early morning, the [Soma-]pressing at midday, and the third [Soma-]pressing indeed belong to this (i.e., to the fourth day of the Abhiplava).

idaṃ eva śākvaraṃ pañcamam ahaḥ. tasmād anenopasaṃgrhya śaknoti. tasyedaṃ eva prātassavanam idaṃ mādhyandinaṃ savanam idaṃ tṛtīyasavanam.

This is indeed the fifth day devoted to the [Sāman] named after [Indra] Śakvara (lit. ‘bull’). Therefore, after taking it (i.e., Soma), he becomes capable (of reproducing) thanks to this (i.e., ‘the bull’ which is the Śakvara Sāman). The [Soma-]pressing in the early morning, the [Soma-]pressing at midday, and the third [Soma-]pressing indeed belong to this (i.e., to the fifth day of the Abhiplava).

idaṃ eva raivataṃ ṣaṣṭham ahaḥ. tasmād anayā prāśnāti. tasyedaṃ eva prātassavanam idaṃ mādhyandinaṃ savanam idaṃ tṛtīyasavanam.

This is indeed the sixth day devoted to the [Sāman] named after Revatī (i.e., the prosperous cow giving fertility).³⁴ Therefore, he can eat thanks to her (i.e., ‘the cow’ which is the Raivata Sāman). The [Soma-]pressing in the early morning, the [Soma-]pressing at midday, and the third [Soma-]pressing indeed belong to this (i.e., to the sixth day of the Abhiplava).

evam asyābhiplavasyaivam asyaivam asya. ayam evātmā pṛṣṭhyaḥ.

Such [a ritual] belongs to this Abhiplava, such [a ritual] belongs to this (i.e., to the second Abhiplava), such [a ritual] belongs to this (i.e., to the third Abhiplava). This Pṛṣṭhya³⁵ is its *ātman* indeed.

This threefold Abhiplava ritual might constitute the second Abhiplava stage included in Murakawa’s (2000: 113) scheme. Nonetheless, it is tempting to assume that the three Abhiplavas listed at the end of this passage, followed by the mention of the Pṛṣṭhya, do not constitute a second Abhiplava stage (made up of three additional rituals followed by a Pṛṣṭhya), but rather match with the four rituals announced at the beginning (*ayam eko ’bhiplavo ’yam eko ’yam eko ’yam ekaḥ*), here better

³⁴ This is also the name of the fifth asterism which means ‘wealthy’.

³⁵ *pṛṣṭhya-* sometimes means “belonging to or coming from the heights” and when it qualifies a noun such as *payas-*, it denotes the milk that comes from the heights, i.e., Soma juice. Here we cannot exclude that Soma is the object with which the *ātman* is identified. *pṛṣṭhya* is also the name of the Pṛṣṭhya-ṣaḍaha, i.e., a sacrifice lasting six days dedicated to the preparation of Soma (see Ranade 2006: 232). Here *pṛṣṭhya-*, derived from *pṛṣṭha* ‘back (of an animal), summit’, refers to the technique of creating a climax by gradually increasing the number of verses included in the Stotra (‘hymn of praise’) of each Stoma employed during the six days of the Pṛṣṭhya-ṣaḍaha (9 → 15 → 17 → 21 → 27 → 33). See Hirose’s study (2024: 28) on TS 7.2.1.1–7.2.1.4.

distinguished as three Abhiplavas plus a Pṛṣṭhya, since the relevant text gives no mention of a fifth ritual as a Pṛṣṭhya in the first stage described by Murakawa.

From here onward the homologies explained in this paragraph and the next seem to concern the analysis of the anatomical structure of a sacrificial victim (perhaps as a result of its ritual dismemberment), which partly matches with the pattern of the sacrificial performance in which several Stomas are employed. The mentioned Puruṣa might be this victim. On the one hand, there is the sacrificial world as a sort of benchmark, on the other, some different cultural elements which will become typical of the heterodoxies.

(JB 2.57 continues) *ima eva nava prāṇāḥ. trivṛt prāyaṇīyam ahar yat prāṇa idaṃ sarvaṃ prāṇayata. tad yat prāṇayata tasmād apy etat prāyaṇīyam ahaḥ.*³⁶ *imā eva grīvāḥ pañcadaśam ahaḥ. ojo vai vīryam. grīvā ojaḥ. vīryaṃ pañcadaśaḥ. tasmāt paśavo grīvābhīr bhāraṃ vahanti. aṣṭāv ime jatravo 'ṣṭāv ima ūrdhvo jatrus saptadaśaḥ. tad eva saptadaśam ahaḥ. idaṃ evodaram ekaviṃśam ahaḥ. sarve vai stomā ekaviṃśam abhisaṃpannāḥ. sarvam annādyam udare pratiṣṭhitam.*

These are the nine breaths. The introductory day is the Trivṛt(-day, i.e., the day on which the Trivṛt-stoma is recited), because breath animated the whole universe. Since it animated [the latter], therefore the introductory day (i.e., the Prāyaṇīya-atirātra) is also this. The Pañcadaśa-day (i.e., the day on which the Pañcadaśa-stoma is recited) is indeed these neck tendons, valour is actually vigour. Valour is the neck tendons, the Pañcadaśa is power. Therefore, the animals convey the load thanks to their neck tendons. Eight are these neck vertebrae, eight these [others], the upper neck vertebra is the Saptadaśa. This is indeed the Saptadaśa-day (i.e., the day on which the Saptadaśa-stoma is recited). The Ekaviṃśa-day (i.e., the day on which the Ekaviṃśa-stoma is recited) is indeed this belly. All the Stomas indeed reached the number of twenty-one. All the proper food has the belly as its basis.

The text explains how the six days of the Pṛṣṭhya-ṣaḍaha are arranged. Different Stomas are used and the number of Stotra verses increase day by day: the Trivṛt-stoma with nine Stotra verses is recited on the first day; the Pañcadaśa-stoma with fifteen Stotra verses is recited on the second; the Saptadaśa-stoma with seventeen Stotra verses is recited on the third, and the Ekaviṃśa-stoma with twenty-one Stotra verses is recited on the fourth day. JB 2.58 illustrates the last two days of the Pṛṣṭhya-ṣaḍaha: the Triṇava-stoma with twenty-seven Stotra verses is recited on the fifth day while the Trayastriṃśa-stoma with thirty-three Stotra verses is recited on the sixth (9 → 15 → 17 → 21 → 27 → 33). If we have interpreted the several *hapax legomena* contained in this section correctly, the days described in JB 2.58 are related to central body parts.

(JB 2.58) *trayodaśemāḥ pariśavas trayodaśemā aṇḍaparīśus saptaviṃśī. tad eva triṇavam ahaḥ. trayastriṃśad imāni pṛṣṭhikāṇḍāni saha kimkālukābhīḥ. tad eva trayastriṃśam ahaḥ.*

36 Instead, for this second analogous replacement of *prāneta* with *prāṇayata*, see Ehlers 1988: 12.

Thirteen are these ribs,³⁷ thirteen these [others], the twenty-seventh is the scrotum. This is indeed the Triṇava-day (i.e., the day on which the Triṇava-stoma is recited). These costal bones together with some kinds of backbones³⁸ are thirty-three. This is indeed the Trayastrimśa-day (i.e., the day on which the Trayastrimśa-stoma is recited).

These homologies lead us to the middle day in the Sattrā (and in the year), i.e., to the summer solstice (Viṣuvat) ritual, which is the core part of the ceremony. It takes place over nine days (one day for the Abhijit, three for the Svarasāmāns, one for the Viṣuvat, three for the reversed Svarasāmāns and one for the Viśvajit).

(JB 2.58 continues) *ayam abhijit ayam viśvajic chuklaṃ kṛṣṇaṃ kanīnikā. ta ime traya svarasāmāna ime trayo 'yaṃ viṣuvān. prāṇāpāṇav eva goāyusī.*

This is the Abhijit-day (at the beginning of the nine days), this [other] is the Viśvajit-day (at the end of the nine days),³⁹ [the former is] white, [the latter is] black: they are the eye (lit. that which is related to the pupil).⁴⁰ These are the three Svarasāmān-days (before the Viṣuvat-day),⁴¹ these are the other three (after the Viṣuvat-day), this is the Viṣuvat-day⁴² (in the middle). The Goṣṭoma-day and the Āyusṭoma-day are the in-breath and the out-breath.⁴³

37 We assume that *parīśu-* derives from *parśu-* “rib” by means of anaptyxis.

38 We interpret the plural *kālūkā-* as ‘backbones’, due to the vaguely similar word *kaśerukā-* denoting the same bones.

39 According to Ranade (2006: 80; 285), Abhijit and Viśvajit are the names of two one-day Soma sacrifices. Here they have been respectively interpreted as a day before and after the summer solstice.

40 The term *kanīnikā-* is the feminine form of the *taddhita* nominal stem derived from *kanīna-* ‘young’ + the *taddhita* affix *kaN* (A 5.3.70) in the meaning of *iva* ‘like, similar to’ used to denote an image or likeness or a model (A 5.3.96). Therefore, *kanīna-* + *kaN* + *ṭāP* (A 4.1.4 – feminine affix). Moreover, the final phoneme of *kanīna-* is substituted with the short vowel *i* before the phoneme *k* of an affix (*kaN*), when a feminine affix *āP* follows (A 7.3.44). Here, this passage from JB 2.58 deals with the young girl, i.e., *kanīnikā*, who was identified in several ancient cultures with the image of the interlocutor commonly reflected in the listener’s pupils (as regards the analogous Latin *pupilla* and ancient Greek κόρη, see Magnone 2000: 52). Elsewhere in the present text and in other Sanskrit sources the image is instead that of a male being, namely of a *puruṣa*, and ultimately represents a further piece of evidence for the *ātman*. See e.g. ChUp 4.15.1: *eṣo 'kṣiṇi puruṣo dṛśyāta eṣa ātmeti hovāca* “The person you see here in the eye - he is the self - he told him”, BĀU 2.3.3: *athāmṛtaṃ vāyus cāntarīkṣaṃ ca. etad amṛtam. etad yat [...]* *tasyaitasyāmṛtasyaitasyāmṛtasyaitasya yata [...]* *eṣa raso ya eṣa etasmin maṇḍale puruṣaḥ*, “The one without a fixed shape, on the other hand, consists of air and the intermediate region; it is immortal and in motion [...]. The person within the sun’s orb is the essence of the one that is without a fixed shape, that is immortal and in motion [...].” (tr. Olivelle 1998). Cf. BĀU 4.4.1 (*caḥṣuṣaḥ puruṣaḥ*).

41 According to Ranade (2006: 325), this is the name of a three-day Soma sacrifice. Here the Svarasāmāns are interpreted as the three days before and after the Viṣuvat-day in accordance with Murakawa (2000: 113 – Table 1).

42 This is the middle day of the Sattrā.

43 See the schema above (Murakawa 2000: 113 – Table 1).

This is when the Daśarātra part of the ritual starts: it includes the six days of the Pṛṣṭhya, the three days of Chandoma, and the tenth day, preceding the Mahāvratā. Breath with all its distinctions and classifications is once again the focus of the explanation, testifying to the special attention the so-called *vrātya* culture paid to inherent reflection, which is so well-represented even in heterodoxies such as the Buddhist Theravāda Suttapiṭaka.⁴⁴ Furthermore, a long list of Vedic metres is mentioned as matching the body parts of the assumed sacrificial victim involved in the performance. The total number of syllables contained by these metres is two hundred and fifty-two; the number of syllables in each metre increases by four: *gāyatrī* (24 syllables) + *uṣṇih* and *kakubh* (20 + 8 = 28) + *anuṣṭubh* (32) + *bṛhatī* (36) + *pañkti* (40) + *triṣṭubh* (44) + *jagatī* (48).

(JB 2.58 continues) *ta ete daśa prāṇā daśa stomā daśa chandāmsi. ime ha sapta mukhyāḥ prāṇā dvāv avāñcau nābhyāṃ daśamaḥ. ime ha pṛṣṭhyasya ṣaḍahasya stomāś chandomāḥ pañcaviṃśaḥ caturdhā. imāny u ha sapta caturuttarāṇi chandāmsi sadvipadāvirāḍ aticchandāḥ. prāṇa eva gayatri.*⁴⁵ *caḥsuṣṭi uṣṇikkakubhau śrotraṃ jagatī vāg anuṣṭub manobṛhaty ātmā pañktir balaṃ triṣṭup. pratiṣṭhā dvipadā māmsāni virāt śarīrāny aticchandāḥ. teṣāṃ eṣāṃ saptānāṃ caturuttarāṇāṃ chandasāṃ dvādaśaikaviṃśās saṃpadyante.*

These which are the ten breaths are the ten praises, i.e., the ten sacred hymns. These seven are placed in the head, two downwards, the tenth in the navel. These Stomas (i.e., the six Stomas mentioned in JB 2.57–58) are [used] for the Pṛṣṭhya-ṣaḍaha, the Chandoma-days⁴⁶ are [the days on which] the Pañcaviṃśa[-stoma] is used but divided over four [days]. These metres are seven [metres] increasing by four, the Aticchandā⁴⁷ with the Dvipadā and the Virāj.⁴⁸ The Gāyatrī⁴⁹ is indeed the breath, the Uṣṇih⁵⁰ and Kakubh⁵¹ metres are the two eyes, the Anuṣṭubh⁵² is the

44 See Neri/Pontillo (2023: 107–111; 114–118) and the bibliography quoted there.

45 We have adopted Murakawa's edition (2007: 214) for the last three sentences.

46 *chandoma-* is the masculine name of the eighth, ninth and tenth day of the Sattra, characterised by a special form of hymn, according to Ranade (2006: 183). Here, in line with Murakawa (2000: 113 – Table 1), the Chandoma-days are the seventh, eighth, and ninth day of the Daśarātra. Cf. TS 7.3.3. 1–2; TS 7.4.1.1–4.25 – see Hirose 2024: 9–10, 17 fn. 25; 20 fn. 33.

47 This is an extremely extended metre, including more than 48 syllables.

48 The Dvipadā and the Virāj are two Vedic metres, respectively consisting of two and four Pādas.

49 The Gāyatrī is an ancient metre made up of twenty-four syllables, which is generally (but not mandatorily) divided into three parts each with eight syllables.

50 The Uṣṇih is another Vedic metre made up of twenty-eight syllables, namely two Pādas with eight syllables, and one with twelve, which can be recited in a different way.

51 The Kakubh is a metre whose name depends on the fact that the second Pāda consists of twelve syllables while the previous and the following one only have eight syllables, meaning that it constitutes a sort of peak (*kakubh*).

52 The Anuṣṭubh metre includes thirty-two syllables divided into four Pādas.

faculty of hearing, the Jagatī⁵³ is the faculty of speaking, the Bṛhatī⁵⁴ is the faculty of thinking, the Pañkti⁵⁵ is the body, and the Triṣṭubh⁵⁶ is the strength. The Dvipadā is the basis (i.e., the feet). The Virāj is the fleshy parts. The Aticchandās are the solid parts of the body. These seven are the metres which increase by four, these twelve amount to twenty-one (i.e., 152) [syllables].

The final homologies (JB 2.59) close the circle by presenting the twelve months – i.e., the time span of the Sattrā explained in this text – as corresponding to metres. Since, as other sources on the Sattrā demonstrate, the sacrificial victim is supposed to be at least prototypically a human being, the ultimate homology which is suggested connects the duration of the sacrifice with the space occupied by a person.

(JB 2.59) *gāyatrīyā uṣṇīho 'nuṣṭubhāś caturaśītir akṣarāṇi. te catvāra ekaviṃśāḥ. pañkteś ca triṣṭubhāś ca caturaśītir akṣarāṇi. te catvāra ekaviṃśāḥ. bṛhatīyā ca jagatīyā ca caturaśītir akṣarāṇi. te catvāra ekaviṃśāḥ. atha trayāṇāṃ chandasāṃ daśāśatam akṣarāṇi. viṃśatyakṣarā dvīpadā. triṃśadakṣarā virāj. śaṣṭyakṣarāticchandāḥ. tāni daśāśatam akṣarāṇi saṃpadyante. tato dve ādatte. atha dvādaśa trivṛtas saṃpadyante. tān imān dvādaśa trivṛto dvādaśasyaikaviṃśeṣūpa-dadhātī. te dvādaśa satriṃśino māsās saṃpadyante. tad etac chandāmsi trivṛtaṃ caiva stomam abhisampadyante...*(this sentence continues in JB 2.60).

The eighty-four syllables of the Gāyatrī, Uṣṇih, Anuṣṭubh [metres] are four times twenty-one. The eighty-four syllables of the Pañkti and the Triṣṭubh are four times twenty-one. The eighty-four syllables of the Bṛhatī and of the Jagatī are four times twenty-one. Then, there are one hundred and ten syllables of three metres: the Dvipadā consists of twenty syllables, the Virāj, thirty syllables, the Aticchandās, sixty syllables. They amount to one hundred and ten syllables. He takes two away from these. And it (i.e., 108) is equal to nine times (trivṛt) twelve ($12 \times 9 = 108$). He adds these [syllables] nine times twelve to twelve times twenty-one ($21 \times 12 = 252$). They amount to twelve months which contain thirty [days] (i.e., 360 days). In this way, the metres (360 syllables) become equal to Trivṛt-stoma...

The general target of this extended *rūpaka* (JB 2.57–59) seems to be the *adhyātma* interpretation of the Sattrā, namely the identification of the individual ascetic practices (especially breath control) with the several days included in the sacrificial performance. Moreover, language and metres seem to replace the relevant sacrificial actions.

53 The Jagatī is a metre comprehending forty-eight syllables divided into four Pādas.

54 The Bṛhatī was originally a metre of thirty-six syllables divided into four Pādas, the third of which exceeded the other three (consisting of eight syllables) by four syllables (thus it consists of twelve syllables).

55 The Pañkti metre is made up of five Pādas of eight syllables.

56 The Triṣṭubh metre is made up of four Pādas consisting of eleven syllables.

4 The Sun-like *puruṣa* as a Foundation of Time (JB 2.60)

The metres presented in the previous chapter are here identified with speech, breath, fire, and the sun. Moreover, mention is made of the units of time on which the year is based to present the identification between metres and years. In fact, a series of rhetorical questions is introduced to explain how the year is essentially based on metres. We assume that the mentioned time slots and the rhythm of breath equalled by the metric rhythm are the counterpart of an assumed equivalence between non-hieratic wisdom and poetry and the more technical traits of Brahmanical culture, in other words this is a strategy to introduce and incorporate values alien to the Brahmanical world into the latter.

(JB 2.60) ... *ekaviṁśaṃ ca vācaṃ ca prāṇaṃ cāgniṃ cādityaṃ ca*.⁵⁷ *atha ye dve akṣare te bṛhadrathantare te ahorātre. so 'rdhamāsa sa māsa sa ṛtus sa saṃvatsaraḥ. tad āhur yat prāṇās chandāṃsi chandāṃsi stomā ity āhuḥ kathaṃ yajamānaḥ prāṇāis chandāṃsy apy eti chandobhi stomān stomair bṛhadrathantare bṛhadrathantarābhyām ahorātre ahorātrābhyām ardhmāsam ardhmāsenā māsaṃ māsenartum ṛtunā saṃvatsaram*.⁵⁸

...and [they become equal to] Ekaviṁśa[-stoma],⁵⁹ which are speech, breath, fire, and the sun. Then these which are two syllables are the Bṛhat⁶⁰ and Rathantara⁶¹ [Sāmans], day and night. This is the half-month, this is the month, this is the season, this is the year. About this they say: “If the metres are bodily functions, the metres are the Stomas.” – they say – “[then] how does the Sacrificer also come to the metres by means of bodily functions, to Stomas by means of the metres, to the Bṛhat and Rathantara [Sāmans] by means of Stomas, to day and night by means of the Bṛhat and Rathantara, to the half-month by means of day and night, to the month by means of the half-month, to the season by means of the month, to the year by means of the season?”

57 Here we are following Murakawa's (2007) edition. Cf. Vira/Chandra's 1955 edition: *ekaviṁśaṃ ca vā pañca prāṇaṃ cāgniṃ cādityaṃ ca*.

58 Here we are following Murakawa's (2007) edition, which considers this passage as a unique long sentence, while Vira/Chandra's 1955 edition places a *daṇḍa* after *ity āhuḥ* and after *apy eti*.

59 In fact, 360 is a multiple of 30, which is the sum of 9 (Trivṛt) and 21 (Ekaviṁśa).

60 The Bṛhat stanza is SV 1.234 = ṚV 6.46.1: *tvām id dhī hāvāmahe sātā vājasya kāravaḥ. tvām vrtrésv indra sátpatiṃ náras tvām kásthāsv árvataḥ* “Because it is just you that we bards call upon at the winning of the prize, you, Indra, as master of settlements that our men (call upon) amid obstacles you at the finish lines of our steed” (tr. Jamison/Brereton 2014: 832).

61 The Rathantara stanza is SV 1.233 = ṚV 7.32.22: *abhí tvā sūra nonumó 'dugdhā iva dhenávaḥ | íśānam asyá jagataḥ svarđśám íśānam indra tashúṣaḥ* “We keep bellowing to you, o champion, like un milked cows - to you, Indra; who see [like] the sun, lord of this moving [world], lord of the still one” (tr. Jamison/Brereton 2014: 922).

Here an important question is being asked about this very year: where was the year established, i.e., what is the cause of the year? The reply implies a further identification of *puruṣa* with year, which was ultimately founded in the Self.

(JB 2.60 continues) *kutas saṃvatsaro jāyate kva pratiṣṭhita iti. sa vidyād aham eva saṃvatsaro 'smi mayi pratiṣṭhita iti. evaṃvido ha vāva saṃvatsaro jāyata evaṃvidi pratiṣṭhitaḥ.*⁶²

“From what was the year born? Where was it established?” He should know: “I am the year indeed. It was established in me”. Indeed, the year was born from the one who has this knowledge, it was established in the one who has this knowledge.

Furthermore, after identifying *puruṣa* with year, the year is said to be the sun; in particular, the *puruṣa* which is in the eye is the year (*saṃvatsara*). The white part of the eye is the side part (*saṃvat*) and the black circle in the middle is the lake (*saras*). Moreover, it is known that the side part is the sun, and the lake is the moon. The lake flows towards the sun and reaches it on the night of the full moon.

(JB 2.60 continues) *atho āhur āditya eva saṃvatsaraḥ. etaṃ hi sarvā śrīs sarvaṃ yaśas sarve devās sametās tasmād āditya eva saṃvatsara iti. tasya yad bhāti tat saṃvad yan madhye kṛṣṇaṃ maṇḍalaṃ tat sara ity adhidevatam.*

Moreover, they say that the year is the sun indeed. To him all the splendour, all the glory, all the gods have come together. Therefore, it is said “The year (*saṃvatsara*) is in the sun indeed”. That which shines of this is the side part (*saṃvat*), the black circle in the middle is a lake (*saras*), as far as the gods are concerned.

athādhyātmam. ayam eva saṃvatsaro yo 'yaṃ cakṣuṣi puruṣaḥ. tasya yac chuklaṃ tat saṃvad yan madhye kṛṣṇaṃ maṇḍalaṃ tat saraḥ. atho āhur āditya eva saṃvac candramās saraḥ. tam eṣa sarati. taṃ paurṇamāsyām āpnotiti. tad u vā āhuḥ prāṇa eva saṃvad vāk saraḥ. etābhyāṃ hi samaśnuta iti. tasya vā etasya saṃvatsarasyāgniṣṭomasāmāny eva devayānaḥ panthāḥ.

As far as the self is concerned, the *puruṣa*-in-the-eye is the year. That which is the white of this is the side part, that which is a black circle in the middle is a lake. They thus say that the side part is the sun indeed, the lake is the moon. It flows toward this (i.e., the sun). It reaches it on the night of the full moon. They thus say that the side part is breath, and the lake is language. He attains it by means of these two. The hymns of the Agniṣṭoma of this, which is indeed the year, are the way of gaining access to heaven.

⁶² This self-identification with a partition of time could perhaps be compared with the formula appearing in KauṣUp 1.5.7, which the deceased man has to utter in the presence of Brahmā, precisely in order to gain access to the *devayāna pathin*, namely: [...] *ko 'siti. taṃ pratibrūyāt. ṛtur asmī [...]* *bhūtasya bhūtasya tvam ātmāsi. yas tvam asi so 'ham asmīti [...]* “Who are you? He should reply: ‘I am a season [...] You are the self of every being. I am who you are. [...]’.”

This metaphor of the eye continues up to the last lines of this chapter, where the side part (that is, the white part of the eye) is identified with breath, and the lake (i.e., the black circle in the middle) corresponds to language. By means of these two faculties of breath and language, the Agniṣṭoma hymns are recited and permit access to heaven. The overall image seems to represent the possible journey a human being may make through the solar orb up to the world of the *brahman* and his eventual merging with the sun.⁶³ Such a destiny – reserved for just a few – does not require any priestly intermediation between human beings and the Sacred, a concept that is far from the Śrauta religious world.

5 Sāmavedic Hymns as a Path to Gain Access to Heaven (JB 2.61)

The hymns which can be considered as a path to gain access to heaven are called Rauhiṇaka because at first the gods used them to ascend (*ruh-*) to the world of heaven. This is why the Agniṣṭoma hymns should be recited every day together with the Bṛhat and the Rathantara, which in the previous chapter were said to have created night and day. The notion of ascending to heaven as a way to gain divine status is overtly in contrast with the existence of beings who were born as deities.

(JB 2.61) *tāni vā etāni rauhiṇakāni nāma. etair vai devā svargaṃ lokam ārohan. yad arohaṃs tasmād rauhiṇakāni.*⁶⁴ *tasmād vayam anvaham evāgniṣṭomasāmāni kurmaḥ. atha vartanyau bṛhadrathantare. etābhyāṃ ha vā eṣa etad vartate.*

These [hymns] have the name of Rauhiṇaka. The gods ascended (*ruh-*) to the world of heaven by means of these. As they ascended, therefore they are [called] Rauhiṇaka. Therefore, as appointed for each day we recite the hymns of the Agniṣṭoma. Moreover, the two fellows of the wheel are the Bṛhat and the Rathantara. This (i.e., the sun) moves with these two in this way.

*tasmād vayam atirātra ubhe bṛhadrathantare kurmaḥ kṛtsnaṃ nas sāma yuktaṃ yajñam vahāt*⁶⁵ *kṛtsnena sāmnoḍṛcam aśnavāmahā iti. atha gatiḥ. yaś caivāsāv āditye puruṣo*⁶⁶ *yaś cāyam adhy ātman tad etat prajāpatyayanam ity evopāsitavyam. etena vā ayanena prajāpatir imām ṛddhim ārdhnod imām vyaṣṭim vyāśnuta. tad yām eva prajāpatir ṛddhim ārdhnod yām vyaṣṭim vyāśnuta tām evarddhim ṛdhnoti tām vyaṣṭim vyaśnute ya evaṃ veda.*

63 See Pontillo 2016: 233-8 and the bibliography quoted there.

64 We have emended the *rohiṇakāni* reading of Vira/Chandra's 1955 edition to *rauhiṇakāni*, on the basis of the previous line.

65 The anonymous assessor of the present article suggested that we should replace *vahat* with *vahāt*, i.e., a subjunctive form in place of an injunctive form, because the injunctive is not used with this function in the text.

66 As far as the solar image of the *puruṣa* is concerned, see above, JB 2.56.

Therefore, we recite both the Bṛhat and the Rathantara hymns in the Atirātra. May our whole hymn lead the yoked sacrifice and may we reach the conclusion of the hymn. Now [let us explain] the way. It must be venerated [by saying]: “The road of the one who is indeed the *puruṣa*-in-the-sun and who is the *ātman* is indeed Prajāpati’s”. Indeed, Prajāpati obtained this prosperity, he reached this success by means of this road. He obtains this prosperity which Prajāpati obtained, reaches this success which [Prajāpati] reached, if he is aware of this.

These two Sāmavedic hymns, Bṛhat and Rathantara, should be recited during the Atirātra to lead the sacrifice, so that one can follow the path that permits access to heaven. Prajāpati obtained prosperity and reached success because of this path and, consequently, within a perspective of actualisation of the divine prototypical experience which is common to the Brāhmaṇa-texts, all the men who know this story obtain the same prosperity and reach the same success.

6 A Complex *rūpaka* Targeted on the Homology Between the *dīkṣita* and the Sun (JB 2.62–63)

In the “*upaniṣads*”⁶⁷ taught by Keśin Dārbhya, two of the most important equivalences are mentioned in JB 2.62–63.⁶⁸ The first *rūpaka* (in JB 2.62) starts from the identification of the *dīkṣita* (and part of his body) with the sun and ends with the *puruṣa*-in-the-eye, which was already mentioned in JB 2.58 and 2.60.

(JB 2.62) *eṣa vāva dīkṣito ya eṣa tapati. sa eṣa indriyaṃ jyaiṣṭhyam śraiṣṭhyam abhi dīkṣitaḥ. tasya ye ’rvāñco raśmayas tāni śmaśrūṇi ya ūrdhvās te keśāḥ. ahorātre eva kṛṣṇājīnasya rūpaṃ. ahar eva śuklasya rūpaṃ rātriḥ kṛṣṇasya.*

The consecrated man is indeed he who emanates heat. He is consecrated to power, pre-eminence, excellence. The rays that tend downwards are (the hairs of) his beard, the [rays] that tend upwards are (the locks of) his hair. Day and night are indeed the visible appearance of his black antelope skin. The day is indeed the visible appearance of the white [part], the night that of the black one.

⁶⁷ Indeed, the ending of the JB section devoted to the *dīkṣā* seems to suggest that the so-called Vedic homologies, which are considered the main target of the Upaniṣads, might have been a crucial feature of the *dīkṣita*’s knowledge. In fact, the esoteric teaching given by Keśin Dārbhya focuses on the action denoted by the verb *upa-ni-ṣad-*: JB 2.68: [...] *eṣā vai kaisinī dīkṣā. etāṃ ha keśi dārbhyo dīkṣām upaniṣāsāda* “This is indeed the Kaisinī consecration. Keśin Dārbhya indeed explained the homologies of this consecration”.

⁶⁸ See Candotti/Pontillo 2022, where some excerpts of JB 2.62; 63; 64 are studied.

*atha yad etan maṇḍalaṃ tā āpas tad annaṃ tad amṛtam.*⁶⁹ *tasminn etasmin maṇḍale tejomayaś chandomayaḥ puruṣaḥ. sa prāṇas sa indras sa prajāpatis sa dīkṣitaḥ. tad etad dīkṣayaiva saṃgrhitam. tata ābhyah prajābhyo 'nnādyam visṛjate. tasyemā eva dīśaḥ patnaya āsan. taṃ hemās tistro dīśo 'ticeruḥ. iyaṃ haivāsyaṅvratatamāsa yeyam dakṣiṇā dik. tasmād eṣa etām evābhyupāvartate. yady apy uttarata udety athaitām evābhyupāvartate. tasmād yasya priyā jāyā syāt tām dakṣiṇārdhyam kuryāt.*

Moreover, the orbit [of the sun] is the waters and food is immortality. In this, which is the orbit, lies the *puruṣa* made of shining energy and of metres. He is the breath, he is Indra, he is Prajāpati, he is the consecrated man. This is what is grasped by means of the consecration. Therefore, from those creatures the proper food flows forth. These directions were his wives. The three directions were indeed unfaithful to him. The southern direction was the most faithful to him. Therefore, he turns towards it (i.e., the southern direction). Even if he rises from the North, then he turns towards her. Therefore, he should make her who is his beloved wife the one who sits on his right.

Here the directions are mentioned as the wives of the *dīkṣita*. An esoteric *rājanya*-oriented horizon for the same *rūpaka* follows. His favourite wife is mentioned at the beginning of this chapter to introduce the second *rūpaka*.

(JB 2.63) *prathamām samnahyati prathamām vācayati prathamām pūrṇapātra āgacchaty anantaritāḥ patnaya stha. udag u yajñiyam karma samtiṣṭhate. iti nv adhidevatam.*

He ties [this wife] up first, he makes [her] speak up first, the vessel full of rice comes [to her] first: o wives stay not separated! Turned upwards (i.e., to the North), the sacrificial action is successful. It is thus as far as the gods are concerned.

The second homology is the other way round starting from the identification with the *puruṣa*-in-the-eye and parts of the eye itself.

(JB 2.63 continues) *athādhyātman. ayam eva dīkṣito yo 'yam cakṣuṣi puruṣaḥ. tasya yāny arvāñci pakṣmāṇi*⁷⁰ *tāni śmaśrūṇi yāny ūrdhvāni te keśāḥ. yad eva śuklam ca kṛṣṇam ca tat kṛṣṇājinasya rūpam. śuklam eva śuklasya rūpam kṛṣṇam kṛṣṇasya.*

⁶⁹ This complex identification of the *dīkṣita* with the sun and the relevant *variatio* included in JB 2.63 seem to be one of the extended homologies between ritual features and cosmic entities or other *upamānas*, which Pontillo (2009) tried to analyse as a sort of *samastavastuviṣaya-rūpakas ante-litteram*. This was in accordance with Witzel's 1979 thesis and after fundamental inquiries such as those by Mylius (1968; 1976; 1977) and Schlerath (1979) which demonstrated the methodical character of Vedic identifications and their systematising aim. First, the two matching wholes are enunciated, then the equivalent parts pertaining respectively to the two wholes are listed in a rigorously parallel fashion. Another less symmetric homology was encompassed in JB 2.57–59: see above. See also Boccali/Pontillo 2010: 122-28; Candotti/Pontillo 2017: 352; 355 and the bibliography quoted there.

⁷⁰ Ehlers (1988: 12) emended *pakṣāṇi* (Vira/Chandra 1955: 183) by replacing it with *pakṣmāṇi*.

As far as the self is concerned, this *puruṣa*-in-the-eye is indeed the consecrated man. The eyelashes turned downwards are (the hairs of) his beard, and those turned upwards are (the locks of) his hair. What is white and what is black [in the eye] is the visible appearance of his antelope skin. The white appearance is indeed that of the white of the eye, and the black is that of the black of the eye.

atha yad etan maṇḍalaṃ tā āpas tad annaṃ tad amṛtam. tasminn etasmin maṇḍale tejomayaś chandomayaḥ puruṣaḥ. sa prāṇas sa indras sa prajāpatis sa dīkṣitaḥ.

Waters are the orbit and food is immortality. In this, which is the orbit, is the *puruṣa* made of shining energy and of metres. This breath is Indra, he is Prajāpati, he is the consecrated man.

*sa haivaṃvid dīkṣamāṇo yathaivaiṣa etad indriyaṃ jyaiṣṭhyaṃ śraīṣṭhyam abhi dīkṣita evam evendriyaṃ jyaiṣṭhyaṃ śraīṣṭhyam abhi dīkṣito bhavati.*⁷¹

He who performs the *dīkṣā* and knows this indeed, in exactly the same way as he who is actually consecrated to [achieve] power, pre-eminence, excellence, is consecrated to [achieve] power, pre-eminence, excellence.

Here the context is more oriented to a warrior culture. The emphasised goals are definitely secular. It is evident that the two homologies together thus indirectly construct a macro-equivalence between the *puruṣa*-in-the-sun, i.e., presumably the apparent sunspot, and the *puruṣa*-in-the-eye, i.e., the pupil, in other words the human figure of the interlocutor reflected in the eye of the person in front of him.⁷² Thus, the human and the celestial orbit are paralleled, and they shed light on both the well-known monistic belief in the *puruṣa* that is ingrained in every human being, and more especially on the Upaniṣadic identity between the macrocosmic all-pervasive unique Brahman and the homologous microcosmic Ātman.

This passage clearly states that he who performs the *dīkṣā* and knows the above-mentioned *rūpakas*, is actually consecrated so that he may achieve power, pre-eminence, excellence.

(JB 2.63 continues) *tasmād u haivaṃvidi dīkṣita īśvaro rāṣṭrāṇi samutkampitoḥ kṣāmarandhra iva hi samābhavati. evaṃ hy etad indriyaṃ jyaiṣṭhyaṃ śraīṣṭhyam abhi dīkṣito bhavati. tasmād u sarvam evābhivadaty ācāryaṃ pitaraṃ kṣatriyam. evaṃ hy etad indriyaṃ jyaiṣṭhyaṃ śraīṣṭhyam abhi dīkṣito bhavati.*

⁷¹ The lexicon occurring in this case is crucial in several Vedic versions of the *vṛātya-stoma* (see Candotti/Pontillo 2015: 169–175). Moreover, Vedic *śreṣṭha-* / Pāli *seṭṭha* is registered as a synonym for the masculine noun *brahmān* in the compound *brahmabhūta* which is assumed to convey a shared ancient warrior-ascetic purpose of immortality (see Neri/Pontillo 2016: 136–139).

⁷² See fn. 41.

Therefore, if anybody who knows this is consecrated, he becomes able to cause the domains to tremble as if he were a fissure in the earth.⁷³ Thus, indeed, he is consecrated to this kind of power, pre-eminence, excellence. Therefore, he thus addresses his teacher, father and prince. Thus, indeed he is consecrated to this kind of power, pre-eminence, excellence.

Moreover, if those who know these homologies are also consecrated, they will become able to cause the domains to tremble; in fact, they are consecrated so that they may achieve power, pre-eminence, excellence, just as those who address their teacher, father and prince in this way.

7 The Powerful and Dangerous Language of the *dīkṣita* (JB 2.64)

JB 2.64 has been partly analysed by Candotti/Pontillo (2022) because it contains the interesting phrase *vicakṣaṇavati*⁷⁴ *vāc* “a language characterised by being bright”, which has been translated in several different ways.

⁷³ Here Ehler’s (1988: 12–13) suggestion is partly followed: “Deshalb werden voraussichtlich, wenn ein so Wissender geweiht ist, die Königreiche [durch Erdbeben] erzittern, denn es entsteht [dadurch] irgendwie ein Riß in der Erde”.

⁷⁴ Note that *tad asyāsty asmin* “which belongs to X, which exists in X” is the sense indirectly taught for the *taddhita* affix *-vat* in A 5.2.94, which is a rule devoted to the affix *-mat*, because A 8.2.11 provides for the replacement of *m-* of *-mat* with *v-* when it deals with a proper name. *vicakṣaṇa-* is thus something “which exists in” the mentioned utterance, i.e., which is contained therein. This kind of *taddhita* derivation where a single “quoted” word is its non-head constituent (*upasarjana*) is well documented when specific textual passages derive their name from a single word contained in the self-same passage, in accordance with A 5.2.60. In fact, we learn from BŚS 6.6 that *vicakṣaṇa* is a term that the *dīkṣita* of the Soma sacrifice must add after addressing somebody by his proper name: *upariṣṭād vicakṣaṇam dhehi canasitavatim vicakṣaṇavatim vācam vada [...]* *athātithinām upasthām eti. canasitavatim vicakṣaṇavatim vācam vadati* “Add after [the proper names] the word *vicakṣaṇa-*! Use a language that contains the words *canasita-* and *vicakṣaṇa-*! [...] Then he meets the guests. He uses a language that contains the words *canasita-* and *vicakṣaṇa-*!”. Cf. BhŚS 10.7.14–15: *parihvālam mānuṣim vācam vadati canasitam vicakṣaṇam vānuṣajan. canasita iti brāhmaṇa āmantrayita. vicakṣaṇa iti rājanyavaiśyāv iti vijñāyate* “He should utter secular words falteringly and adding at the end either the word *canasita* or the word *vicakṣaṇa*. He should address a Brāhmaṇa with *canasita* and a Rājanya or a Vaiśya with *vicakṣaṇa*. So it is said.” (tr. Kashikar 2003). Cf. ĀpŚS 10.12.7–10: *canasitam vicakṣaṇam iti nāmadheyanteṣu nidadhāti. canasiteti brāhmaṇam. vicakṣaṇeti rājanyavaiśye. pariṇayena mānuṣim vācam vadati* “At the end of the proper names he adds *canasita* and *vicakṣaṇa*: [he should address] a Brāhmaṇa with *canasita* and a Rājanya or a Vaiśya with *vicakṣaṇa*. He speaks the ordinary speech while going round about”. Accordingly, Caland (1919: 140) translates this sentence as follows: “In seiner (An)rede füge er (n.l. der zum Somaopfer Geweihte) (das Wort) *vicakṣaṇa* (‘Ansehlicher’) bei”. Indeed, the second term *canasita* is not included either here in JB or in AB 1.6 or KB 7.3 (which instead include the phrase *vicakṣaṇavati-* *vāc-*), while in GB 1.3.19 and 2.2.3,

(JB 2.64) *vicakṣaṇavatīṃ vācaṃ vadati. annaṃ vai vicakṣaṇam. annavatīm eva tad vācaṃ vadati. vicakṣaṇavatīṃ vācaṃ vadati. somo vai vicakṣaṇaḥ. annam u vai somaḥ. annavatīm eva tad vācaṃ vadati. vicakṣaṇavatīṃ vācaṃ vadati. prāṇo vai vicakṣaṇaḥ. tasya vāg eva mithunam. mithunavatīm eva tad vācaṃ vadati. vicakṣaṇavatīṃ vācaṃ vadati.*

He speaks a language characterised by being bright. The food is indeed bright. He actually speaks a language characterised by food. He uses the language characterised by being bright. Soma indeed is bright. Soma is food indeed. He thus speaks a language characterised by food. He speaks a language characterised by being bright. Breath indeed is bright. His (i.e., the *dīkṣita*'s) language is indeed a pair. He thus speaks a language characterised by a pair. He speaks a language characterised by being bright.

annaṃ vai vicakṣaṇam. annena hūmāḥ prajā vipaśyanti. tata ābhyaḥ prajābhyo 'nnādyam prayacchati. sa yadāsmāi vratam prayacchet sarvam eva vratayet sarvasyānnādyasyāvaruddhyai.

Food indeed is bright. These creatures (i.e., offspring and cattle) [can] discern [the world] thanks to the food. Therefore, he offers proper food to these creatures. If he offered a vow, he should observe the vow to obtain all the food.

yady u pariśiṃsyād vratapradam brūyād aśāna vā piba veti. yady u vrataprado 'nucchiṣṭāśī vā syāt pari vā śiṃsyāt tad adbhir abhyukṣya chāyāyāṃ niṣektavai brūyāt. tad ośadhīhir abhi-saṃchādayitavai brūyāt. tad ośadhīnāṃ mūlāny upasiñcati. varṣukaḥ parjanya bhavati yatraivaṃvidvān dīkṣate.

If he were to leave some remnant, he should say to him who presents the fast-milk: “Eat! or Drink!”. If he who presents the fast-milk does not eat the remnant or leaves some remnant, he should order it to be washed away in a shaded place after besprinkling it with water. He should order it to be covered with plants. He waters the roots of plants. Parjanya has to give rain, where he, who is aware of it, is consecrated.

Once the sacrifice of consecration has been accomplished, the Adhvaryu anointed, and the Sacrificer purified, then the consecrated one should be recognised as a deity, namely the Sun. In fact, the Sun god seizes the power, pre-eminence, excellence, and the glory of the one who is being consecrated. As a consequence, the *dīkṣita* should ask the Sun not to seize his power, pre-eminence, excellence, and glory, because he

where both terms are involved in an identical sentence [*vicakṣaṇa* is instead associated with *brāhmaṇas*, and *canasita* with Prajāpati's descendants ([...] *vicakṣaṇavatīṃ vācaṃ bhāṣante canasitavatīṃ vicakṣayanti brāhmaṇam canasayanti prajāpatyam*). Unfortunately, even if we assume that Prajāpatya here denotes a *rājanya* (cf. Gonda 1986: 154), the actual meaning of the verbal forms *vicakṣayanti* and *canasayanti* still remains unclear. The verbal base *vicakṣ-* is frequently employed in Vedic Saṃhitās to denote the action of “seeing clear and far” (see e.g. RV 1.24.12; 9.45.6), while *canas* “delight” is used as a noun, except for a denominative imperative form *canas-ya-tam* “may you (two) find your delight!” in RV 1.3.1.

has been consecrated only after – which we also read as *on the basis of* – the Sun’s consecration, i.e., he has been consecrated as the human counterpart of the Sun.

(JB 2.64 continues) *dikṣitā udaśūśuṣann⁷⁵ itihāhuḥ. sa yadā dikṣaṇīyeṣṭis samtiṣṭheta yadainam adhvaryur abhyañjayed yadā sampavayed. athaitam ādityam upatiṣṭheta tvam devatā dikṣitāsi. sā dikṣamānasyendriyaṃ jyaiṣṭhyaṃ śraiṣṭhyaṃ yaśa ādatse. mā ma indriyaṃ jyaiṣṭhyaṃ śraiṣṭhyaṃ yaśa ādithāh. tava dikṣām anu dikṣa iti. tasyaiśā devatā dikṣamānasyendriyaṃ jyaiṣṭhyaṃ śraiṣṭhyaṃ yaśo nādatte.*

In this case they say: “The consecrated men really made [the earth] dry”. When the sacrifice of consecration has been accomplished, and the Adhvaryu anointed and purified him (i.e., the consecrated man), then he should attend that Sun [by saying]: “You deity, you are consecrated! You are this [deity]. You seize the power, the pre-eminence, the excellence, the glory of the one who is being consecrated”. [Therefore, he should say:] “No, may you not seize my power, pre-eminence, excellence, and glory! I am being consecrated after your consecration.” Thus, the deity does not seize the power, the pre-eminence, the excellence, the glory of the one who is being consecrated.

8 The *dikṣā* of the Individual “Deities” to Reach Imperishableness: *śraddhā* (JB 2.65)

Here again the sacrificial arena is compared to the ascetic world.

(JB 2.65) *tam adhvaryur abhyajya prapādyaudgrahaṇāni juhōti. yad audgrahaṇāni juhōti. yadāsmā⁷⁶ audumbaradaṇḍam prayacchaty athaitam āhavanīyam upatiṣṭheta vācā me vāg dikṣatām agnaye samaṣṭavā u prāṇena me prāṇo dikṣatām vāyave samaṣṭavā u cakṣur me cakṣur dikṣatām sūryāya samaṣṭavā u manasā me mano dikṣatām prajāpataye samaṣṭavā v iti.*

After leading him and taking refuge with him, the Adhvaryu pours out the Audgrahaṇa offerings. As soon as he pours out the Audgrahaṇas, then he presents him with an Udumbarastick. Then he should attend to that Āhavanīya-fire [by saying]: “With my faculty of speaking: let my faculty of speaking be consecrated to the fire to reach [it].⁷⁷ With my breath: let my breath be

75 We have adopted Murakawa’s (2007: 223) reading *udaśūśuṣann* “they made something dry”, i.e., the causative form of the reduplicated aorist of the verbal base *śuṣ-* “to dry”. This verbal form was actually advanced by Ehlers (1988: 13–14) with a mistake in the preverb (*udaśūśuṣann*) in place of Vira/Chandra’s reading of *udaśuśrūṣann* (1955: 184).

76 We have adopted Murakawa’s (2007: 223–224) reading (*yadāsmā*) in place of Vira/Chandra’s (1955: 184) reading (*yad asmā*).

77 We have translated *samaṣṭi-* as a *nomen actionis* denoting the action of reaching [something] on the basis of JB 2.54, where the offering of several individual faculties and body parts to specific officiant priests ensured that the Sacrificer obtained some permanent elements of nature which also included fire. It is not clear why Ranade translated it (2019: 623) as a “collective aggregate”.

consecrated to the wind to reach [it]! With my faculty of seeing: let my faculty of seeing be consecrated to the sun to reach [the sun]. With my faculty of thinking: let my faculty of thinking be consecrated to Prajāpati to reach [him]”.

tad etābhir anārtābhir devatābhir imā svā devatā dīkṣayati. athāha agnir dīkṣitaḥ pṛthivī dīkṣā sā mā dīkṣā dīkṣeta tayā dīkṣayā dīkṣe. vāyur dīkṣito 'ntarikṣaṃ dīkṣā sā mā dīkṣā dīkṣeta tayā dīkṣayā dīkṣe. ādityo dīkṣito dyaur dīkṣā sā mā dīkṣā dīkṣeta tayā dīkṣayā dīkṣe. prajāpatir dīkṣito mano dīkṣā sā mā dīkṣā dīkṣeta tayā dīkṣayā dīkṣe. vācam ma rco 'nu dīkṣantām mano yajūṃṣi prāṇaṃ sāmāni. śraddhām⁷⁸ me somo rājān u dīkṣatām. ṛcā dīkṣe yajuṣā dīkṣe sāmāni dīkṣe pṛthivyā dīkṣe 'ntarikaṇa dīkṣe divā dīkṣa ity.⁷⁹ atra kṛtsno dīkṣitaḥ. atha yasyādīkṣitā ime lokā adīkṣitāni chandāṃsy adīkṣitas somo rājā. . . (the sentence continues in JB 2.66)

This [formula] by means of those deities (i.e., faculties of perception) when they are undisturbed causes the relevant deities to be consecrated. Then he said: “The fire is the consecrated man, the earth is the consecration. This consecration should consecrate me. I am being consecrated with this consecration. The wind is the consecrated man, the intermediate space is the consecration. This consecration should consecrate me. I am being consecrated with this consecration. The sun is the consecrated man, the sky is the consecration. This consecration should consecrate me. I am being consecrated with this consecration. Prajāpati is the consecrated man, the faculty of thinking is the consecration. This consecration should consecrate me. I am being consecrated with this consecration. May the stanzas consecrate [me] through my faculty of speaking, the formulas through my faculty of thinking, the Sāmans through my breath! May king Soma consecrate my faith!” Here he is consecrated as a whole [by saying]: “I am being consecrated by the stanza, I am being consecrated by the formula, I am being consecrated by the hymn, I am being consecrated by the earth, I am being consecrated by the intermediate space, I am being consecrated by the sky.” Then he is perfectly consecrated. The metres of him whose worlds are not consecrated are not consecrated, his king Soma is also not consecrated. . .

9 *śraddhā* and *Tapas* Ensure Imperishableness (JB 2.66)

The asceticism involved in the Sacrificer’s consecration is finally extolled as the true means to obtain prosperity and imperishableness on earth.

⁷⁸ In KB 7.4 it is precisely the *śraddhā* which ensures the imperishableness of what has once been offered: [...] *atha khalu śraddhaiva sakṛmetresdiṣṭasyākṣitih* [...], a key doctrinal point which aroused Lévi’s (1898: 109) interest. He connected faith with truth: “La *śraddhā*, c’est la confiance. Mais à qui s’adresse la confiance qui assure de si beaux fruits au sacrificant? [...] La *śraddhā* est frè-quemment associé au *satya*, qui est l’exactitude.” Among the several passages that Lévi quotes as evidence, see e.g. MS 3.6.3: *satyaṃ vai cakṣur neva vāce śrad dadhāti* “Truth is the eyesight indeed. He does not put his trust in words”; AB 7.10: *śraddhā satyam ity uttamam mithunam* “Faith and truth are the highest pair.”

⁷⁹ The full stop was added by Murakawa (2007: 224).

(JB 2.66) ...*kaṃ*⁸⁰ *sa kāmam abhyaśnuvīta. atha haivaṃvid dīkṣamāna eva sarvān kāmān upāpnoti. tasmād dīkṣāsu na rājānaṃ pariveśiyāt. yadvrato hy evaiṣa bhavati tadvratā ime lokās tadvratāni chandāṃsi tadvratas somo rājā.*

... what wish should he reach? Thus, he who is consecrating himself and knows this, fulfils all his wishes. Therefore, in the consecrations one should not offer food to a king. These worlds are devoted to the vow to which he is devoted, the metres are devoted to it, king Soma is devoted to it.

*athāha bhūr bhuva svas supoṣaḥ poṣais suvīro vīrais suprajaḥ prajayā bhūyāsam*⁸¹ *iti. tad etām aparimitām āśīṣam antata*⁸² *āśāste tapo me pratiṣṭheti. tat tapaḥ*⁸³ *pratiṣṭhāṃ kurute.*

Then he says: “Earth (*bhū-*), intermediate space (*bhuvā-*), heaven (*sva-*)!⁸⁴ May I be prosperous thanks to my prosperity, may I be heroic thanks to my heroes, may I be endowed with good offspring thanks to my offspring!”. In the end, he prays in this way, which is an unlimited prayer: “May [ascetic] heat be the basis for me!”. Then he (i.e., the *dīkṣita*) makes [his own] basis out of the [ascetic] heat.

The ritual name used for the Sacrificer, i.e., *gr̥hapati*, is especially significant, since it is the term used not only to denote the Sacrificer in Sattra ceremonies but also to signify the head of the Vrātyas.

(JB 2.66 continues) *śraddhā me 'kṣitir iti tac chraddhām akṣitiṃ kurute. satyaṃ me gr̥hapatir iti. eṣa vai satyaṃ ya eṣa tapati*⁸⁵ *saiśānārtā devatā. tad etām anārtāṃ devatāṃ gr̥hapatim kurute*⁸⁶ *sa vā eṣa suvrataḥ. yad dhy eṣa khalas*⁸⁷ *syāt sarvam idaṃ pradahet.*

80 We have adopted Murakawa's (2007: 225) reading *kam* in place of Vira/Chandra's (1955: 184) reading *tam*.

81 We have adopted Murakawa's (2007: 225) reading *prajayā bhūyāsam* in place of Vira/Chandra's (1955: 185) reading *prajayāsam*.

82 We have adopted Murakawa's (2007: 225) reading *antataḥ* in place of Vira/Chandra's (1955: 185) reading *ante*.

83 Ascetic behaviour together with faith is also the guarantee of permanent merit gained by means of sacrifices in VādhS fragment 37 (Caland 1928: 148): *tapo ha dīkṣā(m) upaimi satyaṃ svam śraddhāṃ dakṣiṇām annam akṣitiṃ brahma* “I devote myself to the consecration, truth is my faith, the gift is my food, imperishableness is my Brahman”. See also Kulkarni 2016: 77.

84 This is the *incipit* of the renowned Gāyatrī Mantra (= RV 3.62.10): *om bhūr bhuvāḥ svaḥ tāt savitūr vāreṇyaṃ | bhārgo devāsya dhīmahi dhiyo yó naḥ prachodayāt* “Om, Earth, Atmosphere, Sky! Let us think of the lofty splendour of the god Savitṛ, may he give impulse to our thoughts!”.

85 We have adopted Murakawa's (2007: 225) reading *eṣa vai satyaṃ ya eṣa tapati* in place of Vira/Chandra's (1955: 185) reading *eṣa vai satyam. satyaṃ ya eṣa tapati*.

86 These lines allow us to understand what the *śraddhā* might actually have been in the pre-classical sacrifice, i.e., before what Heesterman (e.g. 1993; 1995) calls the “axial break-through of Sacrifice”. When the aim of the *sattras* performed by groups was to share expeditions and competitions with rivals to attain prosperity for the whole clan, the *Gr̥hapati*, who carried out both ascetic observances

[By saying]: “May faith be imperishableness for me!”. Then he makes [his own] imperishableness out of the faith. He says: “The Ṛḥapati is the truth.” He who emanates heat is indeed the truth. This is that undisturbed deity. Then he makes the Ṛḥapati out of the undisturbed deity. This indeed is he who has good vows. If he (i.e., the *dīkṣita*) were a mischievous man, it (i.e., the sun) should burn all this.

*tasmād ṛḥpatis svvrata syāt. sa yad v adīkṣitavratam cared apāpavadyam vā pāpam vaden*⁸⁸
mithunam vā cared anyad vā mithyākuryād etam evādityam etais sarvair japair upatiṣṭheta. tato
haiva dīkṣitaḥ. sa vā eṣa etarhy adīkṣitaḥ |

Therefore, a Ṛḥapati should be strict in observing vows. When he performed a vow unfit for a consecrated man or when he declared sinful one who should be declared sinless or he had sexual intercourse or he did something else wrong, he should indeed approach the sun with all the muttered prayers. From then on, he is precisely a consecrated man. At this point of time, he is still a non-consecrated man.

In the last passage of this chapter the glory of the *dīkṣita* is identified with the skin of the black antelope, which represents the visible appearance of the Vedas, associated with three different colours: the white Vedas have the form of hymns; the black ones have the form of stanzas and, in other cases, the yellow ones, which are almost reddish-brown, have the form of formulas. The importance of this homology is underlined by mentioning the fact that, even if the consecrated man wears the antelope’s skin without being seen, the other people taking part in the sacrifice actually wish to see this representation of the Vedas.

(JB 2.66 continues) *yad v evāsmiṇ dīkṣite yaśa āsit tad v evāsmiṇ apy etarhi yaśaḥ. tad āhus sa*
*vādya dīkṣeta sa vānyam dīkṣayed ya etasya dīkṣitayaśasasya vyavacchittim*⁸⁹ *vidyād iti.*

“The glory which was of the consecrated man is also the glory of this.” They say that either he should be consecrated today or he should cause the consecration of another man, who should know the limits of the glory of such a consecrated man.

and the redistribution of booty, should self-evidently have deserved the highest degree of faith from the clan members whose very life depended on his virtues.

⁸⁷ The anonymous assessor of the present article suggested that we replace Vira/Chandra’s (1955: 185) reading *eṣā khalā* with *eṣa khalas* instead of Murakawa’s (2007: 226) reading *eṣo ’khalas*.

⁸⁸ This closely resembles one of the traits involved in the negative portrait of *vṛātyas* presented in PB 17.1.9: *āhur adaṇḍyam danḍena ghnantaś caranty* “They go around punishing who is not to be punished” (tr. Hock 2016: 103).

⁸⁹ We assume that *vyavacchitti* is derived from *vyavacchid-* “to cut, to limit”. Murakawa (2007: 226) corrected the phrase *dīkṣitayaśasasya vyavacchittim* with *dīkṣitayaśasasyavyavacchittim*, but we have not adopted the latter reading.

kṛṣṇājinam vāva dīkṣitayaśasam. etad dhi sarveṣāṃ vedānāṃ rūpam. yāni śuklāni tāni sāmnam rūpaṃ yāni kṛṣṇāni tāny ṛcām. yadi vetarathā. yāny eva babhrūṇiva harīṇi tāni yajuṣām.⁹⁰ tasmād yady apy enad adṛṣṭo⁹¹ vaste didṛkṣanta evainam. etad dhy asmin dīkṣitayaśasaṃ bhavati.

The black antelope's skin is the glory of the consecrated man. That is the visible appearance of all the Vedas. Those which are white have the form of hymns, those which are black have the form of stanzas. If it is in another manner, those which are yellow and almost reddish-brown [have the form] of formulas. Therefore, even if he wears it (i.e., the black antelope's skin) without being seen, they actually wish to see him. This is the glory of the *dīkṣita* here.

10 The Final Ablution (JB 2.67)

However, those who bathe in the waters wearing a black antelope skin are separated from the glory of the consecrated man; in fact, even after washing their body with water, they do not wash away their sins.

(JB 2.67) *te ye sakṛṣṇājina apo 'bhyavayanti ya etasmād dīkṣitayaśasād avacchidyante te sarvam ātmānaṃ praplāvya pāpmanā⁹² sahodāyanti. sa yadāvabhṛtheṣṭis samtiṣṭhetāthonmucya kṛṣṇājinam adbhīr abhyukṣed indriyā jyaiṣṭhyac chraiṣṭhyān mā yoṣam iti. atha yaṃ rātiṃ⁹³*

90 Cf. ŚBM 1.1.4.2: *tasya yāni śuklāni ca kṛṣṇāni ca lomāni. tāny ṛcām ca sāmnam ca rūpaṃ yāni śuklāni tāni sāmnam rūpaṃ yāni kṛṣṇāni tāny ṛcām yadi vetarathā yāny eva kṛṣṇāni tāni sāmnam rūpaṃ yāni śuklāni tāny ṛcām yāny eva babhrūṇiva harīṇi tāni yajuṣām rūpam*, “Its white hair and its black hair represent the ṚV stanzas and the SV hymns respectively or, conversely, the black the SV hymns and the white the ṚV stanzas. The brown and the yellow ones, on the other hand represent the YV-formulas.”

91 Here we are following Ehlers' (1988: 14) reading *enad adṛṣṭo* instead of *enad drukto*. His translation of the passage in the relevant note is as follows: “Deshalb begehrt man besonders einen der insgeheim das (schwarze Antilopenfell) trägt, zu sehen”.

92 Cf. Caland's (1919: 141) translation: “mit ihrem bösen Geschick”.

93 For the emendation of *yaṃ arātiṃ* with *yaṃ rātiṃ* see Ehlers 1988: 14. Caland (1919: 141) – who translates *yaṃ rātiṃ manyate* as “den er für seinem Freund hält” – refers to ĀpŚS 13.19.9 and MŚS 2.5.4.33. In fact, ĀpŚS 13.19.6-9 establishes that, after the Avabhṛta, the Sacrificer can throw the skin of the black antelope into the Catvāla pit (6–7) or he may use it again in another sacrifice to consecrate himself, or he may wear it every day, or have a leather-bag made out of it (8). According to some, he should give it to his son or to a Brahmacārin ([...] *putrāya brahmacāriṇe vā dadyād ity eke*). MŚS 2.5.4.33 is an almost identical passage which teaches that after the lustral bath, the Sacrificer hands the black antelope skin to a person who is dear to him (*priyatamāya kṛṣṇājinam prayacchati*), or the grains are ground on it (*tadādhi peṣaṇam kurvanti*). It is noteworthy that just a few lines below the Sacrificer is said to have achieved immortality in exactly the same way as described in these chapters of the JB (MŚS 2.5.4.41): *apāna somam amṛtā abhūmāganma jyotir avidāma devān. kiṃ nūnam asmān kṛṇavaḍ arātiḥ kim u dhūrtir amṛta martyasya. iti jāpanti* “They murmur the verse ‘We have drunk the Soma, we have become immortal, we have reached the light, we have found the gods, what can enmity, what can the treachery of mortal men now do to us, o immortal?’”. In accordance with ŚBM 1.

manyate tasmai prayacchati. athāpa ācāmati bhakṣasyāvabhṛtho 'si bhakṣaṣasyāvabhṛtho 'si bhakṣitasāvabhṛtho 'siti. sa yad evātrarjīṣe kiṃ cit saktam bhavati tasyaiṣa bhakṣaḥ.

They who bathe in the waters wearing a black antelope skin, are separated from the glory of the consecrated man, after washing their whole body with water, they emerge with their sin. When the oblation in the ablution rite has been carried out, after taking off the black antelope skin, he should sprinkle water over it [by saying]: “May I not be separated from the power, pre-eminence, excellence!” He then offers it to whom he considers favourable. He sips water (from the palm of his hand, for purification) [by saying]: “You are the ablution of eating, you are the ablution of the eater, you are the ablution of the eaten”. That is what is sticky in the sediment of Soma, this is his eating.

Subsequently, he enters the waters, which are here mentioned as a hiding place, and this makes him sinless.

(JB 2.67 continues) *athāpaḥ praviśati. nyañcanam vā etat prapadanam yad āpaḥ. nyañcanam evaitat prapadanam prapadyate pāpmano 'nanvavāyāya. yady āpa syanderaṇ pratisrotam gāheta pāpmānam me nirvahān iti. sarvā u ha tvā āpa syandante. yā u ha sthāvarā avācis tā syandante 'vāñcam evāśya tāḥ pāpmānam nirvahanti. anyo 'nyasya jāyāpatiḥ prṣṭham pradhāvataḥ. vajro vā āpaḥ. vajreṇaiva tat sarvam pāpmānam apahanāte. atho dvandvam eva tan mithunam prajananam kurvāte prajātyai. snātvā kṣipra udeyāt kṣipre pāpmano vyāvṛtṭyā iti.*

Then he enters the water. This entrance that is the waters is indeed a hiding place. He thus enters the entrance which is a hiding place with the aim of putting an end to his sin. If the waters were overflowing, he should plunge into them against the current, [thinking]: “They (i.e., waters) will remove my sin”. All waters indeed are overflowing. These (i.e., waters) which are immovable below are overflowing. They remove his sin which is [gathered] below. Husband and wife wash each other's backs. Waters are the thunderbolt. They (two) destroy all sin by means of the thunderbolt. Thus, they (two) make a pair, a begetting coupling for procreation. He should quickly get out [of the water] after bathing [thinking]: “The aim [of this rite] is to quickly remove sin!”.

11 The Sun as the Final Goal (JB 2.68)

Finally, the Sacrificer asks the Unnetṛ,⁹⁴ who is identified with Viṣṇu who represents the sacrifice, to lead him out of the water, and the sacrifice now frees him from all sins and he beholds the sun, the highest light.

4.4.3 the rice can also be husked on this skin (*tasmād adhyavahananam adhipeṣanam bhavati*). Ranade (2019: 628) does not include the mentioned emendation and translates *arāti-* as “enemy”.

94 The Unnetṛ is the assistant of the Adhvaryu who extracts the Soma juice.

(JB 2.68) *unnetar un mā nayety āha. viṣṇur vā unnetā yajño vai viṣṇuḥ. yajña evainam tat sarvasmāt pāpmano vimucyonnayati. ud vyaṃ tamasas pari suvaḥ paśyanto jyotir uttaram. devaṃ devatrā sūryam aḡanma jyotir uttamam. ity etāṃ japann udaiti.*

He says: “Unnetṛ, lead me out!” The Unnetṛ is Viṣṇu; Viṣṇu is the sacrifice indeed. Thus, the sacrifice leads him out after releasing him from all sin. He goes out of the water murmuring this [formula]: “We are out of darkness, we behold the sun, the higher light, we have reached the god of gods, the sun (i.e., god Sūrya), the highest light”.

The murmured stanza beginning with *ud vyaṃ tamasas* and ending with *jyotir uttamam* is indeed *Ṛgveda* 1.50.10. This hymn is dedicated to the description of the sunrise, especially to the sun’s journey through heaven.⁹⁵ It is tempting to consider the hypothesis that this *Ṛgvedic* hymn originally hinted at human beings being given the chance to go to heaven, but this is quite difficult to demonstrate. However, the formula *ud vyaṃ tamasas pari suvaḥ paśyanto jyotir uttamam* with its soteriological solar imagery is very close to the renowned phrase *tamasah parastāt jyotiṣām jyotis* “the light of lights, beyond darkness” (see BhG 13.17,⁹⁶ ŚvUp 3.8; MuṇḍUp 2.2.6; 9),⁹⁷ which depicts the *brahman* as the supreme light. Malinar has pointed out that this represents a basic significant description of the highest human achievement, i.e., the wiseman’s status is changed from mortal to deity,⁹⁸ within the cultural framework of the so-called “Law of heroism”.⁹⁹ It is noteworthy that one of these occurrences finds a parallel in the *Ṛgveda-Khilāni*, a text officially marginalised by the mainstream Brahmanical culture.¹⁰⁰

This last part of chapter 68 concludes the consecration ritual. The final formula is recited by the Sacrificer so that he will be endowed with power, pre-eminence, and excellence.

(JB 2.68 continues) *etad vai jyotir uttamaṃ ya eṣa tapati. saiṣānārtā devatā. tad etām anārtāṃ devatām ārabhyodaiti. audumbarīr ārdrās sapalāsās samidhaḥ kurvata edho ’sy edhiṣimahiti gatvāhavanīye samidham abhyādadhāti samid asi tejo ’si tejo mayi dhehi svāheti.*

95 The final three verses (11–13) of the hymn constitute a spell against jaundice because the yellow sun, by a sort of homeopathic magic, dispels this medical condition that makes the skin turn yellow. These verses have “a clear Atharvan cast” according to Jamison/Brereton (2014: 162).

96 BhG 8.9–10: *kaviṃ purāṇam anuśāsītāram [...] anusmared yaḥ | sarvasya dhātaram acintya-rūpam ādityavarṇam tamasaḥ parastāt [...] sa taṃ paraṃ puruṣam upaiti divyam*, “The sage and preceptor primordial, [...] creator of all, of form unimaginable, hued like the sun. Beyond the darkness [...] he attains to the Supreme and Divine Person.”

97 Cf. less directly VSM 23.47–48.

98 Malinar 2007: 196.

99 Malinar 2007: 38–42.

100 ṚVKh 4.11.9 = ŚvUp 3.8: *vedāham etaṃ puruṣam mahantam ādityavarṇam tamasaḥ parastāt* “I know the immense divine Puruṣa coloured like the Sun, beyond darkness.” See Pontillo 2016: 236–238.

This is the highest light which gives heat. This is the undisturbed deity. He moves upward after taking hold of this, i.e., that undisturbed deity. They (i.e., the officiant priests) make the logs of Udumbara wood, green, with leaves, as fuel [with the formula]: “You are the fuel, may we become prosperous.” After reaching it, he puts the log of wood on the Ahavaniya [with the formula]: “You are the log of wood, you are the shining energy, endow me with shining energy, *svāha!*”.

abhyādhāyopatiṣṭhate. apo 'nv acārṣaṃ¹⁰¹ rasena samasrīkṣmahi. payasvaṃ agna āgamaṃ.¹⁰² taṃ mā saṃsṛja varcasā. iti. evam eva patnī gārhapatyē 'bhyādhāyopatiṣṭhate. ājyasthālīm sasruvām ādāyottareṇāgnīdhraṃ ca sadaś ca parītyāpareṇa gārhapatyam upaviśyopasthe kṛṣṇājīnam ādhāya caturgrhitam ājyaṃ grhitvā juhoti mayindriyaṃ jyaiṣṭhyaṃ śraīṣṭhyam agnir dadhātu svāheti.

After putting [the log] on [the fire], he stands nearby [with the formula]: “I followed the waters. We have been mixed with your sap. I came full of milk, o Fire! Mix me as such with the lustre of the sun!”.¹⁰³ In the same manner, after putting it (i.e., the log of wood) on the Gārhapatya fire, his wife stands nearby. After taking the pot of clarified butter with its small wooden ladle, circumambulating the north side of the Āgnīdhra fire and the Sadas, entering the west side of the Gārhapatya fire, putting the black antelope skin on his lap and taking the clarified butter which has been taken four times, he offers it [with the formula]: “May Agni endow me with power, pre-eminence, excellence, *svāha!*”

In this way, at the end of the Sattrā, Agni becomes the glory of the consecrated man. Thus, the Kaiśinī consecration is indeed a means to obtain divine status, the ultimate purpose in the most renowned Vedic passages devoted to Vrātyas, such as PB 17.1–2; 24.18 and JB 2.221.¹⁰⁴

sa yad evāsmiṃ dīkṣite yaśo bhavati tad asmiṃ utthite yaśo bhavati. tat kṛṣṇājīnam nātipādayeṭ sruḡavadhānaṃ vainat kurvita haviṣo vādhipēṣaṇaṃ punardīkṣāyāi vainan nidadhīta. eṣā vai kaiśinī dīkṣā. etāṃ ha keśī dārbhya dīkṣām upaniṣasāda.

He (Agni) becomes the glory, which is in this consecrated man, this glory is in this one who has risen to his feet (after completing the Sattrā). He should not allow [anybody] to cross over the black antelope skin: he should fasten the large wooden spoon on it or grind upon it or he should keep it for a next consecration. This is indeed the Kaiśinī consecration. Keśin Dārbhya indeed explained the homologies of this consecration.

101 As noticed by Ehlers (1988: 14), a preferable reading could be *apo 'nv acāriṣaṃ*.

102 The full stop was added by Murakawa (2007: 231).

103 This is a modified version of RV 1.23.23: *āpo adyānv acāriṣaṃ rāsena sām agasmahi | pāyasvān agna ā gahi tāṃ mā sām sṛja varcasā* || “O Waters, today I have followed (you). We have united with your sap. Full of milk, come here, o Agni. Merge me with luster.” (tr. Jamison/Brereton 2014: 118). Cf. also PS 1.33.1: *āpo adyānv acāriṣaṃ rasena sam asrīkṣmahi | pāyasvān agna āgamaṃ taṃ mā saṃ sṛja varcasā* || “Today I have followed the waters. We have united with their essence. Full of milk, O Agni, I have arrived. So, unite me with splendour!” (tr. Zehnder et al. 2024).

104 See Candott/Pontillo 2015 and the bibliography quoted there.

12 Conclusions

All the figures that over time have been compared with Keśin Dārbhya, i.e., the homonymous Keśin in ṚV 10.136, the Brahmacārin in ŚS 11.5 and the Ekavrātya in ŚS 15, were ultimately put on the same level as the Sun god, as mentioned above in § 1. Thus, the emphasis placed in this JB section on the metaphorical identifications of the *dīkṣita* with the sun might suggest that this interpretation was correct. Nonetheless, the general framework of this passage is different from a pure extolment of the Sun god: it displays the perspective of a one-way journey for human beings towards the sun with the aim of being identified with the Sun god himself. This is a particular fragment of royal wisdom (*rājavidyā*) that another deceased leader, namely Yajña-sena, recognises as extraneous to his culture.

The complex homologies used by Keśin Dārbhya (*upanīśasāda*) to teach how merits – including those gained by means of sacrifices – can become permanent seem to mirror the Upanīśadic culture, especially when solar imagery is mentioned. All in all, the truth revealed by Keśin seems to be a thought-provoking *ante-litteram* excerpt of the complex reflections on after-death that flourished when the concept of re-death (*punarmṛtyu-*) came to be especially feared, i.e., the idea that any human beings who had exhausted their merits in heaven were destined to fall back to earth again. This became a starting point for the transmigration (*samsāra*) doctrines which are quite well known in later Brāhmanical sources and in the heterodox traditions.¹⁰⁵ In fact, the JB was indeed one of the most recently established Brāhmaṇa texts.¹⁰⁶

However, it is also true that several scholars have maintained that this Brāhmaṇa contains many parts that can be classified as quite conservative in terms of their contents. This is mainly due to its (ritual and narrative) eclectic prolixity which has evidently led this text to prodigiously incorporate notions borrowed from different traditions and at least partially retain them.¹⁰⁷ Moreover, Caland¹⁰⁸ considered the Jaiminīya school older than the Kauthuma-Rāṇāyaṇīya Śākhā, due to its similarities with the surviving Nambudiri *Rgveda* and Yajurveda traditions.¹⁰⁹

It is plausible that it was precisely this conservative and eclectic approach that caused the specific JB text here analysed to encompass a doctrine other than the mainstream Brāhmanical culture, which was intriguingly compared with the latter

¹⁰⁵ See e.g. Bodewitz 2019: 9–11.

¹⁰⁶ See e.g. Bodewitz 1973: 13.

¹⁰⁷ See e.g. Renou 1947: 101–102; Gonda 1975: 348; Fujii 2012: 112 and bibliography quoted by them.

¹⁰⁸ Caland 1931: XIX.

¹⁰⁹ Witzel 2016: 69. The chronological problem might indeed be amplified by the assumed existence of a third Sāmaveda Brāhmaṇa, mentioned as Śatyāyanakam Brāhmaṇam or Śatyāyani-Brāhmaṇa or Śatyāyanakam in several Kalpasūtras or by some commentators.

in an open-minded manner. This was perhaps one of the earliest experiments that deliberately merged different Indo-Aryan traditions, before some of these were marginalised as *vr̥atyā-* or *vice versa* uncritically encapsulated as Śrauta.

Bibliographic references

Primary sources

A	<i>Aṣṭādhyāyī</i> , ed. R.N. Sharma 1987-2003.
AB	<i>Aitareya Brāhmaṇa</i> , ed. M. Haug 2003 [1863].
ĀpŚS	<i>Āpastamba-Śrauta-Sūtra</i> , ed. G.U. Thite 2004.
BhG	<i>Bhagavadgītā</i> ed. S. K. Belvalkar 1945.
BhŚS	<i>Bharadvāja-Śrautasūtra</i> ed. C.G. Kashikar 2002.
BŚS	<i>Baudhāyana-Śrautasūtra</i> , ed. C.G. Kashikar 2003.
GB	<i>Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa</i> , ed. D. Gaastra 1919.
JB	<i>Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa</i> , ed. R. Vira / L. Chandra 1986 [1955].
JUB	<i>Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa</i> , ed. H. Oertel 1895.
KB	<i>Kauṣītaki-Brāhmaṇa</i> , ed. E.R.S. Sarma 1968.
KS	<i>Katha-Saṃhitā</i> , ed. L. von Schroeder 1900.
KauṣUp	<i>Kauṣītaki-Upaniṣad</i> , ed. V.P. Limaye and R. K. Vadekar 1958.
MŚS	<i>Mānava-Śrautasūtra</i> , ed. 1985, ed. J.M. Gelder 1985 [1961]
MS	<i>Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā</i> , ed. L. von Schroeder 1970 [1881-1886].
MuṇḍUp	<i>Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad</i> , ed. R.K. Vadekar 1958.
PB	<i>Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa</i> , ed. A. Ch. Śastri, P. Śastri 1935-1936.
RV	<i>R̥gveda-Saṃhitā</i> , ed. N.S. Sontakke, C.G. Kashikar 1983 [1946].
RVKh	<i>R̥gveda-Khilāni</i> , ed. I. Scheftelowitz 1906.
ŚBM	<i>Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa</i> , ed. by A. Weber 1964 [1885].
ŚS	<i>Atharvaveda Śaunakīya</i> , ed. J-S. Kim 2022.
ŚāṅkhŚS	<i>Śāṅkhāyana Śrautasūtra</i> , ed. A. Hillebrandt 2002 [1885-99].
ŚvUp	<i>Śvetaśvataropaniṣad</i> , ed. V.P. Limaye and R.K. Vadekar, 1958.
SV	<i>Sāmaveda-Saṃhitā</i> , ed. A. Pandey 1999.
TS	<i>Taittirīya-Saṃhitā</i> ed. R.L. Kashyap 2004.
VādhAn	<i>Vādhūla Anvākyāna</i> , ed. B. B. Chaubey 2001.
VādhS	<i>Vādhūlasūtra</i> , ed. W. Caland 1928.
VSM	<i>Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā</i> , ed. A. Weber 1849.

Secondary sources

Amano, Kyoko (2013): “Keśin Dār̥bhya in the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā. Description of the Brahmaudanika Fire in MS I 6,5 (1d): 94, 4–8”. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 61.3: 1073–7.

- Amano, Kyoko (2016): "Ritual context of sattra myths in the Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā". In: *Vrātya Culture in Vedic sources: Select Papers from the Panel on "Vrātya culture in Vedic Sources" at the 16th WSC, Bangkok, 28 June – 2 July 2015*. Edited by Tiziana Pontillo, Moreno Dore and Hans H. Hock. Bangkok: DK Publishers, 35–72.
- Amano, Kyoko (2019): "The development of the uses of *ha / ha vāi / ha sma vāi* with or without the narrative perfect and language layers in the old Yajurveda-Saṁhitā texts". *Lingua Posnaniensis* 61.2: 11–24.
- Amano, Kyoko (2022): "Interconnecting Glimpses of Vrātya Culture in Ancient India". *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 117.2: 91–97.
- Bloomfield, Maurice (1893): "Contributions to the Interpretation of the Veda". *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 15: 143–188.
- Bloomfield, Maurice (1897): *Hymns of the Atharvaveda together with extracts from the ritual books and the commentaries*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bloomfield, Maurice (1899): *The Atharvaveda and the Gopatha Brahmana*. Strassburg: Trübner.
- Boccali, Giuliano / Pontillo, Tiziana (2010): "The Background of the *samastavastuviṣayarūpaka* and its importance in early kāvya". *Pandanus* 10: 109–138.
- Bodewitz, Henk W. (1973): *Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa* I, 1–65. Translation and Commentary with a Study. Agnihotra and Prāṇāgnihotra. Leiden: Brill.
- Bodewitz, Henk (2019): *Vedic Cosmology and Ethics. Selected Studies*. (Gonda Indological Studies; 19). Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (2016): *How the Brahmins won. From Alexander to the Guptas*. Leiden: Brill.
- Caland, Willem (1919): *Das Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa in Auswahl: Text, Übersetzung, Indices*. (Verhandelingen der Koninklijke akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, 1). Amsterdam: Sändig.
- Caland, Willem (1928): "Eine vierte Mitteilung über das Vādhūlasūtra". *Acta Orientalia* 6: 97–241.
- Caland, Willem (1982) [1931]: *Pañcaviṁśa-Brāhmaṇa. The Brāhmaṇa of twentyfive chapters*, Calcutta: The Asiatic Society of Bengal.
- Candotti, Maria Piera / Neri, Chiara / Pontillo, Tiziana (2020): "Reconsideration of a plausible relationship between gift and merit in the earliest Vedic and Pāli sources (1): A comparison between the usages of Pā. *dakkhiṇeyya* and Ved. *dakṣiṇīya*". *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* XCIII: 137–163.
- Candotti, Maria Piera / Neri, Chiara / Pontillo, Tiziana (2021): "Vedic *dākṣiṇā*/Pāli *dakkhiṇā*. Recovering an original notion behind the later institutional gift". In: *Resisting and justifying changes How to make the new acceptable in the Ancient, Medieval and Early Modern world*. Edited by Elisabetta Poddighe and Tiziana Pontillo (Nuova Biblioteca di Studi Classici e Orientali. Supplementi alla rivista *Studi Classici e Orientali*; 5). Pisa: University Press, 21–108.
- Candotti, Maria Piera / Pontillo, Tiziana (2015): "Aims and functions of *Vrātyastoma*-celebrations: a historical appraisal". In: *The Volatile World of Sovereignty. The Vrātya Problem and Kingship in South Asia and Beyond*. Edited by Tiziana Pontillo, Cristina Bignami, Moreno Dore and Elena Mucciarelli. New Delhi: DK Printworld, 153–213.
- Candotti, Maria Piera / Pontillo, Tiziana (2017): "Late Sanskrit Literary Theorists and the Role of Grammar in Focusing the Separateness of Metaphor and Simile". *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 45.2: 349–380.
- Candotti, Maria Piera / Pontillo, Tiziana (2022): "The *dikṣita*'s Language Vedic homologies and *rūpakas* in *Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa* 2.60-64". In: 'Verità e bellezza'. *Essays in honour of Raffaele Torella*. (Series Minor; XCVII, 1). Edited by Francesco Sferra and Vincenzo Vergiani. Napoli: UniorPress, 153–192.
- Candotti, Maria Piera / Pontillo, Tiziana (forthcoming): "Vrātyas in the *Jaiminiya-Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa* as a Fossil of the pre-Yajurvedic Culture". In: *The Vedas in Perspective: Myths, Language and Ritual*. Edited by Jan E.M. Houben, Silvia D'Intino, Julieta Rotaru. Leiden: E.J. Brill (-De Gruyter).
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh (2000): *Provincializing Europe*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Delbrück, Berthold (1968) [1888]: *Altindische Syntax*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

- Dore, Moreno (2015): "The pre-eminence of men in the *vr̥atyā*-ideology". In: *Puṣpikā: Tracing ancient India through texts and traditions: Contributions to current research in Indology*. Edited by Robert Leach and Jessie Pons, 3: 48–73. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Dore, Moreno (2016): "Men's Relationship with Gods in the *Vr̥atyā* Culture: An Interpretation of AVŚ 2.1". In: *Cross-cutting South Asian Studies*. Edited by Serena Bindi, Elena Mucciarelli and Tiziana Pontillo. New Delhi: D.K. Printworld, 131–151.
- Dore, Moreno / Pontillo, Tiziana (2013): "What do *Vr̥atyās* have to do with long-stalked plants? *Darbha*, *kuśa*, *śara* and *iṣīkā* in Vedic and Classical sources". In: *150th Anniversary of the Birth of Moriz Winternitz Seminar (Pandanus 4)*. Edited by Jaroslav Vacek. Prague: Triton, 35–61.
- Ehlers, Gerhard (1988): *Emendationen zum Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa (zweites Buch)*. Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- Falk, Harry (1986): *Bruderschaft und Würfelspiel. Untersuchungen zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des vedischen Opfers*. Freiburg: Hedwig Falk.
- Fujii, Masato (2012): "The Jaiminiya Sāmaveda Traditions and Manuscripts in South India." In: *Aspects of Manuscript Culture in South India*. Edited by Saraju Rath. Leiden: Brill, 99–118.
- Gonda, Jan (1975): *Vedic Literature. Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Gonda, Jan (1986): *Prajāpati's Rise to higher Rank* (Orientalia Rheno-Traiectina, 29). Leiden: Brill.
- Heesterman, Jan Cornelius (1993): *The broken World of Sacrifice*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Heesterman, Jan Cornelius (1995): "Warrior, peasant and brahmin". *Modern Asian Studies* 29.3: 637–654.
- Hirose, Tsutomu (2024): "On the Structure of the Sattrā Descriptions in the *Taittirīya-Saṃhitā*, Book 7: Exploring the prototype of the *dvadasaha* (Twelve-Day Sacrifice)". *Journal of Indological Studies* 36–37: 1–32.
- Hobsbawm, Eric (1983): *Introduction. Inventing traditions*. In: *The invention of tradition*. Edited by Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger. Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 1–14.
- Hock, Hans H. (2016): "'*Vr̥atyā* Prakrit', Ritual Concerns, or Anti-*Vr̥atyā* Propaganda? *aduruktavākya*m in its broader context". In: *Vr̥atyā culture in Vedic sources. Select Papers from the Panel on "Vr̥atyā culture in Vedic Sources" at the 16th WSC - Bangkok, 28 June - 2 July 2015*. Edited by Tiziana Pontillo, Moreno Dore and Hans H. Hock. Bangkok: DK Publishers, 103–116.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. / Brereton, Joel P. (tr.) (2014): *The R̥igveda: The earliest religious poetry of India*. 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kashikar, Chintamani G. (2003): *The Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*. 4 vols. (Kalāmūlāsāstra series 37). New Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts.
- Koskikallio, Petteri (1999): "Baka Dālbhya: a complex character in Vedic ritual texts, Epics and Purāṇas". *Studia Orientalia* 85: 301–387.
- Kulkarni, Nirmala R. (2016): "The Kaiśinī Dīkṣā: A reappraisal". In: *Vr̥atyā culture in Vedic sources. Select Papers from the Panel on "Vr̥atyā culture in Vedic Sources" at the 16th WSC - Bangkok, 28 June - 2 July 2015*. Edited by Tiziana Pontillo, Moreno Dore and Hans H. Hock. Bangkok: DK Publishers, 73–87.
- Lévi, Sylvain (1898): *La doctrine du sacrifice dans les Brāhmaṇas*. Paris: Leroux.
- Magnone, Paolo (2000): "Il maestro, il pupillo e la pupilla (tra India e Grecia) (tra India e Grecia)". *Avallon*: 45–58.
- Malinar, Angelika (2007): *The Bhagavadgītā. Doctrines and contexts*. Cambridge: University Press.
- McGovern, Nathan (2012): "Brahmā: An early and ultimately doomed attempt at a Brahmanical synthesis". *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 40.1: 1–23.
- Murakawa, Akiko (2000): "The *Gavāmayana* Portion(s) of the *Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa*: A Preliminary Study". *Journal of the Japanese Association for South Asian Studies* 12: 110–134.
- Murakawa, Akiko (2007): *Das Gavāmayana-Kapitel im Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa*. Inauguraldissertation zur Erlangung des Grades eines Doktors der indischen Philologie, Universität Berlin.

- Mylius, Klaus (1968): "Die Identifikationen der Metren in der Literatur des Veda". *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl Marx Universität* 17: 267–73.
- Mylius, Klaus (1976): "Die vedischen Identifikationen am Beispiel des *Kauṣītaki-Brāhmaṇa*". *Klio. Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte* 58.1: 145–166.
- Mylius, Klaus (1977): "Die Identifikationen im *Kauṣītaki-Brāhmaṇa*". *Alt-Orientalische Forschungen* 5: 237–244.
- Neri, Chiara / Pontillo, Tiziana (2015): "Words Involving the Stem *Brahman-* denoting the Achievement of Super-Human Status in Vedic and Sutta Piṭaka Sources". *Indologica Taurinensia* 40(2014): 151–194.
- Neri, Chiara / Pontillo, Tiziana (2016): "The meaning of the phrase 'to become Brahman/Brahmā' in Vedic and Sutta Piṭaka Sources". In: *Vrātya culture in Vedic sources. Select Papers from the Panel on "Vrātya culture in Vedic Sources" at the 16th WSC - Bangkok, 28 June - 2 July 2015*. Edited by Tiziana Pontillo, Moreno Dore and Hans H. Hock. Bangkok: DK Publishers, 117–158.
- Neri, Chiara / Pontillo, Tiziana (2018): "*Setu*, 'bridge', a Connection between Places and States in Brahmanical and Early Buddhist Sources: An Attempt at a Semantic Reconstruction". In: *Journey and Travellers in Indian Literature and art*. Edited by Danuta Stasik and Anna Trynkowska. Warsaw: Elipsa, vol. 1, 34–61.
- Neri, Chiara / Pontillo, Tiziana (2019a): "The case of *yogaṣema/yogakkhema* in Vedic and Suttapiṭaka sources. In response to Norman". *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 47.3: 527–563.
- Neri, Chiara / Pontillo, Tiziana (2019b): "On the Boundary between *Yogakkhema* in the *Suttapiṭaka* and *Yogaṣema* in the *Upaniṣads* and *Bhagavadgītā*". *Cracow Indological Studies* 21.2: 139–157.
- Neri, Chiara / Pontillo, Tiziana (2023): "The ascetic whom the gods worship: conservative unorthodox meditative traditions in the *Vrātyakāṇḍa* and in the *Suttapiṭaka*". In: *Resisting and justifying changes II. Testifying and legitimizing innovation in Indian and Ancient Greek Culture*. Edited by E. Poddighe and T. Pontillo (Nuova Biblioteca di Studi Classici e Orientali: Supplementi alla rivista Studi Classici e Orientali, n° 7). Pisa: Pisa University Press, 89–133.
- Neri, Chiara / Pontillo, Tiziana (2024): "Vrātya or Ancient Indo-Aryan Violence? Challenge and Defeat within the Patterns of Vedic and Buddhist Dialogues". In: *Shades of Violence: Aggression and Domination in Indian Culture*. Special Issue of *Cracow Indological Studies* (26.1). Edited by Hermina Cielas Leão, Tiziana Pontillo, and Lidia Sudyka, 81–116.
- Olivelle, Patrick, ed., tr. (1998): *The early Upaniṣads. Annotated text and translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Parpola, Asko (1979): "On the Symbol Concept of the Vedic Ritualists". *Scripta Instituti Donneriani Aboensis* 10: 139–153.
- Pontillo, Tiziana (2009): "Late vedic Rūpakas based on nature imagery: ritual identifications as a sort of *alaṃkāra*-pattern". In: *Nature in Indian Literature, Art, Myth and Ritual at Charles University, 4-7 June 2009, Prague*. Edited by Jaroslav Vacek (Pandanus '09. To the Memory of Kamil V. Zvelebil). Prague: Triton, 9–24.
- Pontillo, Tiziana (2016): "Droṇa and Bhīṣma as borderline Cases of Pupils and Masters in the Brāhmanical systematization: Some other Traces of the Vrātya Tradition in the *Mahābhārata*". In: *On the Growth and Composition of the Sanskrit Epics and Purāṇas. Relationship to Kāvya. Social and Economic Context. Proceedings of the Fifth Dubrovnik International Conference, August 2008*. Edited by Ivan Andrijačić and Sven Sellmer (general editor Mislav Ježić). Zagreb: Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts & Ibis Grafika, 205–246.
- Pontillo, Tiziana (2019a): "When a tatpuruṣa turns into a *dvandva* in order to meet the 'Brāhmanical Reform'. The case-study of *iṣṭāpūrtām*". *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 92.3–4: 37–63.
- Pontillo, Tiziana (2019b): "Devayāna and Dyutāna in some supposed proto-indo-āryan I fragments". In: *Living Tradition of Vedas. Proceedings of the 6th International Vedic Workshop*. Edited by

- P. Vinod Bhattathiripad and Shrikant Bahulkar. New Delhi, India: New Bharatiya Book Corporation, 256–277.
- Pontillo, Tiziana (2022): “A remarkable example of Vedic prose (*Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa* 2.53-56)”. In: *Ubi homo, ibi lingua. Studi in onore di Maria Patrizia Bologna*. Edited by Laura Biondi, Francesco Dedè, Andrea Scala (con la collaborazione di Chiara Meluzzi e Massimo Vai). Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso, 1081–1095.
- Pontillo, Tiziana (2023): “When the satrins ‘offer themselves’: The plural agency in Vedic sacrifice”. In: *Medhótá śrávaḥ. Felicitation Volume in honour of Mislav Ježić on the occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by Ivan Andrijić, Petteri Koskikallio, Krešimir Krnic, Sven Sellmer, Przemysław Szczurek. Zagreb/New Delhi: Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts/ Dev Publishers & Distributors, 197–220.
- Ranade, H.G. (2006): *Illustrated Dictionary of Vedic Rituals*, New Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts.
- Ranade, H.G. (2019): *Jaiminīyabrāhmaṇam. Sanskrit text with Engl. Transl.* 3 vols. New Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts.
- Renou, Louis (1947): *Les Écoles Védiques et la Formation du Veda*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Schlerath, Bernfried (1979): “Bemerkungen zu den vedischen Metaphern und Identifikationen”. In: *Sanskrit and World Culture. Proceedings of the Fourth World Sanskrit Conference of the International Association of Sanskrit Studies*. Weimar, May, 23–30, 1979 (Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des alten Orients, 18). Berlin: De Gruyter, 478–482.
- Spivak Chakravorty, Gayatri (2008): *Other Asias*. Malden and Oxford: Blackwell.
- Vira, Raghu, Chandra, Lokesh (1986) [1955]: *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa of the Sāmaveda*, Critically edited. (Sarasvati Vihāra Series, 31). Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Werner, Karel (1977): “Yoga and the Ṛg Veda: An Interpretation of the Keśin Hymn (RV 10,136)”. *Religious Studies* 13.3: 289–302.
- Witzel, Michael (1979): *On Magical Thought in the Veda. Rede uitgesproken bij de aanvaarding van het ambt van gewoon lector in het Sanskrit aan de Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden op vrijdag 19 Oktober 1979*.
- Witzel, Michael (2016): “On the current situation of the Śākhās”. In: *Vedic Śākhās Past, Present, Future. Proceedings of the Fifth International Vedic Workshop Bucharest 2011*. Edited by Jan E.M. Houben, Julieta Rotaru and Michael Witzel. Cambridge (MA): Department of South Asian Studies, Harvard University/South Asia Books, Columbia, 1–94.
- Zehnder, Thomas, Hellwig, Oliver, Leach, Robert, Plamada, Magdalena, Malinar, Angelika, & Widmer, Paul. (2024): *Atharvaveda Paippalāda Zurich Edition Book 1* (Version 1.0.0) [Data set]. LaRS - Language Repository of Switzerland. [Accessed on 02/08/25]