Keśin Dārbhya in the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā: Description of the Brahmaudanika Fire in MS I 6,5 (1d): 94,4–8

AMANO Kyōko

0. Keśin Dārbhya, the king of Pañcāla in the old Vedic time, is famous for the ritual methods named after him and the episodes that he achieved hegemony by the special ritual practices.¹⁾ There is seen his character as the king who was well acquainted with ritual and also had political power. What is often narrated is the motive that he as a sacrificer or a specialist for ritual competed with his rivals, and in several cases it is told that he was at first inferior.²⁾

1. In MS I 6,5 (1) the name Keśin Dārbhya appears. The context relates that the brahmaudanika fire should be set up through shifting from the house fire (aupāsana fire) and a share should be given to the brahmaudanika fire at the brahmaudana ritual which is performed one year before the main ritual of establishing fires (see Hertha KRICK, *Das Ritual der Feuergründung* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien, 1982), 232–284). This brahmaudanika fire is the origin of the ritual fires established lately.

I 6,5 (1): 93,13–94, 8³⁾

a)^[93,13] *yó vā asyāyām + manuṣyò 'gnír, etám upāsīnó 'nnam + atty, etám upāsīnaḥ*^[93,14] *prajāñ vinda-ta, etám upāsīnam paśāvā úpatiṣṭhante. yád etám abhāgadheyám utsādāyeta*^[93,15] *tásmā āvṛśceta= . anudhyāyī kṣódhukaḥ syāt. tád ... ādhéyas. tád enam dvayām bhāgadheyam abhyutsādayām*^[93,18] *akar .... téna tásmāi nāvṛscaté. 'nanudhyāyī ākṣodhuko*^[93,19] *bhavati* “This fire of him (the sacrificer) for mankind, sitting by this he eats food, sitting by this he gets offspring, cattle comes near him, sitting by this. If he may move this [fire] without giving a share, he may become divorced from it.⁴⁾ He may feel dissatisfaction and become hungry. Therefore, (having thrown a cake made from barley and a cake made from rice into the fire), he should set up [the fire]. Then he has moved it on the two kinds of shares [...], by that he doesn't become divorced from it, doesn't feel dissatisfaction, doesn't become hungry.”

b) (The cake made from rice should be offered at first, the cake made from barley latterly.)

c) *prajāpater vā etáu stānau.*^[94,3] *yajñām asya devā upajīvanti, varṣām manuṣyā. annādyam asmā ávarunddhé.*^[94,4] *'kṣudhyatām svānām puraḥsthātā bhavati, yá evām véda=* “Both these cakes are Prajāpatis teats. The gods live on his (the sacrificer's) sacrifice, the mankind on rain. He ensures

(16)

Keśin Dārbhya in the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā (K. AMANO)

[necessary] food for it (the brahmaudanika fire). Who knows thus becomes the head of his [people] who aren't hungry."

d) *etād dha sma vā*^[94,5] *āha keśī sātyakāmiḥ keśinaṃ dārbhyaṃ annādāṃ janātāyā: "evām iva*^[94,6] *vayām etāsmā agnyādhyé 'nnam + āvārudhmahy, āthaiṣo 'nnam + atti*."*^[94,7] *tād āhuḥ: "sārvaṃ vāvāitāsyedāṃ ānnaṃ. yājamānaṃ tv evāsyaitād āsānn āpidadhāti. tād evaṃ*^[94,8] *véditor, ná tv evaṃ kártavā" iti* *SCHROEDER SĀTAVALEKAR *atti*. It got the accent after this sentence was interpreted as a *yāthā*-sentence; [AMANO 226 n. 495]. "As following Keśin Sātyakāmi was accustomed to say about Keśin Dārbhya, the food-eater among the foreign people: 'Thus we have ensured food for this [fire] at the fire establishing, then that one (K.D.) eats food (i.e. is rich in foods).' Regarding this they say: 'This food here (on the sacrificial place) really belongs to this [fire] entirely, but he (the priest) throws the sacrificer in his (the fire's) mouth in this way. One should know thus, but one should not do it.'"

Note to the translation:

- 1) *annādāṃ janātāyās* is appositional to *keśinaṃ dārbhyaṃ*. The sentence doesn't end before *annādāṃ janātāyās*, but after that; see AMANO 225 n. 493.
- 2) *āvārudhma* attested in the editions is root-aor. 1. pl. act. But *āva-rodh* is 'Medium tantum' in the YVP (AMANO 32). *āvārudhma yāthaiṣo* should be corrected to **āvārudhmahy āthaiṣo* (root-aor. 1. pl. mid.; cf. TS VII 5,2,1, KS 33,1: 27,2 *āva . . . arutsmahi* s-aor. 1. pl. mid. (see Johanna NARTEN, *Die sigmatischen Aoriste im Veda* (Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1964), 228).
- 3) *yāthā* is not necessarily worthy here. The construction of *evām . . . yāthā* is not attested in MS, but always *yāthā . . . evām* (AMANO 129–130).⁵⁾
- 4) *āthaiṣo 'nnam + atti* 'then that one eats food.' Cf. the construction of (*hi vai . . .*) *ātha* + present that indicates the present condition resulted by a ritual action: MS I 4,13 (2): 62,17–18 *ātha yō 'dakṣiṇéna yajñéna + yājeta, *tām yājamānaṃ vidyād: "adakṣiṇéna hi vā ayāṃ yajñéna yājaté, 'tha ná vāsīyān bhavati=" iti* * [AMANO 171 n. 188]. "And he should know about the sacrificer who holds a sacrifice without reward: 'For this [sacrificer] holds a sacrifice without reward, then he doesn't become better.'"

The expression of *ānnam atti* 'he eats food' implies the following two meanings: 1) with 'fire' as subject it means 'the fire gets his share', e.g. *annādā-* I 6,11 (1): 103,8 (about dakṣiṇāgni), II 1,10 (9): 12,14; cf. I 6,3 (4): 90,18–19 *annādyam asmā āvarunddhe*; 2) with 'ruler' as subject it means 'the ruler has a stabilized economy',⁶⁾ cf. II 1,11 (2): 13,8 *annādāḥ syāt* 'he (his king) may be eater of food' means 'his king may have a stabilized economy'.

ānnam atti in our passage is connected with *annādāṃ janātāyās* 'food-eater among the people', so that the subject *eṣā* is likely to refer to Keśin Dārbhya.

- 5) *āha* + acc. *keśinaṃ dārbhyaṃ* doesn't mean 'he says to K.D.,' but 'he says about K.D. . .'. *etād dha sma vā āha* 'as following he was accustomed to say' introduces a speech or teaching that former experts of ritual talked usually (AMANO 13, 143 n. 19). In the newer layer of MS (books III and IV) . . . *iti ha smāha* (once *tād dha smāhur*) is used. There are totally 20 examples, but there is

no example with acc. of person who is spoken to. For *āhur* + acc. ‘they say about acc.’ e.g. I 6,3 (8): 91,13–14 “*purīṣī=*” *īti vai gr̥hamedhīnam āhur*; II 4,5 (3): 43,8 “*candrām giyatā*” *īti vai śā-māhur*; see AMANO 216 n. 435, Bertold DELBRÜCK, *Altindische Syntax* (Halle, 1888), 165, 173–174, Toshifumi GOTŌ, “Funktionen des Akkusativs und Rektionsarten des Verbums: anhand des Altindischen” in *Indogermanische Syntax*, ed. H. HETTRICH (Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, Wiesbaden, 2002), 30. MS I 4,13 (2): 62,16–18 above has the same construction: ... *tām yajamānam vidyād*: “... *ātha ná vāsīyān bhavati=*” *īti*. “he should know about the sacrificer: ‘..., then he doesn’t become better.’”

6) Are all sentences after *annādām janātāyās* Keśin Sātyakāmi’s speech? Is *tād āhur* . . . *īti* included in that? *tād āhur* ‘regarding this they say’ indicates a ritual opinion, especially an opposed opinion to the foregoing statement.⁷⁾ Also here the speech with *tād āhur* probably indicates MS’s opinion opposed to Keśin Sātyakāmi’s speech. From this remark it follows that *īti* is lacking before *tād āhur*. For the lack of *īti* there are several examples, see AMANO 617, Wortindex s.v. *īti* and also MS IV 8,7: 115,14–15. In I 8,4 (4): 120,2, just like as our passage, *īti* is lacking at an opinion after that another follows (see AMANO 291 n. 889, 292 n. 891).

The main point of discussion is as follows: Keśin Sātyakāmi spoke ‘we had given a share to the brahmaudanika fire’, but this fire is the one ‘eating everything’ so that it eats also the sacrificer, therefore one should not give a share to that fire. The speech of K.S. who was officiating as a priest for K.D. is connected with foregoing I 6,5 (1c) ‘who knows thus becomes the head of his [people] who aren’t hungry’, that Keśin Dārbhya as ruler is referred to. Then *eṣo ’nnam atti* means ‘this (K.D.) has a stabilized economy (by giving a share for the brahmaudanika fire)’, implying ‘his economic power is due to our (K.S.’s and his associate priests’) ritual’, which indicates the view of brahmin’s superiority.

2. To understand this discussion deeper the character of the brahmaudanika fire is important. In I 6,5 (1a) it is prescribed to set up the brahmaudanika fire by taking it from the house. That means that the brahmaudanika fire is not sacred but secular by birth. That is the motive of the myth of Āyu told in MS I 6,12 (4a): 106,1–7 and Vādhūla-Anvākhyāna I 1–2. Āyu is the son of mankind Purūravas and goddess Urvaśī, who was regarded at first as mankind and later became sacred and godly. This metamorphosis implies making the brahmaudanika fire sacred by taking it in araṇi sticks and leaving it for one year.⁸⁾

In this way the brahmaudanika fire as well as Āyu in the myth has both the sacred and the secular characters, that VādhAnv *devamanuṣyāṇām annāda-* ‘food-eater among the gods and mankind’ and MS I 6,5 (1c) ‘both these cakes’ (as two kinds of food for gods and mankind) refer to. I 6,5 (1d) ‘this food here really belongs to this [fire] entirely’

(18)

Keśin Dārbhya in the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā (K. AMANO)

means likewise that the fire ‘eats everything’ with implying an uncivil act which is then not sarced.

3. This brahmaudanika fire is compared with Keśin Dārbhya, then his epithet *annāda-janātāyās* can imply an eater of ‘secular food.’ This interpretation is supported by the meaning of *janātā-* in the MS ‘foreign (uncivilized) people’⁹⁾; cf. *jāna-* ‘foreign (uncivilized) land.’¹⁰⁾

The ruler of foreign uncivilized people was probably not respected, which is recognized in MS I 4,14 (2b): 64,10–12:

[. . . *asyā janātāyāḥ* * *śráiṣṭhyāya svāhā* //] *iti juhuyād, yātra kāmāyeta*: “*citrām asyām janātāyām syām*” *iti. citrām āha tasyām janātāyām bhāvati, śabālam tv āsyātmān jāyate* * [SCHROEDER 64 n. 6; Amano 176 n. 211]. “He (the sacrificer) should offer with [saying] ‘. . . for the superiority to the foreign people here, *svāhā*’ in a place where he wishes: ‘I may become a shining in this foreign people here.’ He really becomes a shining in the foreign people, but the adulterated [mind] occurs in himself.”

The view of looking down on Keśin Dārbhya that is found also in the episodes that K.D. was at first inferior (see 0.) is recognized in the epithet *annāda-janātāyās*.¹¹⁾

At the end of this paper I attempt to observe the relation between Keśin Dārbhya and the MS from view of locality. K.D. is the king of Pañcāla that was central for Taittirīya schools.¹²⁾ The MS area was wide southeast from Pañcāla, Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa was further south from MS.¹³⁾ MS and JB that have ‘ironical’ statements about K.D. were probably hardly touched by the influence of K.D. and his descendant.

1) See TSUJI Naoshirō 辻直四郎 “Keśin Dārbhya o megutte” ケーシン・ダールビアをめぐって, in *Veda gaku ronshū* ヴェーダ学論集 (Iwanami Shoten, Tokyo, 1966); Petteri KOSKIKALLIO, “Baka Daalbhya: A Complex Character in Vedic Ritual Texts, Epics and Purāṇas,” in *Electronic Journal of Vedic Studies* 1.3 (1995).

2) See KOSKIKALLIO 3–5: MS I 4,12 (1): 60,13ff., JB II 279–280, JB III 312, also JB II 100 (TSUJI 242) about Darbha Śātānīki, the father of Keśin Dārbhya.

3) Text: Leopold von SCHROEDER, *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā: Die Saṃhitā der Maitrāyaṇīya-Śākhā* (Leipzig, 1881/1883/1885/1886); Ś. D. SATAVALEKAR, *Yajurvediā Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā* (Aundh. Vikrama, 1988). Translation: KRICK 267ff.; Kyoko AMANO, *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā I-II: Übersetzung der Prosa-partien mit Kommentar zur Lexik und Syntax der älteren vedischen Prosa* (Hempfen Verlag, Bremen, 2009), 222–226. See variable readings and corrections in AMANO’s notes.

4) The subject of *āvṛśceta* and *anudhyāyī kṣódhukah syāt* is the same as that of *utsādayet*, namely the sacrificer. Cf. I 6,11 (2): 130,14–16 *tād yābhyo devātābhyo ’gnīm ādhatté, yāt tābhyo ná juhuyāt, tābhyā āvṛśceta* = . *anudhyāyī kṣódhukah syāt*.

5) The final *yāthā*-sentence ‘so that . . .’ that follows the main

sentence without correlative is used with verbs in expectative subjunctive, prospective *sya*-future or potential optative, that all correspond with mood of verbs in main sentences (AMANO 128–129).

6) See Wilhelm RAU, *Staat und Gesellschaft im alten Indien* (Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1957), 34–35.

7) See Kyoko AMANO, “Indication of Divergent Ritual Opinions in the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā,” Proceeding to 5th International Vedic Workshop, 2011.9.20–23 Bucharest (in print), 2.6.

8) See KRICK 202. For VādhAnv I 1–2, see Toshifumi GOTŌ, “‘Purūravas und Urvaśī’ aus dem neuentdeckten Vādhūla-Anvākhyāna (Ed. Ikari),” in *Anusantatyai*, ed. A. HINTZE / E. TICHY (J. H. Röhl, Dettelbach, 2000), 79–110 and 後藤敏文 “Shinshiryō Vādhūla-Anvākhyāna no tsutaeru ‘Purūravas to Urvaśī’ monogatari,” 新資料 Vādhūla-Anvākhyāna の伝える「Purūravas と Urvaśī」物語, in *Indo tetsugaku Bukkyō shisō ronshū* インド哲学佛教思想論集 (Nagata Bunshōdō, Kyoto, 2004), 845–868; Purūravas and Urvaśī got four sons which are all ‘not sacred’ fires, namely the fire for delivery, the fire to burn the dead, the fire used to make the womb ready and Āyu as the brahmaudanika fire (see GOTŌ (2000), 96 §10 and (2004), 853). Cf. also KS 8,10: 93,15–94,1 (KRICK 194, 205–206), ŚB XI 5,1,1–17 (especially 13ff.), VādhAnv I 2 (GOTŌ (2000), §§8–9). For arañi sticks, see KRICK 189–223.

9) Cf. RAU 64 ‘Fremde’. It means so in all examples in the MS: I 4,14 (2): 64,11–12, I 6,5 (1): 94,5 (here), II 1,1 (7): 1,15 (AMANO 430 n. 1685), II 1,9 (2): 10,18 (AMANO’s interpretation in 459 n. 1868, 460 n. 1873 should be corrected); II 5,2 (5): 49,13–14 Pl. ‘tribes in the foreign lands’ (AMANO’s interpretation in 560 n. 2448 should be corrected); see AMANO 625 Wortindex s.v.

10) I 4,9 (1): 57,3–4 (AMANO 156 n. 108), I 6,12 (1): 105,1, II 2,9 (2): 22,13–14. The name Janakā- can be derived from this meaning, namely ‘man in foreign land’; in ŚB XI 6,2,1 it is told that the brahmins came to him by chariots (*dhāvāyant-*; Junko SAKAMOTO-GOTŌ, “kathām-katham agnihotrām juhutha—Janakas Trickfrage in ŚB XI 6,2,1,” in *Anusantatyai* (2000), 231 n.3).

11) On the other hand, K.D. played an important role to propagandize this-worldly realistic effects of ritual, for example to achieve economic power or high social standing; cf. JB II 279–280 JB II 122–124, MS I 4,12 (1): 60,13–61,1, ŚB XI 8,4,1–6 (TSUJI 247–252).

12) See Michael WITZEL, “II. Konstellationen: Early Sanskritization; Origins and Development of the Kuru State,” in *Recht, Staat und Verwaltung im klassischen Indien* (Oldenbourg Verlag, München, 1997), 49; KOSKIKALLIO 8; WITZEL, “The Development of the Vedic Canon and Its Schools: The Social and Political Milieu,” in *Inside the Texts, Beyond the Texts*, ed. M. WITZEL (Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies Harvard University, Cambridge, 1997), 301.

13) See WITZEL, “On the Localization of Vedic Texts and Schools (Materials on Vedic Śākhās, 7),” in *India and the Ancient World*, ed. G. POLLET (Department Oriëntalistiek, Leuven, 1987), 178ff.; WITZEL, “Tracing the Vedic Dialects,” in *Dialects dans les littératures indo-aryennes*, ed. C. CAILLAT (Collège de France Institut de Civilisation Indienne, Paris, 1989), 113, 141–142.

〈Key words〉 Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, Keśin Dārbhya, *ānnam atti*, *annādā-*, *janātā-*

(University of Freiburg Dr. phil.)