

Tiziana Pontillo

HOW TO FIND GENEROUS PATRONS EVEN WHEN THERE ARE NONE

The article discusses the alleged lexical opposition between *kṣemya*, in the sense of “the one who stays at home, householder”, and *yāyāvara* — denoting “the one who constantly goes” according to *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 3.2.176, but also “the vagrant mendicant” e.g. in BDhS 2.7.12.1 — by carrying out an intertextual comparison of three parallel black Yajurveda versions of the same passage. The MS version (3.2.2) is assumed to have intentionally transformed the itinerant, but plausibly autonomous figure of the *yāyāvara* into one who depends on feeble or munificent householders.

Keywords: *kṣema-*, *yāyāvara-*, *dhṛti-*, sedentary life, nomadic life, pre-brāhmaṇic Indo-Āryan culture.

1. The background of the present research

As is well known, Yaroslav Vassilkov devoted an important part of his scholarly work to reconstruct the “Pre-Vedic culture of the Indo-Aryans, the legacy of which is much better preserved in the early layer of the *Mahābhārata*’s contents than in the hieratic poetry of the *R̥gveda*” (Vassilkov 2016: 182). In his opinion, “The historical expansion of Vedic (Brahminic) culture may be interpreted as a continuous forcing out, or assimilation of *vr̥tya* traditions”, since indeed “the centres of Vedic culture emerged against a background of *vr̥tya* culture”, which was the expression of “a society of mobile and warlike pastoralists”, similar to other ancient Indo-European nomadic peoples (Vassilkov 2016: 186-7).

In line with Prof. Vassilkov’ precious teachings, I already had the opportunity sometimes in the past to try to show how it is possible to catch in the Vedic works themselves some traces of the efforts made by the protagonists of the so-called Brahmanical Reform, in order to “force out their past”, and namely to fashion a new sedentary way of life, where everything was almost fixed and well-arranged from the birth, although by relying on the institutions, traditions and literary sources that had indeed been produced within the previous nomadic or semi-nomadic social, economic and religious patterns. Here, in the same framework of research, my focus shall be the search for generous patrons which have been supposed to be the subject of three passages in the late Mantra period of Vedic sources, concerning a stage of the *Aśvamedha*, namely the preparation of the ground for the fire (MS 3.2.2; KS 19.12; TS 5.2.1.7).

2. The starting point: a couple of authoritative translations of TS 5.2.1.7

First of all, I shall concentrate on TS 5.2.1.7, because, among these three works, it is the only one which was entirely translated into English:

[...] *pūrvedyúḥ prá krāmaty¹ uttaredyúr úpa tiṣṭhate tásmād yóge ’nyāsām prajānām mánah kṣéme ’nyāsām tásmād yāyāvaráh kṣemyasyeśe tásmād yāyāvaráh kṣemyám adhyāvasyati,*

Keith’s (1914: 404) transl.: “On the first day he strides forth, on the next day he pays reverence; therefore the minds of some creatures are set on en-

¹ The sacrificer is envisioned as god Viṣṇu: *yád viṣṇukramān krāmate ’múm evá táir lokām abhí jayati*, “Since he strides Viṣṇu’s strides, he wins the yonder world by means of them” (TS 5.2.1.7).

ergy, those of others on rest; therefore the active lords it over him who takes his ease, therefore he fixes upon a man who takes his ease.”

Cf. Oertel’s (1926: 223) transl.: “On one day he strides forth, on the next day he stands worshipping; therefore the mind of some creatures is (set) on a life on the road (*yoge*), (that) of others on a staying at home; therefore he who is fond of wandering lords it over the stay-at-home; therefore he who is fond of wandering settles down (for support) on the stay at home (*kṣeme*).”

In these two interpretations, a sort of opposition between two ways of life seems to emerge and, in Oertel’s interpretation even a possible convenience relationship between the *yāyāvarā-*, i.e. the man who wanders restless and the so-called *kṣemyá-*, supposed to be the “stay-at-home” human type, i.e. the stable and reliable householder whose support is sought for by the *yāyāvarā*. The main key to this reading is self-evidently the noun *kṣemyá* on which we shall return below, but also the two verbal forms *īše* and *adhyávasyati*.

— The Vedic stative verbal form *īše* combined with a genitive case should mean “he prevails over something, he rules over something.”² The socio-political meaning assumed both by Keith and by Oertel could be suitable to the context, and convey the sense of “dominance, supremacy”, only provided that the object is an individual man or even a class of men.³

— The present form *adhyávasyati* (from *adhy-ava-so-*) should merely mean “he undertakes”, but Oertel (1926: 223) maintains that the common meaning of the verb *adhy-ava-so-* “does not fit; it must rather mean ‘to settle down’ in the literal sense”.⁴ He considers *adhyavasyati* as corresponding to *abhiprayāti*, employed in MS 3.2.2 (see below), “the sense being that he who leads a roaming life falls back for support on the thrifty stay-at-home”.⁵

² The use of this 3rd sg. person *īše* (and its more recent matching form *īṣṭe*) but also of the 2nd sg. *īṣiše* and of the 3rd pl. in the Mantra and Brāhmaṇa language are commented on by Kümmel (1996: 24) in the following manner: “Unabhängig von der Herkunft aus einem Perfekt ist das Verbum synchron als Stativpräsens zu betrachten. Die Bedeutung ist zuständig ‘verfügen über, herrschen über’, das Verbum wird mit Genitiv (des Bereichs) konstruiert.”

³ Cf. Rau’s (1957: 14) transl.: “[...] Deswegen herrscht der Fehrende über den Ruhigen.”

⁴ Cf. Rau’s (1957: 14) transl.: “Deswegen läßt sich der Fehrende beim Ruhigen nieder.”

⁵ For a possible use of this denominative verbal base *avas-ya-* as a participle present inflected in the dative case see RV 1.116.23: *avasyatē stuvatē kṛṣṇiyāya ṛjūyatē*

— One could furthermore wonder what is the link with the sentence which immediately follows the passage quoted above, namely: *muṣṭīkaroti vācam yacchati yajñāsya dhṛtyai*, which seems to merely denote a practice of self-restraint targeted on imposing firmness on oneself, as preparatory task for a sacrificial performance, even though Keith (1914: 404) translates it as follows: “He clenches his fist, he restrains his speech, for support.”

3. Looking for a patron and need of food in MS 3.2.2

In fact, the MS version of this passage, and therefore, as is well known, the probably more ancient version which Black Yajurveda School preserved, is more clearly tuned to the modern interpretation quoted above.

MS 3.2.2: *anyedyúh prakrāmayaty anyedyúr úpatiṣṭhate yogakṣemám vā etát prajānām dādharma tásmād yāyāvará anyāḥ prajāḥ kṣemyā anyās. átha yát prakrámyopatiṣṭhate tásmād yāyāvará kṣemyám abhipráyāti tásmād yāyāvarásya kṣemyó ’nnam babhūva,*

“On one day, he causes to move forward, on the next day he stops; he thus keeps the *yogakṣema*- of people under control. Therefore, some people are fond of wandering, others are *kṣemyá*-; in that, after moving forward, he stops, therefore he who is fond of wandering resorts to *kṣemyá*-; therefore, the *kṣemyá*- became the food for him who is fond of wandering.”⁶

The occurrences of *kṣemyá*- rise to three, while its etymon *kṣéma*-disappears, excluding its use as a constituent of the compound *yogakṣemá*.

• The final sentence might be the most evident piece of evidence in favor with the interpretation of *kṣemyá*- as an individual who becomes the material support for the *yāyāvará*-, in accordance with

nāsatiyā śácibhiḥ | paśúm ná naṣtám iva dárśanāya viṣṇápúvaṃ dadathur víśvakāya || “To Viśvaka Kṣṇiya, who was seeking your help and singing your praise, who was aiming straight, Nāsatiyas, you gave by your powers Viṣṇápū to be seen (once more), like a lost animal” (tr. Jamison-Brereton 2014: 271).

⁶ Cf. Oertel’s (1926: 223) translation “On one day he strides forth, on the next day he stands worshipping; he thus establishes life at home connected with life on the road for the creatures; therefore some creatures are fond of wandering, others are stay-at-homes; in that, having strode forth he stands worshipping, therefore he who is fond of wandering comes to a stay-at-home (for support); therefore the stay-at-home is the food (= source of support) for him who is fond of wandering.”

Oertel's (1926: 223) interpretation, but it is not so conclusive. "To become food for somebody else" might have rather been the usual Vedic expression to denote the defeated enemy or rival and the *yāyāvarā* could be merely depicted as a winner. As emphasized by Amano (2013: 1073), in MS I 6,5 *annādam janatāyāḥ* denotes "the food-eater among the foreign people" and the phrase *annam atti*, lit. "he eats food", indeed means that "the ruler has a stabilized economy".

- The verb *abhiprayāti* "he falls back to, he resorts to" is indeed fit to the scenario of patronized-patron relationship.

- A third supplier difference consists in directly defining *prajāḥ* as *yāyāvarā*- vs. *kṣemyā*- instead of referring this opposition to *manas*- which can concentrate on *yoga*- or *kṣema*-, even only temporarily and alternately. This detail rather clearly engenders a distinction between two kinds or two vocations or even two classes of human beings who are respectively fond of wandering and in need of support or who prefer a quiet and sedentary life and can afford to support somebody else.

4. A third ancient Black YV School version where there is only a single occurrence of *kṣemya*- (KS 19.12)

If we only compared these two versions of the same passage, we would probably agree with Oertel's interpretations, by assuming two slight different assessments of the wandering style of life in the two compared sources, to be read as distinct witnesses of the historical stage which Palihawadana (1996: 21) explained as "the growing tendency of 'those who loved *kṣema*-' to create wealth and not merely consume, lavish away and plunder it from adversaries." This should have been the period when criticism of the Indra cult and of the way of life connected with this cult was more and more intensively emerging inside the Aryan community itself, in accordance with Palihawadana 1996 historical reconstructive hypothesis.

Nevertheless, there is a third Black YV School version of the same passage, which perhaps also allows to understand how this "growing tendency" might have philologically been managed.

KS 19.12: [...] *yat prakramān prakrāmati. yāmaṃ tena dādihāra. yad upatiṣṭhate, kṣemaṃ tena. pūrvedyuh prakrāmaty. aparedyur upatiṣṭhate. tasmād yāme 'nyāsām prajānām manaḥ. kṣeme 'nyāsām. tasmād yāyāvaraḥ kṣemasyeśe. tasmād yāyāvaraḥ kṣemyam adhyavasyati. [...]*

“When he moves forward by moving forward, he has kept motion under control. Inasmuch as he stops, he [keeps] rest under control. The previous day he moves forward, the day after he stops. Therefore, the mind of some people is [focused] on motion, that of some others is on rest. This is why the man fond of wandering is master of rest, this is why the wandering man undertakes rest.”

This is a tentative translation, based on the text fixed in Schroeder’s critical edition, where *kṣemasyeśe* is preferred to the variant reading of *kṣemyasyeśe*.

- It is noteworthy in fact that there is only one occurrence of the *taddhita*-form *kṣemya-* and two occurrences of the *kṛt kṣema-*.
- The alternance between a day devoted to a journey and one reserved for rest is not an exclusive detail of this version (see above both TS 5.2.1.7 and MS 3.2.2).
- In this version, on the basis of the mentioned balance between moving and stationary phases, the fact that the *yāyāvara* is capable to exercise control over the second one and that he chooses to take some rest at the right time could fully make sense. Within a context of cultural ferment which paid an extraordinary attention to the ascetic restraint with regard to all bodily as well as mental activity and movement as it has been reconstructed by Bronhorst (2011: 5), *kṣema-* has perhaps to be assumed not as a mere external immobility but as a spiritual attitude, in order to understand how one “who constantly goes”, i.e. a *yāyāvara* can be a master of it (*kṣemasyeśe*).

Thus, everything depends on how we decide to translate the nominal base *kṣemya-* in its occurrences of these three compared Black YV School texts. Here also one might imagine that the *yāyāvarāḥ* who stops, is indeed looking for support from somebody else, who is envisioned as a *kṣemya-* (masculine noun), as in MS 3.2.2, in the sense of somebody who habitually owns *kṣema-* (masculine or neuter noun), and as a consequence can yield it for others. One might even wonder if *iśe* in KS and TS versions is a mistake for some verbal form of *iṣ-* “to seek, to strive for obtaining something”.

5. Passing the word to grammarians

On the contrary, *kṣemya-* might have denoted “rest” exactly as its etymon *kṣema-*, as maintained in *Mahābhāṣya* 3.434 l. 13. Patañjali focuses on these nominal bases by including the pairs *kṣemyasyeśe* /

kṣemasyeṣe and *kṣemyam adhyavasyati* / *kṣemam adhyavasyati* (this latter not documented anywhere) in a list of pairs of Vedic phrases appended to Vt 5 ad A 5.4.30.⁷ The grammarian classifies *kṣemya-* as a *taddhita*-nominal base whose denotation is *svārthe*, lit. “in its own sense”, i.e. a nominal stem endowed with a redundant suffix, which does not add anything to the sense of its base. Therefore, according to Patañjali no derived meaning (e.g. “yielding rest”, as it could be supposed on the basis of the above-mentioned comparison) has to be taken into account for *kṣemya-* but rather the meaning of the original *kṣema-* has to be adopted. Recently Bronkhorst (2007: 349–50), in an appendix devoted to the survey of Vedic sources which can be assumed as known by Patañjali, has drawn scientific attention to Patañjali’s mention of the pair *kṣemyasyeṣe* vs *kṣemasyeṣe*. Bronkhorst clearly shows that the second member of each listed pair is that which Patañjali considers the right form but he argues that it does not matter whether this also occurs in some Vedic source like the first member,⁸ because this latter Vedic source might have corrected this form exactly as Patañjali made. Of course, we are not aware of the sense these words exactly had at the age of the Yajurveda-Saṃhitā redaction, some centuries before Patañjali’s age. Nonetheless, in the specific case of *kṣemasyeṣe* might have actually been the right form, and *vice versa* it is tempting to assume that the phrase *kṣemyasyeṣe* was intentionally replaced in the TS version and in a part of the manuscripts of the KS version and even absent (perhaps expunged) in the MS, which instead includes the following sentence in MS 1.9.5.2: *nāśyānyō yogakṣemāsyēṣe*, “No one else is master of *yogakṣema*.”⁹

Therefore, I would also propose to suppose that the first version quoted above (TS 5.2.1.7) was fruit of an intentional replacement of *kṣema-* with *kṣemya-*, targeted on the promotion for the sedentary existence and the accumulation of great wealth opposed to the wandering way of life. As a consequence, the meaning of the original passage might have rather been indeed a praise of the balance between

⁷ This passage is already singled out by Bronkhorst (2007: 349–350) in a chapter (appendix) devoted to the survey of Vedic sources which can be assumed as known by Patañjali.

⁸ Bronkhorst 2007: 349 n. 2 notices for instance that *kṣemam adhyavasyati* which Rau records as a quotation from KS 19.12 in reality is untraced.

⁹ See transl. Amano (2009: 338): “über sein Ausrücken zum Erwerben [von Reichtum] und über sein sicheres Wohnen (d.h. sein Gesamtleben) herrscht kein anderer.”

yoga- and *kṣema-* and the intrinsic capability of a wanderer to devote a part of his life to rest, ascetic practices and sacrificial performances, so that he was the extolled model of Indo-Āryan Indra-like virtues and thus a true master of the *kṣema-* cyclically obtained by means of *yoga-*:¹⁰ “[...] This is why the man fond of wandering is master of *rest*, this is why the wandering man chooses *rest*. [...]” (TS 5.2.1.7).

6. No previous or classical source can document the alleged meaning of *kṣemya-*

Furthermore, even if we ignored Patañjali’s teaching and we did not accept that the *taddhita kṣemya-* were to be interpreted *svārthe*, however the meaning of “yielding rest [to others]” which seems to be adopted in MS 3.2.2 and also extended by the modern interpreters — as we have just seen — to the matching KS and TS versions of this passage, results as being absolutely unpredictable on the basis of the previous usages. The most ancient occurrences of *kṣemya-* are ṚV 10.28.5, where it agrees with the feminine noun *dhur-* “chariot-pole”: [...] *yám árdham te maghavan kṣemyá dhúh* [...], “toward which half your chariot-pole is to come to rest, bounteous one.” (transl. Jamison and Brereton 2014: 1419), and AVŚ 12.2.49, where it agrees with the vocative *talpa-* “bed” in the phrase *ahorātré árv eṣi bíbhrat kṣemyás tiṣṭhan*, “Day-and-night you go after, bearing, standing comfortable.” (transl. Whitney 1905: 681 modified). In both cases this nominal base denotes an individual condition, but it is referred to a material object which is directly “resting” and not a human being who ensures this condition to other people.

In the Kalpasūtras we also find a formula encompassing *kṣemya-* as a qualifying word for the *āhavanīya-* fire, in an expiatory context of the Agnihotra:

MŚS 3.3.6 *ihaiva kṣemya edhi mā prahāsīr mām amum iti nābha*, “Be at home here, do not forsake me, yonder one, the son of yonder one” (transl. van Gelder 1963: 111).¹¹

¹⁰ On this subject Chiara Neri and T. Pontillo presented a joint paper under the title “A philological approach to comparative religious studies: the case of *yogakkhema/ yogakṣema* in Theravāda Buddhism and Brahmanism” — 18th Conference of the International Association of Buddhist Studies, Univ. of Toronto, August 20th–25th, 2017. I am sincerely grateful to Chiara Neri for reading and commenting on a preliminary version of the present paper which goes deep into a detail of the broader shared research on *yogakkhema/ yogakṣema*.

¹¹ Cf. MS 1.8.9; ĀpŚS 9.7.6; ĀŚS 3.12.7

Furthermore, if we have a look at the classical occurrences of *kṣemya-* with the help of the Digital Corpus of Sanskrit,¹² the assumed meaning proves to be even more arbitrary. Indeed, the single occurrence in MDhŚ agrees with the noun *bhūmi-* and the resulting phrase denotes a safe/peaceful land,¹³ and in eight out of nine occurrences which are the total amount in the MBh, *kṣemya-* is referred to other real or metaphorical places (3X) or communications (5X).

MBh quotation	Citation	Translation	Object denoted
12.185.8	<i>uttare himavatpārśve punye sarvagunānvite punyaḥ kṣemyaś ca kāmyaś ca sa varo loka ucyaate </i>	Towards the North on the other side of Himavat, which is sacred and full of merit, there is a sacred, safe/peaceful, and highly desirable place. That is called ‘the other world’.	PLACE OR METAPHORICAL PLACE = OBJECT OF KNOWLEDGE
12.291.12	[...] <i>yac cākṣaram iti proktam śivaṃ kṣemyam anāmayam</i>	That which is taught as being imperishable, auspicious, safe/peaceful, destitute of any defect.	
12.306.80	[...] <i>caitad uktam tvayā bhoḥ samyak kṣemyaṃ devatādyam</i>	And you taught. o Lord, what is the truly safe/peaceful origin of all the Gods	

¹² <http://kjc-sv013.kjc.uni-heidelberg.de/dcs/index.php?contents=lemma&IDWord=135622>

¹³ MDhŚ 7.212.1: *parityajen nrpo bhūmim ātmārtham avicārayan | kṣemyaṃ sasyapradāṃ nityaṃ paśuvrddikarīm api ||* “For this own well-being, a king may abandon without hesitation even a land that is safe and always abundant crops and on which livestock thrive.”

12.9.3	<i>kṣemyaś caikākinā gamyah panthāḥ [...]</i> ¹	The <u>road</u> which has to be travelled alone is <u>peaceful</u> .	COMMUNICATIONS
12.174.6	<i>kṣemyam ātmavatām mārgam āsthitā hastadakṣiṇam</i>	They have undertaken the <u>peaceful way</u> of self/controlled men which is situated on the right hand	
12.228.11	<i>tyāgavartmānugaḥ kṣemyaḥ śaucago dhyānagocaraḥ jīvayukto ratho divyo brahmaloke virājate </i>	The <u>chariot</u> which is yoked to the life and goes along the <u>track</u> of the renunciation, <u>peaceful</u> , directed to the purity, moving within the meditation, heavenly, shines in the world of Brahman.	
12.306.82	<i>[...] tatraiva tad darśanaṃ darśayan vai samyak kṣemyaṃ ye pathaṃ samśritā vai</i>	Then in this way he caused to see the vision to them who had adopted the <u>path</u> which is truly <u>safe</u> .	
14.57.2	<i>na caivaiṣā gatiḥ kṣemyā na cānyā vidyate gatiḥ etan me matam ājñāya prayaccha maṇikuṇḍale </i> ²	And the present <u>path</u> is not <u>peaceful</u> . I do not find any path. May you recognize that this is my wish and give away the jeweled earrings!	

The only exception is a name of the ascetic God Śiva in a long list of his epithets (MBh 14.8.12-14): *tasmai bhagavate kṛtvā namaḥ śarvāya vedhase [...]* *kṣemyāya harinetṛāya sthāṇave puruṣāya ca*.

Therefore, there is no hint in the MBh nor in the MDhŚ at a masculine use of *kṣemya-* as denoting a patron's attitude, while there

is a noteworthy degree of continuity from the Earlier Vedic Saṃhitās until the Epics.

Even the link between *kṣemya-* and some speculative objects of soteriological knowledge singled out as *kṣemya-* *pathin-* or *mārga-* seems to be prefigured by the use of *kṣema-* as a stable and peaceful condition which pertains to the spiritual individuality, if it has attained the immortality in AVŚ 11.7.13¹⁴ and an even more soteriologically oriented association occurs in a JB passage devoted to the kingly throne used in the context of a renowned fertility festival, probably performed by the Vrātyas at the winter solstice, and secondarily incorporated into the orthodox Aśvamedha sacrifice, i.e. in the context of the Mahāvratā. A series of eulogies and oblations are performed by the Cardinal points and by natural elements addressed to the King who is a sort of embodied Sun. Among these, really intriguing homage comes from the Earth and includes an offering of *kṣema-* alongside *vimoka-*, i.e. security and liberation are made matching with each other.

JB 2.25-26: [...] *anu mām ā tapeti pṛthivī prāyacchat kṣemaṃ ca vimokaṃ ca [...]*,

“The earth offered him rest and liberation, by saying ‘May you emit heat on me!’”

If this meaning were actually at work in all the YV passages analysed above, it could hardly be documented beyond them, and in my opinion even only in MS 3.2.2. TB itself should have registered a piece of contra-evidence with respect to the meaning of *kṣemya-* assumed for instance by Keith (1914: 404) for its *mūla-*text.

TB 3.9.13: [...] *yāt prātār iṣṭibhir yājate. āsvam evā tād ānvicchati. yāt sāyāṃ dhṛtīr juhōti. āsvasyaivā yātyai dhṛtyai. tasmāt sāyāṃ prajā kṣemyā bhavanti. yāt prātār iṣṭibhir yājate. āsvam evā tād ānvicchati. tasmād divā naṣṭaiśā eti. yāt prātār iṣṭibhir yājate sāyāṃ dhṛtīr juhōti. ahorātrābhyām evāinam ānvicchati. atho ahorātrābhyām evāśmai yogakṣemaṃ kalpayati,*

“[...] When he performs sacrificial oblations in the morning, he only seeks after the horse. When he offers the (Aśvamedha evening) *dhṛti-*oblations in

¹⁴ *sūnṛtā sāmnaṭiḥ kṣémaḥ svadhōrjāmṛtaṃ sāhaḥ | ūcchiṣṭe sārve pratyāñcaḥ kāmāḥ kāmēna tatpūḥ ||* “Pleasantness, compliance, comfort, custom, refreshment, immortality, power — in the remnant all occurring desires are satisfied with desire” (transl. Whitney 1905: 645).

the evening, this is for the restraint of the horse, to keep him back. Therefore in the evening, beings become quiet (i.e. taking a rest). When he performs sacrificial oblations in the morning, he only seeks after the horse. Therefore in daytime he goes seeking after what is lost. When he performs sacrificial oblations in the morning, he offers the *dhṛti*-oblations in the evening. Therefore, he (the Adhvaryu) seeks after the horse by means of day- and night-time; thus, he is disposing the *yogakṣema*- to him by means of day- and night-time.¹⁵

Once again in this passage concerning a detail of the *Aśvamedha*, we have to notice that the main focus is the opposition between two activities of the same individual, nor two distinct ways of life or even two kinds of human beings. The human beings (*prajā-*) become peaceful (*kṣemyā bhavanti*) in the evening, so that they actually alternate their active life, prevalently made of journeys and expeditions, with some time to be spent in performing the *dhṛti*-oblations. This self-evidently could help us to understand the meaning of the final dative of the conclusive sentence in TS 5.2.1.7:

muṣṭīkaroti vācaṃ yacchati yajñāsya dhṛtyai,

“He clenches his fist, he restrains his speech, in order to comply with the [due] sacrifice (i.e. something which is afterwards taught as *dhṛti*-oblations).”

In the White YV tradition also the same sense is documented for *kṣemyā-* and the association of *kṣéma-* with the *dhṛti*-oblations is even more explicit. Although both human beings and animals taking rest in the evening are the subject of the predicative structure where *kṣemyā-* is the predicate, ŚBM 13.1.4.3 is quite similar to TB 3.9.13:

[...] *yát sāyám dhṛtīr juhóti kṣémo dhṛtiḥ kṣémo rátriḥ kṣémenaivainam dādhāra tásmāt sāyám manuṣyāś ca paśávaś ca kṣemyā bhavanty átha yát prátár iṣṭibhir yájata icháty eváinam tat tásmād dívā naṣṭaiśá eti yádvevá sāyám dhṛtīr juhóti. yát prátár iṣṭibhir yájate yogakṣemám eva tad yájamānaḥ kalpayate tásmād yatrai téna yajñéna yájante kṛptáḥ prajāñāṃ yogakṣemó bhavati,*

“[...] When he offers the (*Aśvamedha* evening) *dhṛti*-oblations — the evening oblation is rest (*kṣema-*) and the night is rest. It is by means of rest

¹⁵ Cf. Dumont’s (1948: 490) transl. of this last sentence: “And consequently, it is by means of day and night that he (the Adhvaryu) brings about for him (for the Sacrificer) acquisition and security (secure possession)”.

that he restrains him (i.e. the horse); therefore in the evening human beings and animals become quiet (i.e. taking a rest). Thus, when he performs sacrificial oblations in the morning, he only seeks after the horse. Thus, he goes seeking after what is lost in day time, while he performs *dhṛti*-oblations in the evening. When he performs sacrificial oblations in the morning, the sacrificer is disposing the *yogakṣema*-. Therefore, wherever they perform this (Aśvamedha) sacrifice, *yogakṣema*- becomes disposed to the people.”

7. A sort of Brahmanical Reform-oriented lexical meteor

To sum up, we have seen above (§ 4) how in the early KS version of the YV passage here focused there is only one occurrence of *kṣemya*- and how the context seems to be far from the idea of a patron for wanderers. In my opinion, the idea of “choosing peace / rest” (even temporarily) is perfectly fit to the content of the KS and TS version of this passage. In the plausibly more recent TS-version, it seems even more improbable that the *yāyāvarāḥ* is looking for support, instead of being moved by a mere need of rest or by religious exigencies, since an ascetic practice and a sacrifice performed by him are mentioned at the end. This sacrifice might have consisted in the *dhṛti*-oblations which are better explained in TB 3.9.13 and in ŚBM 13.1.4.3, provided that they have not been rather secondarily and later made matching with this section of the Aśvamedha sacrificial session, namely in the evening, when it is the horse which has to be restrained and kept back (*āśvasyaivā yātyai dhṛtyai*).

Furthermore, the mythic episode of the renowned steps Viṣṇu used to conquer the heaven, which is mentioned at the beginning of TS 5.2.1.7, suggests a competitive social and religious background instead of a Brahmanic ordered world with social fixed roles to play by birth.¹⁶

On the other hand, in MS 3.2.2, the generalization of the form *kṣemya*- and in particular its inflection in the plural form agreeing with *prajāḥ* (in the place of the expression with *manas*- etc. in KS and TS versions) seems expressly to aim at transforming the itinerant but supposedly autonomous figure of the *yāyāvāra*- into an aggressive plunderer or into a vagrant mendicant, depending on feeble or munificent householders,¹⁷ as even in the BDhŚ he is not yet

¹⁶ In KS 19.12 only a generic attainment of the tree worlds is mentioned.

¹⁷ This socio-economic context self-evidently matches the current presentation of the Vṛātya-bands (based on some passages such as BŚS 18.24), depicted as a sort of Män-nerbund with the aim of achieving a higher and steadier condition (Falk 1986: 51–54)

depicted.¹⁸ A comparably negative shadow is only thrown up on the assumed lack of autonomy and sinful behavior of the *yāyāvaras'* group in the famous episode of Jaratkāru in the MBh, where his *yāyāvaram*-style of life (MBh 12.236.19 ff.) and in particular his celibacy is criticized reasonably by the Pitr̥s, who finally forced him to get married and to assure them a descendant, i.e. the renowned Āstika.

I assume that the final purpose of the MS version of the questioned episode was to separate a social class engaged in *yoga*- and another one yielding *kṣema*, so that a balanced complementarity between them was assured, which was assumedly denoted by the copulative compound *yogakṣema*- (see the final sentence in TB 3.9.13 and MS 3.2.2).¹⁹ I am persuaded that this version was one crucial step in the so-called Brahmanical Reform, a “strategy” adopted in the orthodox Vedic texts in order to cast the wanderers in a definitely unfavorable light, in the so-called “anti-*vrātya* propaganda,” as defined by Hock (2016: 111-113), to gradually build the well-known brāhmaṇic Varṇāśrama-system.

References

Primary Sources

- A** — *Aṣṭādhyāyī* — Sharma, Ram Nath. 1987–2003. (ed.) *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. 6 Vols. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- ĀpŚS** — *Āpastamba-Śrautasūtra* — Thite 2004.

and ‘demanding ransom from the king’ (Witzel 1989: 235-236). Such a reconstruction has been assumed as a second historical phase of the *Vrātya*-phenomenon by Candotti and Pontillo 2015, who advanced the hypothesis that in a more ancient stage than the Śrauta age, *Vrātya*-expeditions might instead have been a cyclical temporary institution (cf. also Harzer 2005) broadly extended to the common life of clans, aimed at attaining the prosperity for all their members by means of competitions with rivals. This previous stage might correspond to the period of Indra cult, then disfavoured in order to promote a new style of life, targeted on the accumulation of wealth, as it has been reconstructed by Palihawadana 1996.

¹⁸ See in particular BDhŚ 3.1.1-4: *atha śālīnayāyāvaracakracaradharmakāṅkṣiṇām [...] teṣāṃ tadvarṭanād vṛttir ucyate. vartamānānām śālāśrayatvāc chālīnatvam. vṛttyā varayā yātīti yāyāvaratvam*, “Next, we describe those who desire to follow the Law of Śālīnas, Yāyāvaras, and Cakracaras. [...] We will show below that these means derive their names from the activities by which people procure their livelihood. The name Śālīna is derived from their living in houses (*śālā*). Yāyāvara is derived from the fact that they follow (*yā*) an excellent (*vara*) means of livelihood [...]” (transl. Olivelle 2000: 302).

¹⁹ On this subject see Neri — Pontillo, “The case of *yogakṣema/yogakkhema* in Vedic and Suttapaṭhaka sources. In response to Norman,” forthcoming.

- ĀŚS** — *Āśvalāyana-Śrautasūtra* — Vidyāratna, Rāmanārāyaṇa. 1864–1874. (ed.) *The Śrauta Sūtra of Āśvalāyana, with the comm. of Gārgya Nārāyaṇa* (Bibliotheca Indica 49). Calcutta. http://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil/1_sanskr/1_veda/5_vedang/1_srauta/asvss_u.htm [accessed in March 2018]
- AVŚ** — (*Śaunakīya*) *Atharvaveda* — Bandhu, Vishva. 1960–1962. (ed.) *Atharvaveda (Śaunaka) with the Padapāṭha and Sāyaṇācārya's Commentary*. Hoshiarpur: Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute.
- BDhS** — *Baudhāyana-Dharmasūtra* — Olivelle 2000.
- JB** — *Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa* — Vira, R. — L. Chandra. 1986. (ed.) *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa of the Sāmaveda*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass [Varanasi 1955].
- KS** — *Kāṭhaka-Saṃhitā* — Schroeder, L. von. 1900. (ed.) *Kāthakam. Die Saṃhitā der Katha-Śākhā*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- M** — *Mahābhāṣya* — Kielhorn, F. 1962-1972. (ed.) *The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali*. 3 Vols. Third edition, revised and furnished with additional readings, references, and select critical notes by K. V. Abhyankar. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute [1880-1885].
- MBh** — *Mahābhārata* — Sukthankar, V.S., S.K. Belvalkar, and P.L. Vaidya. 1933–1971. (eds.) *The Mahābhārata*. 19 Vols. Poona: BORI.
- MDhŚ** — *Mānava-Dharmaśāstra* — Olivelle 2005.
- MS** — *Maitrayāṇī-Saṃhitā* — Schroeder von, L. 1881–1886. (ed.) *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- MŚS** — *Mānava-Śrautasūtra* — ed. 1961 [repr. 1985] *The Mānava Śrautasūtra belonging to the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā*. (Sri Garib Dass Oriental Series n° 31). Delhi: Sri Satguru Publ.
- RV** — *R̥gveda* — Sontakke, N.S. and C.G. Kashikar. 1933–1951. (eds.) *R̥gveda-Saṃhitā with a Commentary of Sāyaṇācārya*. Poona: Vaidika Samshodana Mandala.
- ŚB** — *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* — Weber, A. 1964. (ed.) *The Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa in the Mādhyandina-śākhā with Extracts from the Commentaries of Sāyaṇa, Harisvāmin and Dvivedagaṅga*. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office [reprint of 1885].
- TB** — *Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa* — ed. 1999. *Kṛṣṇyajurvedīyam Taittirīyabrāhmaṇam. Śrīmat Sāyaṇācārya-Vīracitabhāṣyasametam*. 3 Vols. (Ānandāśrama Saṃskṛta Granthāvaliḥ, Granthāṅkaḥ 37). Punyakhyaṇpattane: Anandasramamudrana Laye.
- TS** — *Taittirīya-Saṃhitā* — *Kṛṣṇyajurvedīyataittirīyasamhitā. Vedārtha-Prakāśa by Sāyaṇa*. 8 vols. (Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series 42). Poona: Anandasramamudrana Laye 1900–1905.
- Vt.** — *Vārttika* — vedi M.

Secondary Sources

- Amano, Kyoko. 2009. *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā I-II. Übersetzung der Prosapartien mit Kommentar zur Lexik und Syntax der älteren vedischen Prosa*. Bremen: Hempen Verlag.
- Amano Kyoko. 2013. Keśin Dārbhya in the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā. Description of the Brahmaudanika Fire in MS I 6,5 (1d): 94, 4–8. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, vol. 61, 3: 1073–1077.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes. 2007. *Greater Magadha. Studies in the Culture of Early India*. (Handbook of Oriental Studies 2. India, Vol. 19). Leiden-Boston: Brill.
- Candotti, Maria Piera and Tiziana Pontillo. 2015. Aims and functions of vrātyastoma performances: A historical appraisal. In: *The volatile world of sovereignty: The vrātya problem and kingship in South Asia and beyond*, ed. by Tiziana Pontillo, Cristina Bignami, Moreno Dore, and Elena Mucciarelli. New Delhi: DK Printworld: 154–215.
- Dumont, Paul-Emile. 1948. The Horse-Sacrifice in the Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa: The Eight and Ninth Prapāṭhakas of the Third Kāṇḍa of the Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa with Translation. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 92, No 6 /Dec. 27, 1948), 447–503.
- Falk, Harry. 1986. *Bruderschaft und Würfelspiel. Untersuchungen zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des vedischen Opfers*. Freiburg: Hedwig Falk.
- Gelder, Jeannette M. 1985. (tr.) *The Mānava Śrautasūtra belonging to the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā*. Delhi: Sri Satguru [reprint of 1963].
- Harzer, Edeltraud. 2005. Bhīṣma and the Vrātya Question. In: *The Mahābhārata: What is not here is nowhere else (yan nehasti na tad kvacit)*, ed. by T. S. Rukmani. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal: 163–178
- Hock, Hans H. 2016. 'Vrātya Prakrit', ritual concerns, or anti-vrātya propaganda? *aduruktavākyaṃ* in its broader context. In: Tiziana Pontillo, Moreno Dore, Hans H. Hock, *Vrātya Culture in Vedic Sources. Select Papers. A Panel of Veda and Vedic Literature*. Bangkok: Sanskrit Studies Centre, Silpakorn University-New Delhi: Prinworld Publ.: 103–116.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. & Joel P. Brereton. 2014. (trs.) *The Rigveda. The Earliest Religious Poetry of India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 3 Volumes.
- Keith, Arthur B. 1914. (tr.) *The Veda of the Black Yajus School entitled Taittirīya Saṃhitā (Harvard Oriental Series ed. by Ch.R. Lanman, 18–19)*. Cambridge, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press 1914.
- Kümmel, Martin Joachim. 1996. *Stativ und Passivaorist im Indoarischen (Ergänzungshefte zu Historische Sprachforschung, 39)*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Mylius, Klaus. 1994. *Āśvalāyana-Śrautasūtra. Erstmalig vollständig übersetzt, erläutert und mit Indices versehen*. Texte und Übersetzungen 3. Wichtrach: Inst. f. Indologie.

- Oertel, Hanns. 1926. *The syntax of cases in the narrative and descriptive prose of the Brāhmanas*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Olivelle, Patrick. 2000. (ed., tr.) *Dharmasūtras. The Law Codes of Āpastamba, Gautama, Baudhāyana and Vasiṣṭha*. Annotated Text and Translation. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- (ed., tr.) *Manu's Code of Law. A Critical Edition and Translation of the Mānava-Dharmaśāstra*. Oxford: University Press.
- Palihawadana, Mahinda. 1996. *The God of War and Lavishness*. Publication No. 119. State Printing Corporation, Panaluwa, Padukka, Sri Lanka.
- Rau, Wilhelm. 1957. *Staat und Gesellschaft im alten Indien: nach den Brāhmaṇa-Texten dargestellt*. Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz.
- Thite, Ganesh U. 2004. (ed., tr.) *Āpastamba-Śrauta-Sūtra. Text with Engl. Transl. and Notes*, 2 Vols. Delhi: New Bharatiya Book Co.
- Vassilkov, Yaroslav. 2016. The Mahābhārata and Non-Vedic Aryan Traditions. *Proceedings of the Fifth Dubrovnik International Conference 'On The Sanskrit Epics and Purāṇas'* (DICSEP 5), August 11-16, 2008, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Ed. by Ivan Andrijačić and Sven Sellmer, Gen Ed. Mislav Ježić. Zagreb: Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts & Ibis Grafika: 181–203.
- Whitney, William D. 1905. *Atharva-Veda Samhitā*, Translated with Critical and Exegetical Commentary, revised and brought nearer to completion and edited by C. R. Lanman. 2 Vols., Cambridge. Massachusetts: Harvard University.
- Witzel, Michael. 1989. Tracing the Vedic dialects. In: *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes*, ed. by Colette Caillat: (Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne, 55.). Paris: Boccard: 97–265.