

# vidhenāman and vṛdhātu in Yajurvedic Mantras

AMANO Kyōko

## 1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to consider two problematic words *vidhenāman* and *vṛdhātu* which appear in Yajurvedic mantras. The followings are the mantras whose oldest forms and ritual contexts the Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā (MS) represents:

MS I 9,1:131,7–8<sup>m</sup> ~ I 9,4(2):133,9–10<sup>p</sup> (1) *vācaspate hín vidhenāman, vidhéma te náma, vidhés tvám asmākaṁ náma*; MS I 9,1:131,12<sup>m</sup> ~ I 9,5(1):135,10<sup>p</sup> (2) *vidhenāman, vidhéma te náma, vidhés tvám asmākaṁ náma* (→ 2);

MS I 2,2:10,14<sup>m</sup> ~ III 6,4:64,5<sup>p</sup> *bṛhaspátir no havíṣā vṛdhātu* (→ 3).

## 2. vidhenāman

### 2.1. vidhenāman Mantras and the Explanation in MS

(1) MS I 9,4(2):133,7–11 *tá índraṁ janayitvābruvant: “svār ayāma=”* *íti. té vái páñcahotāro nyāsīdan váruṇagr̥hapatayo. {gnír hótāsīd, aśvínādhvaryú, rudrò ‘gníd, bṛhaspátir upavaktá.} yád “aśvínā=”* *íti, téna páñcahotā. té vá etáu grāhā agr̥hṇata: [vācaspate hín vidhenāman, vidhéma te náma. vidhés tvám asmākaṁ náma=]* *íti. té triṇavám āyátanam acāyaṁs. táñ sētuṁ kṛtvā svār āyan.*

They brought forth Indra and said: “Let’s go to the sun!” They sat down [at a *sattra*] with five priests and Varuṇa playing the role of *gr̥hapati*. The *hotṛ* was Agni, the *adhvaryus* [were] both Aśvins, the *agnīdh* [was] Rudra, the *upavaktṛ* [was] Bṛhaspati.<sup>1)</sup> [Owing] to that both Aśvins [are contained], there are five priests (in this *pañcahotṛ* formula). They drew these two [*soma*] drawings, [saying:] “Vācaspati! **hín vidhenāman**! We may arrange your name! You may arrange our name!” They thought of *triṇava* [*stotra*] as their foothold. They used it as bridge and went to the sun.

(translated in Amano 2009, 330–331)

(2) I 9,5(1):135,6– *té vái ‘svār yánto ‘bruvann: “áto no yūyám práyachata” — “kénāyátanena=”* — *“átraivá vetsyatha=”* *íty abruvaṁs. té vái saptáhotāro nyāsīdann: aryamágr̥haspatayo. {maháhavir hótāsīt, satyáhavir adhvaryúr . . .}. té vá etám grāham agr̥hṇata: [vidhenāman. vidhéma te náma. vidhés tvám asmākaṁ náma=]* *íti. té trayastrīṁśám āyátanam acāyaṁs. ténedáñ sámatanvan.*

As they were coming to the sun, they said: “Give us something from there (the earth)!” — “On

(12) *vidhenāman* and *ṛdhātu* in Yajurvedic Mantras (AMANO)

what as foothold?” — “You will find it here,” they said. They sat down [at a *sattra*] with seven priests and Aryaman playing the role of *grhapati*. The *hotṛ* was Mahāhavis (who has a great oblation), the *adhvaryu* [was] Satyahavis (who offers truth) . . . They drew these two [*soma*] drawings, [saying:] “**vidhenāman!** We may arrange your name! You may arrange our name!” They thought of *trayastrīṃśa* [*stotra*] as their foothold. They connected this [earth] (with heaven) from this [foothold].

(translated in Amano 2009, 334–336)

These two mantras have variants in the parallel texts of Yajurveda and Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa (AB):

	(1)	(2)
Kāṭhaka-Saṃhitā (KS) (1) 9,8:110,18, (2) 9,9:112,2	vācaspate <b>hṛd</b> vīdhenāman	vācaspate vidhenāman vidhema te nāma
Kapiṣṭhala-Kaṭha-Saṃhitā (KapKS) (1) 8,11, (2) 8,12	vācaspate <b>rid</b> vidhenāman	vācaspate vidhenāman vidhema te nāma
Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka (TĀ) (1) III 1,1, (2) III 5,1	vācaspate vidhenāman vidhēma te nāma	vācaspate <b>hṛd</b> vidhenāman vidhēma te nāma
AB 5,25,13	vācaspate vidhenāman vidhema te nāma	

## 2.2. Are *hin/hṛd* + *vidhe* + *nāman* Three or Two Words, or One Word?

Several interpretations are attempted hitherto:

- (1) (*hin*)*vidhe* *nāman* as two words, in VWC, VC, MS ed. Schroeder and ed. Sātavalekar;
- (2) (*hin*) *vidhe* *nāman* as three words “(O “Hin”!) O Rule! O Name!” in Voegeli (2002, 172–176);
- (3) (*hin*)*vidhenāman* as one word, in PW, pw, Caland (1953, to ŚāṅkhŚS X 14,6) “O thou that art *hṛdvidhe* by name,” Amano (2009, 331 n. 1126).

I consider the following arguments as decisive: [1] KS shows the accentuation *hṛd vīdhenāman*, and *vidhenāman* stands without *hín/hṛd/hṛd* in the mantra (2) of MS, KS and KapKS,<sup>2)</sup> so *hín/hṛd* is probably independent; [2] the vocative *nāman* as address to Vācaspati is attested nowhere; [3] the following mantra *vidhēma te nāma*, *vidhēs tvám asmākaṃ nāma* includes probably the same lexical expression,<sup>3)</sup> so *vīdhe-nāman* most likely builds a syntagma.

## 2.3. Grammatical Form of *vidhe*

There are some examples for a compound built from a sentence, *śam-yor-vākā*- ‘a passage beginning with *śam yor*’; *ye-yajāmahā*- ‘a [passage] beginning with *yé yājāmahe*’; *idām-madhu*- ‘a [passage] including *idām evā sārāghām mādhu*’ (see AiG II 1: 87, 325–326).

So it may account for that *vidhe-nāman* is concerned with the mantra *vidhés . . . nāma*, so that it most likely means ‘someone [who is addressed in] *vidhés . . . nāma*.’ The grammatical form of *vidhe* can indicate the 2nd sg. opt. *vidhes* as in the mantra. Based on this assumption *vidhe-nāman* could be corrected to ‘*vidher-nāman*.’

#### 2.4. Meaning of *vidhema/vidhes . . . nāma*

The verb *vidh*<sup>4)</sup> ‘work for’ is constructed with dative of recipient (always gods) and instrumental of offering/praising (the most frequent is *haviṣā*); for example Ṛg-Veda (RV) X 121,1–9 = MS II 7,14:95,3, II 7,15:96,14, II 13,23:168,6–169,3 *kāsmāi devāya haviṣā vidhema* ‘Which divinity may we work for with the oblation?’<sup>5)</sup> Construction with accusative of offering/praising appears in few cases and means ‘arrange something (acc.) for a god (dat.)’; for example RV I 189,1 = MS I 2,13:22,7 *bhūyīṣṭhām te nāmauktiṁ vidhema* ‘We may arrange most abundant praise to you.’

The following table will present the constructions with cases attested in RV (in total 31 examples) and MS (in total 34 examples):

	RV (31)	RV citation in MS (18)	Yajurvedic original mantras in MS (16)
dat. + instr.	17	16	9
dat. + instr. + acc.	2	—	—
dat. + acc.	4	1	—
dat.	8	1	3
dat. + loc.	—	—	1
instr.	—	—	1
gen. + acc.	—	—	2

We see that *vidhema te nāma vidhés tvām asmākaṁ nāma* in construction with genitive and accusative *nāma* is an isolated case. Also a god (Vācaspati) as subject of *vidh* is only one example, because a god always appears in dative of recipient. Such peculiar use and expression can owe to the peculiar background of the chapter I 9. This chapter contains esoteric ritual thinking and practice that show characters of secrecy, ascetic and symbolism, and also a lot of unusual linguistic appearances; see Amano, forthcoming, §3.7.

In either case, this mantra could be influenced by other mantras or verbal expressions, possibly MS I 2,8:17,14–18,1<sup>m</sup> ~ III 8,5:100,2<sup>p</sup> *vidér agne nábho nāma yát te* ‘Agni! Find the name *nábhas* as your own!’ or a thinkable construction \**nāma ví-dhā\**

(14) *vidhenāman* and *ṛdhātu* in Yajurvedic Mantras (AMANO)

‘assign a name’<sup>6)</sup> took after the traditional expression *nāma dhā* ‘give a name.’<sup>7)</sup>

### 2.5. Meaning of the Mantras

The mantras can be translated “(Vācaspati! hin!) You addressed with ‘You may arrange [our] name!’ We may arrange your name! You may arrange our name!” Arranging a name means probably nomination of someone for a role in a ritual as the *caturhotṛ* and other formulae indicate in identifying sentences like ‘the *hotṛ* is Agni, the *adhvaryus* are both Aśvins, the *agnīdh* is Rudra, the *upavaktṛ* is Bṛhaspati’ (see 2.1 (1) above and n. 1). It seems to be implied that someone becomes a member of a ritual group that the *sattra* of the gods in the myth represents.

### 3. *ṛdhātu*

The 2nd sg. opt. *vidhes* is attested in two cases in the YS: one is the above mentioned mantra and the other is a mantra explanation in TS VI 1,2,4–5. In this passage, we meet another problematic word *ṛdhātu* that seems to be an alternative for *vidhes*.

*ṛdhātu* must be a verbal form of *vardh/ṛdh* ‘grow larger/stronger’ in the middle, ‘make something larger’ in the active. This verb has a thematic aorist stem *ṛdh-a-* that *ṛdhātu* should belong to, but this doesn’t show any correct grammatical form. And also the mantra’s meaning ‘Bṛhaspati should make larger’ is unusual, because in other cases Bṛhaspati is the subject of *ṛdh* in the middle (‘Bṛhaspati has become larger’)<sup>8)</sup> or the object of the active (‘[someone] makes Bṛhaspati larger’).<sup>9)</sup>

#### 3.1. *ṛdhātu* Mantra and Its Explanation with *vidhes* in TS

TS VI 1,2,4–5<sup>p</sup> [*bṛhaspátir no havísā ṛdhātu* (TS I 2,2,1<sup>m</sup>) //] *ity āha. bráhma vái devānām bṛhaspátir. bráhmanaivásmāi yajñám áva runddhe. yád brūyád “vidher” íti, yajñasthānūm ṛched. “ṛdhātv” ity āha. yajñasthānūm evá pári ṛṇakti.*

He (the priest) says: “Bṛhaspati should make [the heaven, earth and the intermediate space] larger with our oblation.” *brahman-* is Bṛhaspati for the gods. He (the priest) ensures a sacrifice for him (the sacrificer) with *brahman-*. If he would say: “*vidhes* (you may arrange),” he would bump against a stump in the sacrifice. He says: “*ṛdhātu* (he should make larger).” He avoids the stump in the sacrifice.

MS I 2,2<sup>m</sup> ~ III 6,4<sup>p</sup> has this mantra, but doesn’t refer to the alternative *vidhes*.

#### 3.2. *vidhema* Instead of *ṛdhātu* in the Parallel Texts

TS seems to think that *vidhes* had originally stood and *ṛdhātu* had better replace it. The parallel mantra in KS and Vājasaneyin-Saṁhitā (VS) can be supportive of that *vidhes*

stood originally, because KS II 2 and VS IV 7 say *bṛhaspátaye havīṣā vidhema* ‘We may work for Bṛhaspati with the oblation.’<sup>10)</sup> This is the typical use of *vidh* as seen in many examples from RV and MS (see 2.4 above). The 2nd sg. *vidhes* in TS and MS is nevertheless unusual in the point that a god (here Bṛhaspati) is the subject of *vidh*, that could have become the reason for the adoption of another verb *vṛdh* that is sometimes concerned with Bṛhaspati (see 3 above and nn. 8 and 9).

### 3.3. How Was the Form *vṛdhātu* Built?

The most appropriate form would be the 3rd sg. imperative middle of thematic aorist *\*vṛdhatām* ‘[Bṛhaspati] should become larger’ (see 3 above). The use of the active form *vṛdhātu* could have been influenced by the active *vidhes* that can be original in the mantra.

The stem and ending form *-ātu* is still a problem. The form seems to be built from the subjunctive stem *vṛdh-ā-* (e.g., 3rd sg. *\*vṛdhāt*, 3rd du. act. *vṛdhātas* in MS III 11,1:140,9 and KS, VS parallel) and the imperative ending *-tu*. Such a building is seen in a few cases of thematic present: e.g., imper. *svadātu* in MS I 11,1:161,8 (cf. the parallel passage: subj. *svadāti* in KS 13,14:195,18 and TS I 7,7,1; imper. *svadatu* in VS 9,1); imper. *mṛdayātu* in MS II 9,2:121,13 (cf. subj. *mṛdayāti* in KS 17,11:254,15).<sup>11)</sup> There are also some examples at root aorist and s-aorist: 2nd du. act. *karatam*, 3rd du. act. *gamatām*, *karatām*, *yakṣatām*, *matsatām*, 3rd pl. act. *gamantu*, 3rd sg. mid. *rāsatām*, 3rd pl. mid. *rāsantām*.<sup>12)</sup>

*vṛdhātu* in the mantra of TS and MS could have been influenced also by the root aorist imperative *\*ví-dhātu* (cf. *dhātu* RV I 190,8, VI 47,11; *dhātu* X 56,2; *nídhātu* X 11,2) :: subjunctive *\*ví-dhāti* (cf. *ví . . . dhāti* RV II 38,1, see Gotō 2013, 108) as model for analogy. The verb *vidh* should have lain between both. For this phenomenon there are further arguments. The first point is that *vidhes* in TS VI 1,2,5 was explained with *vidadhātu* in the commentary,<sup>13)</sup> and the second point is that a modified mantra in MS I 7,1:109,8–9<sup>14)</sup> has *dadhātu* in the place of *vṛdhātu*. Both indicate the possibility that the verb (*ví-*)*dhā* could have been associated with *vidh* and *vṛdh*.

The stem and ending form *-ātu* could have been built from metrical reason. *vṛdhātu* stands in the cadence of triṣṭubh (– U – –), in a similar way MS I 11,1:161,8 *svadātu naḥ* in the cadence of jagatī (– U – U –), II 9,2:121,13 *mṛdayātu naḥ* in the cadence of anuṣṭubh (U – U –).

**In summary**, the original *vidhes* in the mantra can be supported by [1] the argument

(16) *vidhenāman* and *ṛdhātu* in Yajurvedic Mantras (AMANO)

in TS IV 1,2,5, [2] *vidhema* in KS and VS, [3] the unusual active of *ṛdhātu*, and [4] the irregular stem and ending form *-ātu* that could have been influenced by *\*ví-dhātu*. This irregular form *-ātu* can be caused by [1] modelling after *\*ví-dhātu*, and also by [2] a new building of imperative from subjunctive stem, and [3] from metrical reason.

#### 4. Closing Remarks: A Notice to the 2nd Sg. Opt. *vidhes*

We saw at the two mantras that some problematic uses and forms happened around the 2nd sg. opt. *vidhes*, and it was clear that TS VI 1,2,4–5 avoids the use of *vidhes* in the mantra. I want to remark a probable reasoning that *vidhes* is a word that is not appropriate for a ritualistic use, that is to say a colloquial expression. What can be supportive of that is the variant readings for *vidhes* found in the manuscripts. In I 9,4(2)<sup>p</sup> and I 9,1:131,8<sup>m</sup> *vidhé tvám* and *vidhéḥ tvám* stand in some manuscripts for the right reading *vidhés tvám*.<sup>15)</sup> It is remarkable because *s* before *t* is well preserved in normal cases, and *ḥ* hardly appears before *t*. This could owe to that *vidhéḥ* could have been frequently used in this form, most likely as an exclamation *vidhéḥ!* (or *vidhé* that lost *ḥ*).<sup>16)</sup>

#### Notes

1) This is modelling after the so-called *pañcahotṛ* formula: MS I 9,1:131,7 *agnír hótā=, aśvínādhvaryú, rudró agníd, bṛhaspátir upavaktā*. See Amano 2009, 329 n. 1116.

2) Voegeli (2002, 174 n. 33) comments about *hín* in MS “probably a mistake for the corresponding KS and TĀ III.5.1 *hṛd*,” but both of *hín* and *hṛd* are never used as address to Vācaspati. *hṛd-vidhe* could have been influenced by RV I 24,8 *hṛdayāvīdh-* ‘sticking into heart’ (with *vyadh* ‘stick’), it could have occurred after *vidhenāman-* had no more been understood as connected with *vidh*.

3) This is more probable than the vocative *vidhe* as first member of compound that was argued in Amano (2009, 331 n. 1126). In the argument there, a word (*hin*)*vidhi-* “(dem *hin*-Laut) eine Einteilung gebend” was supposed as referred to in Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa (ŚB) IV 2,2,11 that explains that voice (*vác-*) came into being from the sound *hīm*. But this explanation of ŚB is probably a trial to interpret this difficult mantra of MS (and KS/KapKS). Such an interpretation is sometimes seen in ŚB (e.g., ŚB XII 4,1,7 to MS I 8,3(2), see Amano 2009, 286 n. 854).

4) Catt (2014) argues construction and meaning of *vidh* and its grammatical forms. He denies the etymology of *vidh* from *ví-dhā* by Thieme (1949, 36–37) and Hoffmann (1969, 1–7 [1975, 238–244]). In either case, *vidh* is independent from *ví-dhā* already in RV.

5) See Sakamoto-Gotō 2015, 101 n. 134.

6) *ví-dhā* means ‘partition,’ as used in I 9,3(1):132,8 *sá dásahotāraṃ yajñám ātmānaṃ vyādhatta* ‘He

(Prajāpati) partitioned himself as sacrifice into ten constituents,' so *nāman ví-dhā* could originally mean 'give a name to each part of something.'

7) See Gotō 1989, 142 and 151 n. 6.

8) RV X 14,3 = Atharva-Veda Śaunaka (AVŚ) 18,1,47, MS IV 14,16: 243,4, TS II 6,12,5 *bṛhaspátir ṛkvabhir vāvṛdhāns*.

9) RV X 67,10 = AVŚ 20,91,10, MS IV 12,1:178,2 *bṛhaspátim vṛṣaṇam vardháyantas*.

10) See Ōshima 2007, 213.

11) See Whitney 1889, §740. Further examples are Atharva-Veda Paippalāda (AVP) 16,50,6 *nayātu*; AVP 19,41,11, TĀ II 6,1 *muñcātu*; cf. Whitney 1889, §752c *nudātu*. I thank Dr. Makoto Fushimi for providing me with the examples.

12) See Gotō 2013, 109 and 116; Narten 1964, 185 and 202–203. I thank Prof. Eijirō Dōyama for providing me with the examples.

13) See Keith 1914, to TS VI 1,2,5 n. 2.

14) MS I 7,1:109,8–9 *bṛhaspátir no havīṣā ghṛtēna víchinnaṁ yajñáṁ sám imám dadhātu*.

15) MS I 9,4(2): M1 Sātavalekar *vidhés tvám*; H Bb B Ox VSMP664 *vidhé tvám*. I 9,1: M1 *vidhés tvám*; P *vidhá iti vidhéḥ*; VSMP *vidhéḥ tvám*; B *vidhé*; H Bb *dhidhé*. M1, H, Bb, B are the manuscripts used in ed. Schroeder; P = padapāṭha used in ed. Schroeder; Ox = Oxford manuscript; VSMP = Vaidika Saṁśodhana Maṇḍala (Poona) manuscripts. I thank Prof. Michael Witzel for providing the pictures of Ox and VSMP manuscripts for me and I thank also Dr. Nobuyuki Ikeda for co-operation at reading manuscripts.

16) That can be used like 'Come on!' or 'Help!' in English.

### Abbreviations

VC Bloomfield 1906.

VWC Viśva Bandhu Śāstrī 1942/1976–1963.

### Bibliography

Amano, Kyoko. 2009. *Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā I–II: Übersetzung der Prosapartien mit Kommentar zur Lexik und Syntax der älteren vedischen Prosa*. Münchner Forschungen zur historischen Sprachwissenschaft 9. Bremen: Hempen Verlag.

———. Forthcoming. "Ritual Contexts of Sattrā Myths in the Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā." Paper at the panel "Vrātya Culture in Vedic Sources," XVI World Sanskrit Conference, Bangkok, June 2015.

Bloomfield, Maurice. 1906. *A Vedic Concordance*. Harvard Oriental Series 10. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Caland, Willem. 1953. *Śāṅkhāyana-Śrautasūtra: Being a Major yājñika Text of the Ṛgveda*. Nagpur: International Academy of Indian Culture.

Catt, Adam. 2014. "Studies in Indo-Iranian Historical Linguistics." PhD diss., Kyoto University. <http://hdl.handle.net/2433/188403>.

(18) *vidhenāman and vṛdhātu in Yajurvedic Mantras* (AMANO)

- Gotō Toshifumi 後藤敏文. 1989. “*vācārambhaṇam vikāro nāmadheyam.*” *Indo shisōshi kenkyū* インド思想史研究 6: 141–154.
- Gotō, Toshifumi. 2013. *Old Indo-Aryan Morphology and Its Indo-Iranian Background*. In co-operation with Jared S. Klein and Velizar Sadoski. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Hoffmann, Karl. 1969. “Ved. *vidh*, *vindh*.” *Die Sprache* 15: 1–7; 1975. *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik I*, ed. Johanna Narten, 238–244. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Keith, Arthur Berriedale. 1914. *The Veda of the Black Yajus School Entitled Taittiriya Sanhita*. 2 vols. Harvard Oriental Series 18, 19. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Narten, Johanna. 1964. *Die sigmatischen Aoriste im Veda*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Ōshima Chisei 大島智靖. 2007. “*Vēdasaishiki ni okeru agunishutōmasai no kessai shisō: Yajuruvēda-sanhitā no burāfumana o chūshin ni*” ヲエーダ祭式におけるアグニシュトーマ祭の潔斎思想: ヤジュルヴェーダ・サンヒターのブラーフマナを中心に. PhD diss., Osaka University.
- Sakamoto-Gotō Junko 阪本（後藤）純子. 2015. *Seimei enerugi junksan no shisō: “Rinne to gō” riron no kigen to keisei* 生命エネルギー循環の思想: 「輪廻と業」理論の起源と形成. RINDAS dentō shisō shirīzu RINDAS 伝統思想シリーズ 24. Kyoto: Ryūkoku Daigaku Gendai Indo Kenkyū Sentā.
- Thieme, Paul. 1949. *Untersuchung zur Wortkunde und Auslegung des Rigveda*. Halle (Saale): Niemeyer.
- Viśva Bandhu Śāstrī. <sup>1</sup>1942/<sup>2</sup>1976, 1955, 1956, 1959, 1962, 1963. *Vaidika-Padānukramakośaḥ: A Vedic Word Concordance*. Vol. 1, *Samhitās*. 6 vols. Hoshiarpur: Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute.
- Voegeli, François. 2002. “On the Kāthaka Samhitā Hapax *paśuyajña* and Its Relationship with the *ṣaḍdhotṛ* Mantra.” In *The Vedas: Texts, Language & Ritual; Proceeding of the Third International Vedic Workshop*, ed. Arlo Griffith, 157–178. Groningen Oriental Studies, vol. 20. Leiden: E. Forsten.
- Whitney, William Dwight. 1889. *A Sanskrit Grammar*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

(This research was supported in part by KAKENHI Grant Number 25.40173.)

**Key words** *Yajurveda, Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā, mantra, vidh, vṛdh*

(JSPS Research Fellow, Dr. phil.)