

ADHIKARAṆA (15): *In connection with sacrifices, the Deity must be indicated by means of that name which occurs in the Injunction of the Sacrifice.*

SŪTRA (23).

IN THE MATTER OF THE MANTRA (INDICATING THE DEITY), IT SHOULD BE DONE BY MEANS OF THE TERM THAT IS CONTAINED IN THE INJUNCTION: AS IT IS BY THAT TERM THAT THERE HAS BEEN INJUNCTION

Bhāṣya.

There are the *Darsha-Pūrṇamāsa* sacrifices, laid down in the text—‘Desiring heaven, one should perform the *Darsha-Pūrṇamāsa* sacrifices’; in connection therewith, we read—‘On the Moonless and Full-moon days, one may not fail in offering a cake baked upon eight pans, dedicated to *Agni*’.—Of this deity *Agni*, there are several names—‘*Agni*’, ‘*Shuchi*’, ‘*Pāvaka*’, ‘*Dhūmakētu*’, ‘*Krshānu*’, ‘*Vaishvānara*’, ‘*Shāṇḍilya*’ and so forth.

There arises the following question—In the Mantra-texts indicating the deity (*Agni*), should the Deity be mentioned by *any* one of its several names? Or only by that one name ‘*Agni*’ which occurs in the injunction of the offering?

The *Pūrcapākṣa* is as follows—“It may be mentioned by any one of the names.—Why?—Because all that is meant to be conveyed is the idea of the deity *Agni*; i.e. the Cake has to be connected with the deity *Agni*:—the Deity is to be one that is *Agni*:—it is *Agni* who is to be referred to at the time of making the offering:—now this Deity should be mentioned by a word that may be capable of signifying it:—any one of the several names is capable of signifying the Deity:—hence we conclude that in the Mantra-texts speaking of the Deity, it may be mentioned by any one of the names.”

In answer to this, we have the following *Siddhānta*:—The Deity must be referred to by the name ‘*Agni*’ alone, which is what occurs in the Injunction,—and not by any other of the names, ‘*Shuchi*’ and the rest.—“Why?”—*Because the injunction is by that name*; i.e. the connection between the Deity with the offering has been declared by means of that name.—“How so?”—When the Injunction speaks of the Cake being made ‘*Āgnēya*’ (‘dedicated to *Agni*’) what is meant is that *Agni* should be made its ‘Deity’.

“What do you mean by ‘Deity’?”

There is one opinion that by the term ‘deity’ we understand those beings, Agni and the rest, who are described in *Itihāsas* and *Pūraṇas* as living in Heaven.

Against this opinion there is this that, under that view *Ahaḥ*, *Shārdūla* and the like could not be included under the term—[and yet these have been declared to be *Deities* of certain offerings].—And terms denoting time are found to be spoken of as ‘Deity’, in such texts as—‘This is an offering to *Kāla* (Time)’, ‘the *Māsa* (Month) is the Deity’, ‘*Samvatsara* (Year) is the Deity’.

The other opinion is that—“by the term ‘*dēvatā*’ (‘Deity’) are meant just those to whom the name ‘Deity’ has been applied in the *Mantra* and *Brāhmaṇa* texts, such as—‘*Agni* is the Deity—‘*Ītā* is the Deity,—‘*Sūrya* is the Deity,—‘*Chandramā* is the Deity.”

Under this view also, *Ahaḥ* and the rest do not become included under the term. Further, inasmuch as the generic name ‘Deity’ being scarcely used in common parlance, the meaning of the term would always remain unknown (if its denotation were to rest entirely upon *Mantra* and *Brāhmaṇa* texts).

For these reasons we conclude that *Deities* are those who are *Sūktabhāk* (to whom Hymns are addressed) and *Havirbhāk* (Recipients of offerings).

“Who are ‘*Sūktabhāk*’?”

Those to whom hymns like the following are addressed—‘*Imam stoma-marhatī, etc. rayantava*’ (Rg-Veda)—and ‘*Havirbhāk*’ are those who are mentioned as the recipients of offerings, in texts like—‘*Āgneya-maṣṭākāpālam nirvapēt*’ (‘One should offer the cake baked on eight pans, to *Agni*’): ‘*Āgnīṣomīyamēkādashakapālam*’ (‘One should offer the cake baked upon eleven pans, to *Agni-Soma*’).

Says the Opponent—“If recipients of offerings are ‘Deities’, then, even Pans are ‘Deities’: as these also (containing the offerings) are ‘recipients of offerings’.”

To meet this, that ‘recipient of offerings’ should be the ‘Deity’ for whose sake the offering is made.—Similarly with ‘*Sūktabhāk*’. [it being that to whom Hymns are meant to be addressed]. In this sense we find the term ‘*Dēvatā*’ (‘Deity’) used, in such expressions as—‘*Agnidēvatyam sūktam*’ [‘Hymn addressed to *Agni*’]: in the same way we have the expression ‘*Agnidēvatyam haviḥ*’ [‘the offering to *Agni*’]. Similarly with such expressions as ‘*Atithidēvatyam*’ (‘offered to the guest’), ‘*Pitridēvatyam*’ [‘offered to *Pitrs*’].—Thus the character of ‘Deity’ becomes applicable to all those beings that are spoken of as those to whom anything is offered,—be they corporeal or incorporeal, sentient or insentient;—and in this way the use of the generic term ‘deity’ would also become explicable.

“What if it is so?”

If it is so, then that being becomes the ‘Deity’ of an offering, by whose name the Sacrificer makes the determination ‘I shall present the offering to so and so’.

“ If that be so, then naturally, the Deity *Agni* may be mentioned by any one of its several names.”

The answer to this is as follows:—This would be so if the term ‘*agni*’ were meant to be uttered for the purpose of bringing about the notion of *agni*, *Fire*,—and this thing, *Fire*, also were meant to be connected with the offering. As a matter of fact, however, in the case in question, the term ‘*agni*’ is not pronounced for the purpose of bringing about the notion of the thing, *Fire*; it is only when the purpose in view is meant to be served by the *thing*, that the word is used for bringing about the notion of that thing: in a case however, where there is no need for the *thing*,—and where the purpose is meant to be served by the *word* only, it is the *word* alone whose idea should be brought about for that purpose.—Then again, it is not in its material form that the Deity helps the accomplishment of the sacrifice,—it does so in its verbal form; just as the *Adhvaryu* helps it with his hands, so the Deity helps it with the name. Just as when, in accordance with the injunction—‘*Hotuḥ pānam dvirlēpēnopastrṇāti*’,—though the action bears directly upon his *hands*, yet it is the *Hotṛ priest* himself that is regarded as helping the sacrifice,—in the same manner, even though help is rendered by the Deity through the name connected with itself, yet it is the Deity itself that is regarded as helping the sacrifice. So that, even though what is enjoined is the Deity as helping the sacrifice, yet what enters into the constitution of the sacrifice is the *word* (name, connected with the Deity).—Thus then, the word (‘*agni*’) is not pronounced for the purpose of bringing about the notion of the thing denoted by it, *Fire*. Nor would it be right to take the word as denoting the thing and then, through that denotation, to supply the *name* itself. As that would involve an *indication per indication* (a very complicated process). What happens really is that it is the *word* (name) that is connected with the *offering*, and through its connection with the name, the thing (*Fire*) also comes to be recognised as the Deity. So that the Deity is that being whose name is connected with the offering in the sense that the offering is intended for it; and the act is recognised as being done in reference to the *thing* denoted (*Fire*), only when it is found that it is not possible for the offering to reach the *word*. In the case in question, however, it is possible for the action to take place in reference to the *Word* itself. Hence we conclude that the word is not pronounced for the purpose of bringing about the notion of the thing denoted (*Fire*). This is what has been thus explained by the *Vṛttikāra*—‘The notion of the thing denoted is not preceded by the word; hence the existence of the thing is established (as apart from the word)’.—Thus then, the connection of the *offering* being with the word ‘*agni*’, there can be no possibility of the use of ‘*Shuchi*’ and the other names of *Fire*. Hence when the *Mantra* comes to indicate the Deity, it must make use of that word which occurs in the Injunction.

Says the Opponent—“ In that case it is the *word* that becomes the Deity.”

Answer—This is an idea that it is not for us to refute; because such an idea, if expressed, does not militate against our view; on the contrary it lends all the more strength to the view that ‘*Shuchi*’ and the other names of *Fire* should not be used.

SŪTRA (24).

IN ALL OTHER MANTRAS THE SAME TERM IS USED ; HENCE THAT IS THE NAME THAT IS FOUND EVERYWHERE.

Bhāṣya.

For the following reason also, when the Deity comes to be spoken of, the term used should be the same as that occurring in the Injunction :—“ For what reason ? ”—In the *Mantras*, there is the same one word, which is the word occurring in the Injunction ; that same word is found to be used everywhere in connection with all such (dative) syllables as (a) ‘ *Apāt* ’, (b) ‘ *Ujḡiti* ’ and (c) ‘ *Svāhā* ’.—For instance, (a) in connection with ‘ *apāt* ’, we find the text—‘ *Apāt agnēḥ priyā priyā dhāmāni*, etc.’ ;—(b) in connection with ‘ *ujḡiti* ’, we have the text—‘ *Agnērujḡitimanūjḡeṣam*, etc.’ ;—and (c) in connection with ‘ *svāhā* ’, we have the text—‘ *Svāhā agnim svāhā somam* ’.—Thus then, inasmuch as in every case the term used is the same ‘ *agni* ’ (or ‘ *Soma* ’ or ‘ *Indra* ’), there is no room for the use of any alternative names ;—this is just as we have argued above.

From all this it follows that *in the matter of the Mantra indicating the Deity, it should be done by means of the term that is contained in the Injunction.*