CHAPTER X
HENO RITUALISM OF THE BRĀHMAṆA-TEXTS

Introduction:

Some indologists have understood and occasionally described some of the characteristics of the ancient Indian life and thought in a very effective manner. Max Müller's theory of Henotheism or Kathenotheism can be mentioned as an example in this connection. He has said that in the hymns of the Rg Veda we find 'a successive belief in single supreme gods'. Even though his theory was not accepted by some of the later scholars in its full extent, no other plausible explanation has been offered for the examples given.

1 The theory of henotheism was developed by Max Müller under the influence of the famous philosopher Schelling. Cf. J. Hastings ERE VII.810 b.

2 Cf. Heiman Betty "Kathenotheism and Dānastutis or Kathenotheism and Iṣṭadevatās" ABORI, 28(1949) (p.26 ff) p.32 says, 'Max Müller's term Kathenotheism is the outcome of his vision of the most characteristic basic trends of the vedic, classical and even post-classical indian religions'.

3 Max Müller, Lectures on the origin and growth of religion p.271 and further etc. A History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p.532.

4 For the criticism on henotheism see Oldenberg, Religion des Veda, p.101; Bloomfield Religion of the Veda, p.199; Keith, RPV, p.89.
by Max Müller and such similar ones. I, however, feel that there is not only henotheism and not only in the RV, there is a general 'henoism' in Indian thinking and not only any deity is considered to be supreme successively, but anything which is the subject matter at particular moment becomes the omnipotent, the highest, the only one identical with all etc., for the time being. Henoritualism of the Brāhmaṇa-texts is only a part of that henoism. It is well known that the Brāhmaṇa-texts treat each and every detail in the ritual with the utmost care and importance. Thus Winternitz says, "Every single sacrificial act is treated with the greatest circumstantiality. Enormous importance is attached to the most trivial circumstances, to the least details. Whether an action is to be performed to the left or to the right, whether a pot is to be put in this or that spot on the place of sacrifice, whether a blade of grass is to be laid down with the points to the north or to the north-east, whether the priest steps in front of the fire or behind it, in which direction he must have his face turned, into how many parts the sacrificial cake is to be divided, whether the ghee is to be poured into the northern or the southern half or into the centre of the fire, at which instant the

5 For the henotheism in the post-vedic literature and particularly in the epics, See Gonda Religion in Indiens, I. p. 232.
repetition of a certain spell or the singing of a certain 
song has to take place, these are (questions upon which) 
generations of masters of the art of sacrifice have 
meditated, and which are treated in the most searching manner 
in the Brāhmaṇas."6 In the careful descriptions and explana-
tions of the ritual in the Brāhmaṇa-texts a particular 
henoritualistic tendency is seen. Thus the rite or the 
ritual detail which is in the context, is the only existing 
one in the view point of the Brāhmaṇas. They say that Gods 
obtained heaven by means of it; Prajapati created beings by 
means of it; it is identical with all the worlds, it is 
identical with all the sacrifices, it is identical with 'all'. 
But while describing and praising a rite in this way the 
Brāhmaṇa-texts forget that they have described another rite 
also in the same way. This tendency of successive glorifi-
cation for the time being (with the highest kind of words) 
of a rite in the hand is named here as 'henoritualism' and 
in the following lines various aspects of henoritualism along 
with a few examples are mentioned.

Gods went to the heaven (swarga):

In the henoritualistic praising of any sacrifice or 
any ritual detail the Brāhmaṇa-texts often mention that the

6 Winternitz, Hill p.272
Gods went to the heaven by means of that particular sacrifice or the ritual detail. Now MS I.6.13 clearly says that Gods along with every thing have ascended upto the heaven only once (sakṛḍ) (sakṛḍ vāva devāh sarveṇa sākām svargam lokam samāruksan). But still at different times different rites are said to be used by Gods for obtaining the world of heaven. It will be clearly seen how the Brāhmaṇa-texts remain oblivious of other rites for the time being and consider the rite in the context to be the only one in existence. Thus even though according to the Brāhmaṇa-texts the Gods have gone to the heaven once for all, they must have obtained the heaven by means of not one but several rites which are said to have helped them to obtain it. It is the henoritualistic tendency of the Brāhmaṇa-texts which makes them ascribe the attainment of heaven by Gods wholly and completely to only one particular rite in one particular context, making not even the slightest mention of the other means thereof (which in fact even had been similarly raised up each its own context).

JB III.68 and 300 we are told that by means of the Dvādaśaḥ sacrifice the Gods went to the heaven. JB II.110, however, we read that the gods went to the heaven by means of the Atirātra-sacrifice. About some ritualistic details also it is said that by means of them the Gods went to the heaven. Thus, for example, the Nakasad-bricks (TS V.3.7.1,
KPKS XXXI.17), the Upasad-offerings (KPKS XL.5) the Prāyanīyaday (JB.II.377), the sacrificial post (yupa) (KPKS XLI.2), the meters (TS V.2.3.4; KPKS XLV.5), the Prayājas (SB. XI 2.7.26), etc. In connection with many sāmans also obtainment of svarga by means of them is mentioned. Thus, JB III.67 we read the Gods were desirous of the heaven and they having practised penance saw the sāman named Vairājasāman and obtained the heaven (JB III.67). The same thing is told about sāmans like Śyena-sāman {JB III.158}, Dīrghasāman (JB.III.162), Plavasāman (JB III.195) etc. The Abhiārta-sāman (TMB IV 3.2), Parāka-sāman (TMB XXV 8.2), the Brhat-sāman are also said to have been helpful to Gods in obtaining the heaven. JB.III.253 makes a very interesting statement — The Gods when they went to the heaven by means of the Trirātra sacrifice, went to it by means of this (Sāmkṛti) sāman. Here the Brāhmaṇa forgetting the same statements in connection with other rites assume that the Gods went to the heaven by means of the Trirātra-sacrifice and then again by means of the Sāmkṛti-sāman. Thus the Brāhmaṇa-texts show a henoritualistic tendency.

Removal of the Asuras:

Different rites are connected with the removal of the Asuras at different places. It is said there that the Asuras were removed by means of those individual rites. Now, the removing of evil beings like Asuras who were antagonistic to
the Gods and to their sacrifice was very important for the sake of safe and correct performance of the sacrifice. In order to get the desired result of the sacrifice correct performance of it was required and the removal of the Asuras was an essential factor in the correct performance of the sacrifice. Therefore in praising any rite or any ritual detail it is often said that by means of that rite or ritual detail Asuras were removed. In connecting any rite or the ritual detail with the removal of the Asuras, the Brāhmaṇa texts show themselves to be perfectly oblivious of the fact that the same thing has been told in connection with some other rites.

Thus when the Gods and the Asuras were trying to win these worlds the Gods are said to have removed the Asuras from these worlds by means of the sixth day in the Dvādasāha sacrifice (AB V.II). According to TMB XVI.2.2 the Gods removed the Asuras by means of an ekāha named Go (gava vai devā asurānebhyo lokebhyo'nudanta). But the same sentence is repeated in connection with another sacrifice named Goṣṭoma which is an atirātra and Gods are said to have removed the Asuras by means of it (TMB XX.6.1). MS.I.10.5 we are told that Prajāpati removed Asuras by means of the Cāturmāṣya-sacrifices; but TB II.2.4.6 we read that Prajāpati removed the Asuras from these worlds by means of the Triṇava stoma. Ritual details such as anunirvāpya (KB II.2) Prayājas(TS II.6.1.3)
etc. are also said to have helped the Gods in removing away the Asuras.

Connection with Creation:

In praising henoritualistically a rite or a ritual detail the Brāhmaṇa-texts connect it with the creation of all the beings. Thus, for example, Prajāpati is said to have created, all the being by means of the Vaisvadeva-parvan in the Cāturmāṣya-sacrifice (ŚB II.5.2.1; V.2.4.1.KB V.3; TB I.6.8.1). But elsewhere it has been said that Prajāpati created the beings by means of the whole of the Cāturmāṣya-sacrifice (MS I.10.1). Similarly in connection with the other sacrifices also it is said that Prajāpati created the beings by means of those sacrifices. Thus at different places Prajāpati is said to have created the beings by means of Agnīṣṭoma (TS VII.1.1.2; JB I.67), Apūrva-sacrifice (JB.II.174), Viśvājita sacrifice (JB II.184) Prajāpatya-sacrifice (JB II.288), Viśvasťāmayana-sacrifice (TMB AAAV.18.2), Prajāpatheḥ Saptarātra-sacrifice (TMB AAAII.5.3), fourth Pancādaśarātra-sacrifice (TMB AAAIII.9.2) etc. Sometimes some ritual details are connected with the creation. Thus Prajāpati is said to have created the beings by means of the stombhāgas (KPKS AAAI.17, TS V.3.5.5), Triṃṭ-stoma (MS.III.6.7 KPKS AAAVI.1), Āmaḥīyava-sāman (TMB VI.5.1), Viṣṇukramas (ŚB VI 7.4.1;7; etc.

Sometimes some ritual details are praised by saying that Prajāpati took the forms of those ritual details (or like that) and created the beings etc. In the Agnicayana ceremoney a
tortoise (κūrma) is to be laid down as a brick. To this it is added that Prajāpati created the beings having become a tortise (ŚB VII 5.1.5). Having become Saḍḍhota, Prajāpati created all this (TB II.3.2.3). In praising the Āśvasāman it is said that Prajāpati has created all the beings by means of the Āśvasāman having himself become a horse (aśva) (JB III.11). Thus these ritual details are connected with the creation.

Some ritual details are connected with the creation but Prajāpati does not appear there as the creator. Thus TB III.12.9.4 praising henoritualistically the Sahasrasamvatsara-sattra says that Visvasṛj Gods created all this universe by means of this sacrifice. While praising the Pāncavimsāstoma it is said that Manu created the beings by means of it (MS III.10.3). While prescribing that water is to be sprinkled upon the animal which is to be offered in the soma-sacrifice, MS III.10.1 says that from waters the beings are born (adbhva vai prajāh prajāvante). Following the śukra and manthin soma cups the beings - both the eaters and the eaten are born (TS VI.40.10.4). KPKS ALIV.1, however, says that when the Āgrayaṇa-vessel is used all the beings are born following it. According to ŚB IV.3.1.22 and 25 one who has taken the Ātugrahas has created all this.

TMB VI.9.15 gives the details of the creation done by Prajāpati by means of the Pratipad with the words ete asramam etc.
By means of the word *ete* Prajāpati created the Gods. By (the word) *asgarām* he created men; by (the word) *indavaḥ* he created the fathers, by the words *tirah pavitram* he created the soma cups, by the word *āśavaḥ* he created the stotra, by the word *visvāni* he created the *śastra*, and by (the words) *abhi saubhagena* he created other beings (cp. TMB XII.1.3; JB I.94).

Thus it will be seen how the Brāhmaṇa-texts in order to praise any ritual detail connect it with the creation. In doing this for one ritual detail they consider that thing only. They seem to forget for the time being that such connection with the creation has been maintained by them elsewhere with some other things also.

**Identification with the worlds**:

In the henoritualistic way of the description of a rite or a ritual detail the Brāhmaṇa-texts sometimes identify it with the worlds or the world. Thus JB III.320 says that the Dvādasāha is identical with these worlds. Earlier JB II.284 has identified the Trirātra sacrifice with these worlds. ŚB XIII.6.1.7 identifies the Puruṣamedha with these worlds. Some ritual details are also identified with these worlds. Thus the firepan (*ukhā*) is said to be identical with these worlds (ŚB VI.5.2.17 VI.6.2.1; VII.5.1.27;2.1). ŚB VI.5.3.3 says further that while one makes the firepan one makes these worlds.
The fire which is being built up is also identified with these worlds (ŚB VI.7.1.16; VII.3.1.13). Similarly the sruc (TB III.3.1.2), the Pravargya (ŚB XIV.3.2.23); the meters (JB I.132); the Gayatrapārśvasāman (JB III.214); the Ājayadhasamans (TMB XXI.2.7), the Svarasāmans (AB IV.19) etc. are identified with these worlds.

The barhis is identified with this world (ŚB I.9.2.29). Similarly the built up Agni is identified with this world (ŚB I.5.4.1). The svayamātriṇa brick is identified with these (three) worlds (ŚB VII.4.2.8) and this (earth) (ŚB VII.4.2.1). The Aśadhā brick is also said to be identical with this (earth) (ŚB VII.4.2.3.2).

It will thus be seen how the Brāhmaṇa-texts show awareness of the contextual thing only and they identify it with all the worlds or this world etc. They, the time being appear to be totally unconscious of the fact that they are identifying at different places different things with the three worlds and considering the thing in the hand as the only one existing.

Identification with vajra (thunderbolt):

In hereditary praises of some ritual details the Brāhmaṇa-texts often identify those details with the vajra which represents vigour (cf. vīryam vajrah ŚB I.3.5.7; cp.VII. 5.2.24 etc.) and is the instrument by means of which the active
fighter or energetic champion of the welfare of man-kind, the weather-god rouses, generates or makes accessible the powers and substances which mean food and life. It also removes the evil spirits. So identifying something with vajra is a very effective way of praising it. When the Brāhmaṇa-texts praise anything by identifying it with the vajra they totally forget for the time being that they have identified some other things also with the vajra. Thus, for example, the Ṣoḍasi-saman has been identified with the vajra (e.g. TMB III.13.14). But at the same place the Ṣakvarī-verses are also identified with the vajra. Elsewhere the Pañcadaśa-stoma is also said to be identical with the vajra (TMB II.4.2). Similarly the himkara (KB III.2; JB I.315), the vaṣaṭkara (AB III.8, KB III.5, ŠB I.3.3.14 etc.) clarified butter (ajya) (ŠB III.5.4.2, VI.3.1.39), the sacrificial post (AB II.1.3; KB X.I.etc) etc. are also identified with the vajra.

Identification with 'this one who shines (va ṭa tapati)':

The Brāhmaṇa-texts identify at different times different rites henoritualistically with 'This one who shines (va ṭa tapati) i.e. the sun! Thus ŠB x.6.5.8 we read 'this verily is the Aṣvamedha who this shines'. Similarly about the Agniṣṭoma we read 'That this Aṣṇiṣṭoma is verily who this shines'

7 J. Gonda Viṣṇuism, p.52.
(JB I.314; cp. AB III.44; GB II.4.10). The same remark is found in the case of the Dv阿daśaha sacrifice (JB III.373;386) and the V阿japeya sacrifice (GB.II.5.8) also. Not only the sacrifices but ritual details like vaṣṭ阿k鰾a (ŚB XI.2.2.5); the sv阿h鰾a (ŚB XIV 1.3.26); the sacrificer (JB I.62) are also said to be identical with the 'one who shines and each time the Br阿hmana-texts forget that other things are also described in the same manner.

**Identical with the year (Samvatsara):**

The Br阿hmana-texts henoritualistically identify the rite in their hands with the year. Thus the Agniṣṭoma has been identified with the year (Samvatsara) (Kaś. III.8.10; IV.5.7; Kaś XLI.1. JB II.304). Similarly the C鰾ur鰾a-sacrifices (Ma.5.1.10.7); the Sautr阿man鰾 sacrifice (ŚB XII.8.2.31;36); the fire which has been built up (ŚB VI.7.1.18), the Saḍaha (Kaś XIX.10), the Sarvastoma (JB II.279), the Pravargya (ŚB XIV 3.2.22) etc. are identified with the year. While identifying one rite with the year the Br阿hmana-texts do not take into consideration that they have identified many other rites also with the year. The Br阿hmana-texts are busy with the rite in their hands only. They care of it only and for the time being only. This is henoritualism.

**Identification with Praṇa:**

The Br阿hmana-texts in order to praise any ritual detail
identify it with Prāṇas - the vital airs; breaths etc. They thereby imply that as the Prāṇas are important for life of a man similarly that particular detail is also of very much importance for the sacrifice which is also considered as a man. At different times different things are said to be identical with Prāṇas. While identifying something with Prāṇas the Brāhmaṇa-texts totally forget that they have identified some other things also with the Prāṇas. Thus JB II.255 says that in the Trirātra sacrifice everyday there are ājidohas. The Brāhmaṇa-text further tells that the ājidohas are identical with the Prāṇas. Therefore one who uses them becomes firmly established in Prāṇas. While telling the importance of the kūrmeṣṭaka in the Agnicayana ceremony, ŚB VII.5.1.7 describes that the kūrma (tortoise) is identical with Prāṇa. The Prāṇa makes all these beings; therefore when the kūrmeṣṭaka is put, Prāṇa is put in the fire which is being built. But elsewhere the bricks named Svayamātrīṇṇā (ŚB VII.4.2.8), Aṣādhā (ŚB VII.4.2.36), the Prāṇabhṛt-bricks (ŚB VII.1.1.1) the Viṣvajyotis-brick (ŚB VIII 3.2.4 etc.), the Vālakhilya-bricks (ŚB VII.3.4.1) are also identified with Prāṇas and similar remarks are made there. The seventh layer is also identified with the Prāṇas by ŚB VIII.7.4.21 while ŚB IA.2.1.17 identifies the whole built up fire with Prāṇas. Thus the heno-ritualism is obvious here.
Elsewhere other things are also identified with the Prañās. Thus the ninth day in the Dvādasāha (TS VII.2.8.4), the Vāmadeva sāman (JB III.301), the Gārhapatya-fire (JB I.61), the vaṣaṭkara (ŚB IV.2.1.19) the Prayājas (ŚB XI 2.7.21) etc. While JB III.301 has identified the Vāmadevyā-sāman with Prañās, ŚB IX.1.2.32 identifies all the sāmans in general with the Prañās. JB I.111 says: Prajāpati created the beings. He created them without Prañās. By means of this (Gāyatra) Sāman he put prāna (breath) in them. Thus the Gāyatra-sāman is also connected with the Prañās. According to JB II.136 and ŚB VIII.4.1.3 the stones are identical with the Prañās. Thus whatever rite or ritual detail is in hand that is the supreme to the Brähmana-texts and they praise it with the same kind in which they have praised the other rite or ritual detail.

Identification with Prajāpati:

The Brähmana-texts at different places identify different rites or ritual details with Prajāpati. While identifying a rite or a ritual details with Prajāpati they forget that elsewhere they have identified another rite or another ritual detail with Prajāpati. Thus, for example, JB I.139 and II.15 we find that the Vāmadevyā-sāman is identified with Prajāpati. But elsewhere Rathantara (JB I.231) and Vairāja (TMB XVI.5.17) sāmans are also said to be identical with Prajāpati. Similarly
the Asvamedha is identified with Prajāpati by SB AIII.2.2.13; 4.1.15 but elsewhere when it is a matter of praising the Dronakalasa it is also said to be identical with Prajāpati (SB IV.3.1.6). Elsewhere other sacrifices like Dvadasāha (AB IV.25, JB III.372;376), Āgrayana (TS VI.4.5.11, 5.7.1; are identified with Bṛha) 8.1. KPKS ALIII.9). Though the Dvadasāha sacrifice is said to be identical with Prajāpati, when it is a matter of the tenth day of that sacrifice this tenth day is also described as being identical with Prajāpati (JB II.4.29; III.308). Elsewhere the Prātaranuvāka (JB II.37) and Hīmkāra (TMB VI. 8.5) are also identified with Prajāpati. Thus the Brāhmaṇa-texts while identifying a rite with Prajāpati forget that they have elsewhere identified another rite with Prajāpati. They while describing a particular thing think that that rite alone is existing and try to give it the highest position by identifying it with Prajāpati whose importance is very high in the view of the Brāhmaṇa-texts.

Limbs of the sacrifice-man:

The sacrifice is often conceived either directly or indirectly as a man. Various ritual details are metaphorically described as the limbs of that sacrifice-man. It is, however, interesting to see the heroiuralism here also. Thus the Brāhmaṇa-texts as usual forget for the time being all the other rites and their descriptions. Many ritual details are
described in the same manner. Many things are said to be the head of the sacrifice e.g. the Prātarunuvāka (AB II.21), sacrificial cake (prāpasā) (MS IV.1.9), fire-pan (ukha) (SB VI.5.3.8), Ātithya (SB III.2.3.20, KPKS XXXVIII.1), Pravārgya (SB III.4.4.1), havirdhāna (SB III.5.3.2) etc. Many things are said to be the eye or the eyes of the sacrifice e.g. uktha as the eye (TS VI.5.1.4); ājyabhāga (SB I.6.3.2; MS I.7.4; KPKS VIII.5) the Sukrāmanthins etc. as the eyes (TS VI.4.10.3) the Agniṣṭoma sacrifice (KB XIX.8 MS IV.4.10), Soma-pressing stones (MS IV.6.1), the Āgnīdhra priest (MS IV.8.3); the Bahispavamāna (AB II.22), the juhu (MS III.1.1) etc. are described as the mouth of the sacrifice. It may be seen how the Brāhmaṇa-texts identify different things at different times with the same thing forgetting the others and this is henoritualism.

The Sacrifice:

The Brāhmaṇa-texts sometimes henoritualistically describe a particular sacrifice as the sacrifice. Thus TMB VI.3.1f we read 'This verily is the sacrifice namely the Agniṣṭoma. For any other sacrifice is performed for obtaining one desire only and the Agniṣṭoma for all.' Now here Agniṣṭoma is said to be the sacrifice for by means it all the desires are obtained and no other sacrifice can be able to fulfill all the desires according to TMB VI.3.1f. But this cannot be taken too literally. For in the cases of other sacrifices also the results of
fulfilling all the desires are told e.g. Dvādaśāha (TMB 1. 5.14), Cāturmāśya-sacrifices (GB II.1.26) Vajapeya (SB V.1.1.8) etc. This will show how the Brāhmaṇa-texts in their henoritualistic descriptions forget the other rites for the time being. The Vajapeya sacrifice is also described as the sacrifice. Thus TB I.3.2.5 describes the Vajapeya as the sacrifice. There we are told that Prajāpati gave all the sacrifices to the Gods but reserved the Vajapeya for himself. Then the Gods said 'Vajapeya is the sacrifice'. Here it is interesting to note that a similar story of Prajāpati and Gods (about Aśvamedha) describes Aśvamedha as the sacrifice. (TB.III.8.14.1; cp. SB XIII.2.1.1). In connection with the Ājayabhāgas also similar story is told. Thus Prajāpati gave all the sacrifices to the Gods but reserved the Ājayabhāga for himself. Then the Gods said; "This is the sacrifice namely the ājya" (TS.II.6.3.1) It will be clear now how, for the time being, the Brāhmaṇa-texts, consider a sacrifice or a ritual detail as the sacrifice, forgetting other rites. This is what can be called henoritualism.

The sacrifice is this much :

In praising any rite or ritual detail the Brāhmaṇa-texts henoritualistically say that the sacrifice is this much only. Thus we often read 'The sacrifice, verily, is as much as the Agniṣṭoma (stāvan vai (JB vāva) yojno yavanagnistomah.
TS VI.4.10.1; KS XXII.1 XXVIII.1; KPKS XLIV.1; JB I.179; TÂ V.6.3). ŚB VIII.1.2.10 remarks about the Prānavrdd-istakās that all the sacrifice is this much. But the same ŚB elsewhere makes the same remark about the Nakasadiṣṭakās (ŚB VIII. 6.1.10). MS IV.6.5 we are told that the sacrifice is as much as the ukthyaagraha; but KS XXVII.7 says that the sacrifice is as much as the Śukra and Manthin grahas. While praising henorirtualistically the three vedas ŚB VII.5.3.8 says 'The sacrifice is as much as this three-fold knowledge'; cp. ŚB V.5.5.10) TS.I.7.5.2 remarks that the sacrifice is as much as the portion of the sacrificer (vajamanabhāga) TB I.8.7.2 says that the sacrifice is as much as the (three) Pavamānas (viz. Bahiṣpavamāna, Madhyandinapavamāna and Arbhavapavamāna). Thus, it will be seen how at different places different sacrifices and different ritual details are said to be equal to the sacrifice without remembering the existence of others at each time.

A part is identical with the whole:

The henorirtualistic tendency of the Brāhmaṇa-texts is also seen when we find that some particular ritual detail is identified with the whole sacrifice. Thus for the time being that part is shown to be identical with the whole. Thus, for example, the black antelope's skin (krṣṇajinam) is often identified with the sacrifice. In the Sautrāmaṇi sacrifice
the sacrificer is consecrated on a black antelope's skin. Then it is said that such a skin is identical with the sacrifice and the sacrificer then becomes consecrated in the whole sacrifice (ŚB III.8.3.3). For the black antelope's skin and the sacrifice identification see also ŚB III.2.1.8;28; VI.4.1.6; 7.1.6; IX 3.4.10 etc.) But elsewhere other things are also identified with the sacrifice and the Brāhmaṇa-texts forget in each case any other ritual detail being identical with the sacrifice according to their own statements elsewhere. Thus ŚB III.9.3.3 the carriage (anās) is identified with the sacrifice. TB III.9.8.2-3 we are told that in the process of the Aśvamedha a cow is to be seized. Then the cow is there said to be identical with the sacrifice and it is added that by seizing the cow one seizes the sacrifice. ŚB II.2.4.13 also identifies the cow with the sacrifice and adds the reasoning that no sacrifice is performed without a cow. Many times waters are said to be identical with the sacrifice. Thus when in the Dārsapūrṇamāsa sacrifices, waters are said to be laid down TB III.2.4.1 says that waters are identical with the sacrifice and when one leads waters one has led the sacrifice. For the identification of the waters and the sacrifice see also AB II.20; KB XII.10; ŚB I.1.1.2 etc. Similarly many other ritual details are also identified with the sacrifice e.g. the ājya (ŚB XII.8.1.18;19; TB III.8.4.1;) the animals (ŚB III.1.4.14; 2.3.11); the prastara (ŚB III.4.3.19)
the somagrahās (ŚB Iā 3.2.10); the oblation (āhūti) (ŚB III. 1.4.1; VII.5.2.23); the svāhākāra (ŚB III.1.4.27; Iā 2.3.44); the Hotṛ priest (ŚB ÂIV.3.1.34) etc.

The part and whole identification is also seen elsewhere. Thus the Mahadukthā is said to be identical all the ṛc verses (ŚB ÂI.1.1.5). The Mahāvratā-sāman is identical with all the Sāmans (ŚB ÂI.1.1.5). Kṛṣṇa identifies the Anuśṭubha metre with all the metres while the Aticchandhas metre is identical with all the metres according to ŚB III.3.2.11; IV.4.5.7; V 4.3.22 TS.V.3.8.3 etc. AB I.6 however, maintains that by using the Vīvṛt metre one possesses the power of all the metres, obtains the association and similarity of all the metres. It is interesting to note thus that at each place when any particular thing is in the context that becomes identical with the sacrifice and a part for the time being is supposed to be identical with the whole. In doing this the Brahmaṇa-texts forget for the time being all the other ritual details and forget that they are elsewhere said to be identical with the sacrifice or with the whole class and give their attention only to the contextual thing.

No sacrifice without it:

In describing the importance of any particular ritual details the Brahmaṇa-texts point out that without it there is no sacrifice. So that thing for the time being they describe
to be of the highest importance and of the essential nature for the sacrifice itself. Thus it is not a sacrifice where there is no säman (avyājño vā esa yo'sāma) (TB II.1.5.6). It is not a sacrifice where there are no (deva) patnī (mantra)s (avyājño vā esa yo'patnīkah) (TB II.2.2.6). It is not a sacrifice where there is no sacrificer's wife (avyājño vā esa yo'patnīkah) (TB III.3.3.1). "It is not a sacrifice which is devoid of Agni (avyājño vā esa yo'hagnih)" (KB VII.7). It is not a sacrifice where no stoma is used (avyājño vā esa yatra stomē na vuiyate) (MS I.5.5.). Thus it will be seen that for the different times being the säman, the devapatnī-mantras, the sacrificer's wife etc. are considered to be of so much importance that without them there is no sacrifice. At the time of making this statement in one case the Brāhmaṇa-texts forget that they have made similar statements in connection with the other rites also. Similarly MS I.10.17 says that the sacrifice is sacrifice not because of the dhānas nor because of the mantha; it is sacrifice because of the sacrificial cake (purodāśa). MS III.6.4 quotes the opinion of Aruṇa Anpavesi according to whom "what will he sacrifice with the sacrifice, he who does not know the materials (sambhāras) of the sacrifice?" KB XVI.5 says that the sacrifice is extended (performed) by means of the ghee and soma. Here also the Brāhmaṇa-texts in order to maintain the importance of the sacrificial cake, the materials (sambhāras) or the ghee and soma try to make them the essence of the
sacrifice forgetting for the time being that there are also other essential things.

**All the sacrifices:**

In the henoritualistic descriptions the Brāhmaṇa-texts often describe a sacrificial rite as representing all the sacrifices. Thus MS I.8.6 we are told that in the Agnihotra all the sacrifices are included. The sacrificer having the knowledge (mentioned by Sañc) of Agnihotra (IV.1.1ff. and 2.1) performs the Agnihotra has sacrificed with all the sacrificial rites according to Sañc IV.1.16 and 2.1. JB I.4 and 38 ff we are told that the Agnihotra includes other sacrifices. Similarly the Agniṣṭoma (AB III.39-41 cp.II.49; JB.I.49; II.177); the Rājasūya (ŚB V.3.6.9; 10.4.5.14; 5.5.11); the Traidhātavi offering in the Rājasūya (TS II.4.11.2ff cp. KS XII.4). The Agnicayana, (ŚB I.1.5 1 ff), the sacrifice named Kuṇḍapayinām ayanam (TMB XXV.4.3) are said to be representing all the sacrifices. The Vājapeya (TB.I.3.4 if KS XIV.9) and the Samvatsarasattra (ŚB XII.3.5.3 ff) are also said to be including in themselves many other sacrifices. The Brāhmaṇa-texts try to show whatever sacrifice is in their hand at a time to be the only greatest one. They give all the attributes possible to it and forget others. But at different times different sacrifices become prominent. This is due to the henoritualistic tendency.
Supremecy etc.:

The Brāhmaṇa-texts describe the rite in their hand to be the supreme, the highest etc. for the time being. Thus the Sarvamedha is said to be the supreme (parama) among all the sacrifices (ŚB XIII.7.1.2). But elsewhere Trirātra-sacrifice is said to be the supreme (parama) (TS V.4.12.1) and the highest (varsīṣṭhah) (JB II.284). The second Sāhasra sacrifice is also said to be supreme (TMB XVI.9.2). Sarvajyotis sacrifice is also according to TMB XVI.4.2 the supreme (parama) sacrifice. TS VII.4.10.1 and KS XXXIII.2 quote the opinion of the Brahmavadins according to whom the Atirātra is the supreme sacrifice. Dwādaśāha is said to be the best sacrifice (śreṣṭhavajña) of all the sacrifices (AB IV.26). Agniṣṭoma is also said to the chief sacrifice (jvēṣṭhavajña) (TMB VI.3.8.10; cp. JB I.67; II.378).

TB I.3.6.8 says that the nīvāras form the supreme (parama) food of the Gods, but elsewhere it says that that stoma is the supreme (parama) food of the Gods. At different places different stomas are said to be supreme. Thus according to TMB III.3.2 the Trayastrimśastoma is the supreme of all the stomas, while according to KB XII.6 Ekavimśa Čatuṣṭoma is the supreme (see also KB XV.5; XVI.7). According to AB IV.19 Čatuṣtrimśa is the top-most (uttamaḥ). The Trivṛt-stoma is also said to be both the lowest (avama) and the supreme (parama).
(J.B.I.248; TS.VII.1.3.3). Thus the Brahmana-texts try to describe the rite in their hand as supreme while forgetting that they have described other rites to be supreme for other times being. This is heroritualism.

All the desires are fulfilled:

From the viewpoint of the heroritualism connection of a rite with the attainment of all the desires is very important. There are various sacrifices and they are performed for obtaining various results. Still in order to praise heroritualistically the rite in the context of Brahmana-texts connect it with the attainment of all the desires. Now if there is any sacrifice which can fulfill all the desires why there are other sacrifices? And if any sacrifice only can help to get all the desired objects how some other sacrifices are also described in the same way? This can be explained on the basis of the heroritualism. The Brahmana-texts for the time being consider the rite in the hands as the omnipotent one. But at another time they consider another rite as the omnipotent one. Thus for example in connection with the Agnistoma the TMB VI.3.2 says that any other sacrifice is performed for only one desire; but the Agnistoma is performed for all the desires. This is not true. The Brahmana-texts maintain that there is 'plurality' of results. Thus one rite can give many results. So there are sacrifices which can give results more than one. Similarly there are sacrifices other than the
Agniṣṭoma which can give all the desired results according to the Brāhmaṇa-texts themselves. So the description of the Agniṣṭoma here is obviously henoritualistic. Let us see some examples of the sacrifices which are connected with all the desires. Thus for example the Dwadasāha with transposed meters (TMB X.5.14); the long sacrificial session of one year or more (ŚB IV.5.1.12); Āśvamedha (e.g. TS.V.4.12.3); Viṣajit Sarvaprṣṭha sacrifice (TS.VII.1.10.4); Second Sāhasra sacrifice (TMB XVI.9.4); Sarvajit sacrifice (TMB XVI.7.2); Puruṣamedha (ŚB XIII.6.2.10) etc. are said to be able to give all. Some ritual details also can give all. Thus the Okonidhana Vaitahavya ūsamān (JBI.214); Āpālasamān (JBI I.221); Aurnāyavasamān (JBI.III.76); Jarābodhīyasamān (JBI.I.97) and many other samāns are connected with the obtainment of all the desires. The Prataruvaṣa is to be recited without any measure. That is for obtaining all the desires. (AB II.19).

Identical with 'all' (Sarva):

While praising a rite the Brāhmaṇa-texts henoritualistically identify that rite with 'all'. As usual, the Brāhmaṇa-texts forget the other rites while identifying one rite with 'all'. Thus the Puruṣamedha (e.g. ŚB XIII.6.1.3); the Agnihotra (ŚB XIV 3.2.26); Čāturmāsa-sacrifices (ŚB XIV.3.2.28 etc.) the Pravargya (ŚB XIV.3.2.22 ff); the Upāmsūgraha (ŚB IV.1.1.5); Āgrayaṇagraha (ŚB IV.2.2.1 ff); Asūgraha (ŚB IV.6.3.15) etc. are identified with 'all'.
Shower of Praises:

The Brāhmaṇa-texts wax eloquent while praising a rite in their hand and at that time they make a shower of praises. Thus in connection with the Aśvamedha we read "Verily this is the sacrifice called strengthful (prabhu),...Plentuous (vibhu)...obtainment (vyāṣṭi),... distinction (vidhṛti),... reverence (vyāvṛtti),... food-obtaining (urjasvān),... milkful (payasvān),... abounding in Brahman-splendour (brahmavarcasi),... excelling in hunting (ativyādhi),... long one (dīrgha),... adaptness (kāpti),... firm foundation (pratistha)" (ŚB III.3.7.1 ff; TB III.9.19.1 ff). Similarly TS II.5.6.2 ff we get an eulogy of the Darśapūrṇamāsa sacrifices. The new and full moon sacrifices are the chariot of the Gods ... are the limbs and joints of the year ... are the eyes of the year ... are the striding of the Gods ... are path on which the Gods fare... are the bay steeds of the Gods ... (TS II.5.6.2 ff).

Concluding observations:

From the above given examples it will be clearly seen how the Brāhmaṇa-texts are henoritualistic in their attitude. Each contextual rite becomes the only existing rite for the time being according to the Brāhmaṇa-texts. These texts give the same kinds of high praises to each rite successively and while praising one rite they seem to forget all the rest. Some of the devices to which we may draw special attention are
following: - connection of a rite with the creation of the beings etc., considering a part as identical with the whole sacrifice or considering a sacrifice identical with all the sacrifices, connecting a rite with the fulfilment of all the desires, identifying with 'all' etc. It may be added that the henoritualism of the Brāhmaṇa-texts is worth noticing for it is an important link between the 'ritualism' and the 'spiritualism' of the Brāhmaṇa-texts. Thus it is often told above that by means of the henoritualistic way of praising of a sacrifice or a sacrificial rite the Brāhmaṇa-texts want to show that that sacrifice or the sacrificial rite is of importance or is inevitable in the performance. This is ritualism. But this henoritualism also assures that even one rite is sufficient to give you everything. So if you are not able to do something it does not matter. Thus there is no rigidity; no stress on mere "letter" but on "spirit".

Secondly the henoritualism which as I think is only a part of the general henoism is closely connected with the latent monism which is seen more prominently in Upaniṣads and other literature. In the Rgveda I.164.46 we have already got the line ekām sad viprā bahudhā vadanti (the truth which is one, the wise persons describe it variously). Thus the monistic ideas are present in the Rgveda. In the ŚB I.5.2.20 we get a similar monistic thought which is connected with the ritual and is also of the henoritualistic nature. Thus
in describing the fire altar (which is built up) in an
essoteric (adhyatmik) way and understanding it a divine being
ŚB 1.5.2.20 says 'That same (divine being) the adhvaryus
serve under the name of 'Agni' (fire altar) and 'yajus' because
he holds together (vuj) all this (universe). The chandogas
(Sāmaveda-priests) under that of 'Sāman' because in him all
this (universe) is one and the same (Samana) the bahvīcas
(the Rgveda-priests) under that of 'Uktham' because he
originates (utthāpar) everything here; those skilled in sorcery
under that of 'yatu (sorcery)' because everything here is
held in check (vata) by him; the serpents under that of 'viśa
(poison) the snake-charmers under that of 'sarpa(snake)'
the Gods under that of 'urg (strengthening food)'; men under
that of ravi (wealth) the Asuras under that of māyā (magic
power); the fathers under that of svadha; those knowing the
divine host under that of 'devajana (divine host)'; the
Gandharvas under that of rūpa (form) the Apsaras under that
of 'Gandha (fragrance)' - thus in whatsoever form they serve
him that indeed he becomes and having become that he is
helpful to them. A very much similar idea is found in a
verse of Hanumānāṭaka I.3; where Viśṇu is described to be
worshipped under different names and forms by different
thinkers. Thus the worshippers of Śiva worship him as Śiva;
the vedāntins as the Brahma; the buddhists as the buddha,
the naiyāyikas as kartā, the jainas as the Arhat and the
mīmāṃsakas as Karma. Similar ideas can be found in Ganeshmimnaḥ
stotra verse 2; Śivamahimnah stotra verse etc. Thus the henoritualism and the henoism in general are closely connected with the monism and thus with the spiritualism.

**Summarily we may say** -

1. The Brāhmaṇa-texts reflect throughout a henoritualistic tendency in their dealing with the ritual.

2. The henoritualism is broadly speaking considering the rite in the hand as only the one existing and praising each rite successively in the same or similar ways.

3. The henoritualism is a part of general henoism observed in Indian literature and way of thinking and the both are closely connected with the monism. Thus the henoritualism is a link between the ritualism and spiritualism of the Brāhmaṇa-texts.