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Nu viśesho'sti varṇānāṁ sarvam brāhmaṁ idam jagat
Brahmaṇā prāva-srīṣṭaṁ hi karmabhū varṇatāṁ gatam!
Mahābhārata.

"There is no distinction of castes. This world, which, as created by Brāhma, was at first entirely Brahmanic, has become divided into classes in consequence of men's works."—See pages 138 and 140.
PREFACE.

The main object which I have proposed to myself in this volume is to collect, translate, and illustrate the principal passages in the different Indian books of the greatest antiquity, as well as in others of comparatively modern composition, which describe the creation of mankind and the origin of classes, or which tend to throw light upon the manner in which the caste system may have arisen.

I have not, however, hesitated to admit, when they fell in my way, such passages explanatory of the cosmogonic or mythological conceptions of the Indians as possess a general interest, although not immediately connected with the chief subject of the book.

Since the first edition appeared my materials have so much increased that the volume has now swelled to more than twice its original bulk. The second and third chapters are almost entirely new. The fourteenth and fifteenth sections of the fourth chapter are entirely so. Even those parts of the book of which the sub-

1 The contents of these chapters are not, however, absolutely new, but drawn from articles which I have contributed to the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society since the first edition of the volume appeared.
stance remains the same have been so generally expanded that comparatively little continues without some alteration of greater or less importance.

In order that the reader may learn at once what he may expect to find in the following pages, I shall supply here a fuller and more connected summary of their contents than is furnished by the table which follows this preface.

The Introduction (pp. 1–6) contains a very rapid survey of the sources from which our information on the subject of caste is to be derived, viz. the Vedic hymns, the Brāhmanas, the Epic poems, and the Purāṇas, in which the chronological order and the general characteristics of these works are stated.

The first chapter (pp. 1–160) comprehends the mythical accounts of the creation of man and of the origin of castes which are to be found in the Vedic hymns, in the Brāhmanas and their appendages, in the Rāmāyana, the Mahābhārata, and the Purāṇas. The first section (pp. 7–15) contains a translation of the celebrated hymn called Purusha Sūkta, which appears to be the oldest extant authority for attributing a separate origin to the four castes, and a discussion of the question whether the creation there described was intended by its author to convey a literal or an allegorical sense. The second, third, and fourth sections (pp. 15–34) adduce a series of passages from the works standing next in chronological order to the hymns of the Rig-veda, which differ more or less widely from the account of the creation given in the Purusha Sūkta, and therefore justify the conclusion
that in the Vedic age no uniform orthodox and authoritative doctrine existed in regard to the origin of castes. In the fifth section (pp. 35–42) the different passages in Manu’s Institutes which bear upon the subject are quoted, and shewn to be not altogether in harmony with each other. The sixth section (pp. 43–49) describes the system of great mundane periods called Yugas, Manvantaras, and Kalpas, as explained in the Purāṇas, and shews that no traces of these periods are to be found in the hymns of the Rig-veda, and but few in the Brāhmaṇas (compare p. 215 f.). Sections seventh and eighth (pp. 49–107) contain the accounts of the different creations, including that of the castes, and of the primeval state of mankind, which are given in the Vishṇu, Vāyu, and Mārkandaṇeya Purāṇas, together with references (see pp. 52 ff., 68 ff.) to passages in the Brāhmaṇas, which appear to have furnished some of the germs of the various Puranic representations, and a comparison of the details of the latter with each other which proves that in some respects they are mutually irreconcileable (see pp. 65 ff., 102 ff.). The ninth section (pp. 107–114) adduces the accounts of Brahmā’s passion for his daughter, which are given in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and the Matsya Purāṇa. In the tenth section (pp. 114–122) are embraced such notices connected with the subject of this volume as I have observed in the Rāmāyaṇa. In one of the passages men of all the four castes are said to be the offspring of Manu, a female, the daughter of Daksha, and wife of Kaśyapa. The eleventh section contains a collection of texts from the Mahābhārata and its appendage the Hari-
vaṃśa, in which various and discrepant explanations are given of the existing diversity of castes, one of them representing all the four classes as descendants of Manu Vaivasvata (p. 126), others attributing the distinction of classes to an original and separate creation of each, which, however, is not always described as occurring in the same manner (pp. 128 ff. and 153); whilst others, again, more reasonably, declare the distinction to have arisen out of differences of character and action. This section, as well as the one which precedes it, also embraces accounts of the perfection which prevailed in the first yugas, and of the gradually increasing degeneracy which ensued in those that followed. The twelfth section (pp. 155–158) contains extracts from the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, which coincide for the most part with those drawn from the other authorities. One text, however, describes mankind as the offspring of Aryaman and Mātrikā; and another distinctly declares that there was originally but one caste. The thirteenth section (pp. 159 f.) sums up the results of the entire chapter, and asserts the conclusion that the sacred books of the Hindus contain no uniform or consistent theory of the origin of caste; but, on the contrary, offer a great variety of explanations, mythical, mystical, and rationalistic, to account for this social phenomenon.

The second chapter (pp. 160–238) treats of the tradition of the descent of the Indian nation from Manu. The first section (pp. 162–181) contains a series of texts from the Rig-veda, which speak of Manu as the progenitor of the race to which the authors of the hymns
belonged, and as the first institutor of religious rites; and adverts to certain terms employed in the hymns, either to denote mankind in general or to signify certain tribal divisions. The second section (pp. 181–196) adduces a number of legends and notices regarding Manu from the Brāhmaṇas and other works next in order of antiquity to the hymns of the Rig-veda. The most interesting and important of these legends is that of the deluge, as given in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, which is afterwards (pp. 216 ff.) compared with the later versions of the same story found in the Mahābhārata and the Matsya, Bhāgavata and Agni Purāṇas, which are extracted in the third section (pp. 196–220). Some remarks of M. Burnouf and Professor Weber, on the question whether the legend of a deluge was indigenous in India, or derived from a Semitic source, are noticed in pp. 215 ff. The fourth section adduces the legendary accounts of the rise of castes among the descendants of Manu and Atri, which are found in the Purāṇas; and quotes a story given in the Mahābhārata about king Vitāhavya, a Kshattriya, being transformed into a Brāhmaṇ by the mere word of the sage Bṛigu.

In the third chapter (pp. 239–295) I have endeavoured to shew what light is thrown by a study of the hymns of the Rig- and Atharva-vedas upon the mutual relations of the different classes of Indian society at the time when those hymns were composed. In the first section (pp. 240–265) the various texts of the Rig-veda in which the words brāhmāṇ and brāhmaṇa occur are cited, and an attempt is made to determine the senses in which those
words are there employed. The result of this examination is that in none of the hymns of the Rig-veda, except the Purusha Sūkta, is there any distinct reference to a recognized system of four castes, although the occasional use of the word Brāhmāṇa, which is apparently equivalent to Brāhmā-putra, or "the son of a priest," and other indications seem to justify the conclusion that the priesthood had already become a profession, although it did not yet form an exclusive caste (see pp. 258 f., 263 ff.). The second section (pp. 265–280) is made up of quotations from the hymns of the Rig-veda and various other later works, adduced to shew that persons who according to ancient Indian tradition were not of priestly families were in many instances reputed to be authors of Vedic hymns, and in two cases, at least, are even said to have exercised priestly functions. These two cases are those (1) of Devāpi (pp. 269ff.), and (2) of Viśvāmitra, which is afterwards treated at great length in the fourth chapter. This section concludes with a passage from the Matsya Purāṇa, which not only speaks of the Kshattriyas Manu, Ida, and Purūravas, as "utterers of Vedic hymns" (mantra-vādīnāḥ); but also names three Vaiśyas, Bhaṭāl, Vandyā, and Sāṃkīrtti, as "composers of hymns" (mantra-kritāḥ). The third section (pp. 280–289) shews by quotations from the Atharva-veda that at the period when those portions of that collection which are later than the greater part of the Rig-veda were composed, the pretensions of the Brāhmans had been considerably developed. The fourth section (pp. 289–295) gives an account of the opinions expressed by Professor
R. Roth and Dr. M. Haug regarding the origin of castes.

The fourth chapter (pp. 296–479) contains a series of legendary illustrations derived from the Rāmāyana, the Mahābhārata, and the Purānas, of the struggle which appears to have occurred in the early ages of Indian history between the Brāhmans and the Kshattriyas, after the former had begun to constitute an exclusive sacerdotal class, but before their rights had become accurately defined by long prescription, and when the members of the ruling caste were still indisposed to admit their pretensions. I need not here state in detail the contents of the first five sections (pp. 296–317) which record various legends descriptive of the ruin which is said to have overtaken different princes by whom the Brāhmans were slighted and their claims resisted. The sixth and following sections down to the thirteenth (pp. 317–426) contain, first, such references to the two renowned rivals, Vasishṭha and Viśvāmitra as are found in the hymns of the Rig-veda, and which represent them both as Vedic rishis; secondly, such notices of them as occur in the Brāhmaṇas, and shew that Viśvāmitra, as well as Vasishṭha, had officiated as a priest; and, thirdly, a series of legends from the Rāmāyana and Mahābhārata which describe the repeated struggles for superiority in which they were engaged, and attempt, by a variety of fictions, involving miraculous elements, to explain the manner in which Viśvāmitra became a Brāhman, and to account for the fact which was so distinctly certified by tradition (see pp. 361 ff.), but appeared so un-
accountable in later ages (see pp. 265 f., 364 ff.), that that famous personage, although notoriously a Kshattriya by birth, had nevertheless exercised sacerdotal functions. The fourteenth section (pp. 426–430) contains a story from the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa about king Janaka, a Rājanya, renowned for his stoical temperament and religious knowledge, who communicated theological instruction to

2 As I have omitted in the body of the work to say anything of the views of Signor Angelo de Gubernatis about the purport of the Vedic texts relating to Vasishṭha and Visvāmitra, I may state here that this young Italian Sanskritist, in his Essay, entitled “Fonti Vediche dell’Epopea” (see the Rivista Orientale, vol. i. pp. 409 ff., 478 ff.), combats the opinion of Professor Roth that these passages refer to two historical personages, and to real events in which they played a part; and objects that Roth “took no account of the possibility that a legend of the heavens may have been based upon a human foundation” (p. 409). Signor de Gubernatis further observes that the 33rd and 53rd hymns of the third Mandala of the Rig-veda “may perhaps have been recited at a later period in connection with some battle which really occurred, but that the fact which they celebrate seems to be much more ancient, and to be lost in a very remote myth” (p. 410). Visvāmitra, he considers, is one of the appellations of the sun, and as both the person who bears this name, and Indra are the sons of Kuśika, they must be brothers (p. 412. See, however, the remarks in p. 347 f. of this volume on the epithet Kuśika as applied to Indra). Sudās, according to Signor de Gubernatis (p. 413), denotes the horse of the sun, or the sun himself, while Vasishṭha is the greatest of the Vasus, and denotes Agni, the solar fire, and means, like Visvāmitra, the sun (p. 483). Signor de Gubernatis is further of opinion (pp. 414, 478, 479, and 483) that both the 33rd and 53rd hymns of the third, and the 18th hymn of the seventh Mandala are comparatively modern; that the names of Kuśikas and Visvāmitras claimed by the authors of the two former, are fraudulently assumed; while the last (the 18th hymn of the seventh Mandala) was composed by a sacerdotal family who claimed Vasishṭha as its founder. I will only remark that the theory of Signor de Gubernatis appears to me to be an improbable one. But the only point of much importance for my own special purpose is that ancient Indian tradition represents both Vasishṭha and Visvāmitra as real personages, the one of either directly divine, or of sacerdotal descent, and the other of royal lineage. They may, however, have been nothing more than legendary creations, the fictitious eponymi of the families which bore the same name.
some eminent Brāhmans, and became a member of their class. In the fifteenth section (pp. 431–436) two other instances are adduced from the same Brāhmaṇa and from two of the Upanishads, of Kshattriyas who were in possession of truths unknown to the Brāhmans, and who, contrary to the usual rule, became the teachers of the latter. The sixteenth section (pp. 436–440) contains an extract from the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa regarding king Viśvantara who, after at first attempting to prevent the Syāparaṇa Brāhmans from officiating at his sacrifice, became at length convinced by one of their number of their superior knowledge, and accepted their services. In the seventeenth section (pp. 440–442) a story is told of Matanga, the spurious offspring of a Brāhman woman by a man of inferior caste, who failed, in spite of his severe and protracted austerities, to elevate himself (as Viśvāmitra had done) to the rank of a Brāhman. The eighteenth section (pp. 442–479) contains a series of legends, chiefly from the Mahābhārata, regarding the repeated exterminations of the Kshattriyas by the warlike Brāhman Paraśurāma of the race of Bhrigu, and the ultimate restoration of the warrior tribe, and a variety of extravagant illustrations of the supernatural power of the Brāhmans, related by the god Vāyu to king Arjuna, who began by denying the superiority of the priests, but was at length compelled to succumb to the overwhelming evidence adduced by his aerial monitor.

In the fifth chapter (pp. 480–488) I have given some account of the opinions entertained by Manu, and the
authors of the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas, regarding the origin of the tribes dwelling within, or adjacent to, the boundaries of Hindustan, but not comprehended in the Indian caste-system.

The sixth and concluding chapter (pp. 489–504) contains the Puranic accounts of the parts of the earth exterior to Bhāratavarsha, or India, embracing first, the other eight Varshas or divisions of Jambudvīpa, the central continent; secondly, the circular seas and continents (dvīpas) by which Jambudvīpa is surrounded; and, thirdly, the remoter portions of the mundane system.

The Appendix (pp. 505–515) contains some supplementary notes.

As in the previous edition, I have been careful to acknowledge in the text and notes of this volume the assistance which I have derived from the writings of the different Sanskrit Scholars who have treated of the same subjects. It will, however, be well to specify here the various publications to which I have been indebted for materials. In 1858, I wrote thus: "It will be seen at once that my greatest obligations are due to Professor H. H. Wilson, whose translation of the Vishnu Purāṇa, with abundant and valuable notes, derived chiefly from the other Purāṇas, was almost indispensable to the successful completion of such an attempt as the present." In this second edition also I have had constant occasion to recur to Wilson’s important work, now improved and enriched by the additional notes of the editor Dr. Fitz-edward Hall. It is to his edition, so far as it has yet ap-
peared, that my references have been made. I acknowledged at the same time the aid which I had received from M. Langlois' French translation of the Harivaṃśa, and from M. Burnouf's French translation of the first nine books of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, which opened up an easy access to the contents of the original works. A large amount of materials has also been supplied to me, either formerly or for the preparation of the present edition, by Mr. Colebrooke's Miscellaneous Essays; by Professor C. Lassen's Indian Antiquities; Professor Rudolph Roth's Dissertations on the Literature and History of the Vedas, and contributions to the Journal of the German Oriental Society, and to Weber's Indische Studien, etc.; Professor Weber's numerous articles in the same Journals, and his History of Indian Literature; Professor Max Müller's History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, Chips from a German Workshop, article on the Funeral rites of the Brāhmans, etc.; Professor Benfey's Glossary of the Sāma Veda, and translations of Vedic hymns; Dr. Haug's text and translation of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa: while much valuable aid has been derived from the written communications with which I have been favoured by Professor Aufrecht, as well as from his Catalogue of the Bodleian Sanskrit MSS. I am also indebted to Professor Müller for pointing out two texts which will be found in the Appendix, and to Professor Goldstücker for copying for me two passages of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa's Mīmāṃsā-vārttika, which are printed in the same place, and for making some corrections in my translations of them.
I formerly observed that at the same time my own researches had "enabled me to collect a good many texts which I had not found elsewhere adduced;" and the same remark applies to a considerable portion of the new matter which has been adduced in the present edition.
CONTENTS.

PAGES.
v.—xvi.  PREFACE.

1—6.  INTRODUCTION, CONTAINING A PRELIMINARY SURVEY OF THE SOURCES OF INFORMATION.


7—15.  Sect. I.  Ninetieth hymn of the tenth Book of the Rigveda Sanhitā, called Purusha-Sūkta, or the hymn to Purusha.


17—22.  Sect. III.  Citations from the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, the Vāyasaneyi Sanhitā, and the Atharva-veda.

22—34.  Sect. IV.  Further quotations from the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, Sanhitā, and Aranyaka, and from the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa.

35—42.  Sect. V.  Manu’s account of the origin of castes.

43—49.  Sect. VI.  Account of the system of yugas, manvantaras, and kalpas, according to the Vishnu Purāṇa and other authorities.

49—73.  Sect. VII.  Account of the different creations, including that of the castes, according to the Vishnu Purāṇa, with some passages from the Brāhmaṇas, containing the germs of the Puranic statements.

74—107.  Sect. VIII.  Account of the different creations, including that of the castes, according to the Vāyu and Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇas.
CONTENTS.

107—114. Sect. IX. Legend of Brahmā and his daughter, according to the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, and of Satarūpā, according to the Matsya Purāṇa.

114—122. Sect. X. Quotations from the Rāmāyaṇa on the creation, and on the origin of castes.

122—155. Sect. XI. Quotations from the Mahābhārata and Hari-vamśa on the same subjects, and on the four yugas.

155—158. Sect. XII. Citations from the Bhāgavata Purāṇa on the creation and on the origin of castes.

159—160. Sect. XIII. Results of this chapter.

161—238. CHAPTER II. — TRADITION OF THE DESCENT OF THE INDIAN RACE FROM MANU.

162—181. Sect. I. On Manu as the progenitor of the Āryan Indians and the institutor of religious rites, according to the hymns of the Rig-veda.

181—196. Sect. II. Legend of Manu and the deluge from the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, and other notices regarding Manu from the Satapatha, Aitareya, and Taittiriya Brāhmaṇas, the Taittiriya Sanhitā, and the Chāndogya Upanishad.

196—220. Sect. III. Extracts from the Mahābhārata and the Matsya, Bhāgavata, and Agni Purāṇas regarding Manu, and the deluge; and comparison of the versions of this legend adduced in this and the preceding section.

220—238. Sect. IV. Legendary accounts of the origin of castes among the descendants of Manu and Atri, according to the Purāṇas.


240—265. Sect. I. On the signification of the words brāhmāṇ and brāhmaṇa, etc., in the Rig-veda.

265—280. Sect. II. Quotations from the Rig-veda, the Nirukta, the Mahābhārata and other works, to show that according to ancient Indian tradition persons not of priestly families were authors of Vedic hymns, and exercised priestly functions.

280—289. Sect. III. Texts from the Atharva-veda, illustrating the progress of Brahmanical pretensions.

289—295. Sect. IV. Opinions of Professor R. Roth and Dr. M. Haug regarding the origin of caste among the Hindus.
CONTENTS.

296—400. CHAPTER IV.—EARLY CONTESTS BETWEEN THE BRĀHMANS AND THE KSHATRIYAS.

296—298. Sect. I. Manu's summary of refractory and submissive monarchs.

298—306. Sect. II. Legend of Veṣaṇa.


317—337. Sect. VI. Vasishṭha, according to the Rig-veda and later works.

337—371. Sect. VII. Viśvāmitra, according to the Rig-veda, Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and later authorities; earlier and later relations of priestly families and the other classes.

371—375. Sect. VIII. Do the details in the last two sections enable us to decide in what relation Vasishṭha and Viśvāmitra stood to each other as priests of Sudās?

375—378. Sect. VIII. Story of Triśanku.

379—388. Sect. IX. Legend of Hariśchandra.

388—397. Sect. X. Contest of Vaśishṭha and Viśvāmitra, and entrance of the latter into the Brāhman caste, according to the Mahābhārata.

397—411. Sect. XI. The same legend, and those of Triśanku, and Ambariṣa, according to the Rāmāyaṇa, with a further story about Viśvāmitra from the Mahābhārata.

411—414. Sect. XII. Other accounts from the Mahābhārata of the way in which Viśvāmitra became a Brāhman.

414—426. Sect. XIII. Legend of Saudāsa, and further story of the rivalry of Vaśishṭha and Viśvāmitra, according to the Mahābhārata, with an extract from the Rāja Tarangīṇī.

426—430. Sect. XIV. Story from the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa about king Janaka becoming a Brāhman, with extracts from the Mahābhārata about the same prince.

431—436. Sect. XV. Other instances in which Brāhmans are said to have been instructed in divine knowledge by Kshatriyas.


440—442. Sect. XVII. Story of Matanga, who tried in vain to raise himself to the position of a Brāhman.
CONTENTS.

442—479. Sect. XVIII. Legend of the Brāhmaṇa Pāraśurāma, the exterminator of the Kshatriyas, according to the Mahābhārata and the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, with a series of narratives from the former work illustrating the superhuman power of the Brāhmaṇs.

480—488. CHAPTER V. Relation of the Brahmanical Indians to the Neighbouring Tribes, according to Manu, the Mahābhārata, and the Purāṇas.

489—504. CHAPTER VI. Puranic Accounts of the Parts of the Earth Exterior to Bhratavarsha, or India.

505—516. Appendix, Containing Supplementary Notes.

517—532. Index.

ERRATA ET CORRIGENDA.

Page 23, line 19, for “beingyellow” read “being yellow.”

38, 17 ff., for “59—64” read “58—63.”

42, 4 from foot, for “p. 36” read “p. 37.”

47, 186, 42, for “p. 42” read “p. 43.”

47, 5, for “12,826” read “12,826.”

51, 17, for “Purushottama” read “Purushottama.”

123, 19, for “to” read “tu.”

127, 18 f., for “the two by which these three are followed,” read “two of those which follow, viz. in pp. 134 and 139.”

136, 18, for “116” read “11 and 12.”

169, 26, for “Vivasvat” read “Vivasvat.”

170, 28 and 33, for “Māṭāriswān” read “Māṭāriswan.”

171, 26, for “Asūra” read “Asūna.”

180, 28, before “Prajōpatī” insert “ii. 33.”

194, 5, for “mā bhaja” read “mā abhaja.”

221, before “Prashadras” insert “iv. 1, 12.”

222, 7, for “ix. 2” read “ix. 2, 16.”

13, before “Nābhaga” insert “iv. 1, 14.”

235, 19, for “iv.” read “ix.”

261, 27, for “3” read “2.”

268, 3 from the foot, for “viiii.” read “viiii.”

274, 8, for “Dīlīpāt” read “Dīlīpāt.”

280, 14, for “was” read “were.”

307, 10, for “virā” read “virā.”

308, 24, before “Nāhuso” insert “12460.”

318, 4, for “139 f.” read “161 f.”

371, 12, for “vii.” read “vii.”

399, 18, for “58, 18” read “56, 18.”

487, 2, for “thei rdesertion” read “their desertion.”
ORIGINAL SANSKRIT TEXTS.

PART FIRST.

INTRODUCTION

CONTAINING A PRELIMINARY SURVEY OF THE SOURCES OF INFORMATION.

I propose in the present volume to give some account of the traditions, legends, and mythical narratives which the different classes of ancient Indian writings contain regarding the origin of mankind, and the classes or castes into which the Hindus have long been distributed. In order to ascertain whether the opinions which have prevailed in India on these subjects have continued fixed and uniform from the earliest period, or whether they have varied from age to age, and if so, what modifications they have undergone, it is necessary that we should first of all determine the chronological order of the various works from which our information is to be drawn. This task of classification can, as far as regards its great outlines, be easily accomplished. Although we cannot discover sufficient grounds for fixing with any precision the dates of these different books, we are perfectly able to settle the order in which the most important of those which are to form the basis of this investigation were composed. From a comparison of these several literary records, it will be found that the Hindus, like all other civilized nations, have passed through various stages of development,—social, moral, religious, and intellectual. The ideas and beliefs which are exhibited in their oldest documents, are not the same as those which we encounter in their later writings.
INTRODUCTION.

The principal books to which we must look for information on the subjects of our enquiry are the Vedas, including the Brâhmana and Upanishads, the Sûtras, the Institutes of Manu, and the Itihâsas and Purâṇas. Of these different classes of works, the Vedas are allowed by all competent enquirers to be by far the most ancient.

There are, as every student of Indian literature is aware, four Vedas,—the Rig-veda, the Sâma-veda, the Yajur-veda, and the Atharva-veda. Each of the collections of works known as a Veda consists of two parts, which are called its mantra and its brâhmana.¹ The Mantras are either metrical hymns, or prose forms of prayer. The Rigveda and the Sâmaveda consist only of mantras of the former description. The Brâhmanas contain regulations regarding the employment of the mantras, and the celebration of the various rites of sacrifice, and also embrace certain treatises called Áranyakas, and others called Upanishads or Vedântas (so called from their being the concluding portions of each Veda), which expound the mystical sense of some of the ceremonies, and discuss the nature of the godhead, and the means of acquiring religious knowledge with a view to final liberation.

The part of each Veda which contains the mantras, or hymns, is called its Sanhitâ.² Thus the Rig-veda Sanhitâ means the collection of hymns belonging to the Rig-veda. Of the four collections of hymns, that belonging to the last-mentioned Veda, which contains no less than 1,017 of these compositions, is by far the most important for historical purposes. Next in value must be reckoned those hymns of the Atharva-veda, which are peculiar to that collection, another portion of which, however, is borrowed, in most cases, verbatim, from the Rig-veda.³

¹ Sâyaña says in his commentary on the Rigveda (vol. p. i. p. 4): Mantra-brâh manûtmakam tâvad adhûtâm lakshyam | ata eva Apastambho yajña-paribhâshyayâm evâha 'mantra-brâhmanagor veda-nûmadheyam' | "The definition (of the Veda) as a book composed of mantra and brâhmana, is unobjectionable. Hence Apastamba says in the Yajnaparibhâshâ, "Mantra and Brâhmana have the name of Veda."

² This definition applies to all the Sanhitâs, except that of the Taittirîya, or Black Yajur, Veda, in which Mantra and Brâhmana are combined. But even this Sanhitâ had a separate Brâhmana connected with it. See Müller’s Ane. Sansk. Lit. p. 350, and Weber’s Indische Literaturgeschichte, p. 83. The general character of the Vâjasaneyi and Atharva Sanhitâs is not affected by the fact that the last section of the former is an Upanishad, and that the fifteenth book of the latter has something of the nature of a Brâhmana.

³ For further information on the Vedas, reference may be made to Professor Max Müller’s Ancient Sanskrit Literature, passim, and also to vols. ii. iii. and iv. of the present work.
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From this succinct account of the contents of the Vedas, it is clear that the Mantras must constitute their most ancient portions, since the Brahmanas, which regulate the employment of the hymns, of necessity pre-suppose the earlier existence of the latter. On this subject the commentator on the Taittiriya, or Black Yajur-veda, Sanhitā thus expresses himself (p. 9 of the Calcutta edition):

Yadyāpi mantrabrāhmaṇātmako vedaḥ tathāpi brāhmaṇasya mantra-
vyākhāna-rūpatvād mantra evādau samāmnātāḥ | “Although the Veda is formed both of Mantra and Brāhmaṇa, yet as the Brāhmaṇa consists of an explanation of the Mantras, it is the latter which were at first recorded.”

The priority of the hymns to the Brāhmaṇas is accordingly attested by the constant quotations from the former which are found in the latter. Another proof that the hymns are far older than any other portion of Indian literature is to be found in the character of their language. They are composed in an ancient dialect of the Sanskrit, containing many words of which the sense was no longer known with certainty in the age of Yāska, the author of the Nirukta, and many grammatical forms which had become obsolete in the time of the great grammarian Pāṇini, who refers to them as peculiar to the hymns (chhandas). A third argument in favour of the greater antiquity of the mantras is supplied by the fact that the gods whom they represent as the most prominent objects of adoration, such as Indra and Varuṇa, occupy but a subordinate position in the Itihāsas and Purāṇas, whilst others, viz., Vishnu and Rudra, though by no means the most important deities of the hymns, are exalted to the first rank, and assume a different character, in the Puranic pantheon.

4 See also the passage quoted from the Nirukta in p. 174 of the 2nd vol. of this work, and that cited from Sāyaṇa in p. 195 of the same vol. Compare the following passage of the Muniḍaka Upanishad, i. 2, 1: Tad etat satyaṃ mantreshu karṇāṃi kaveyo yāny opasyams tāṁ tretāyām bahudhā santatāṁ | “This is true: the rites which the rishis saw (i.e. discovered by revelation) in the hymns—these rites were in great variety celebrated in the Tretā (age).”


7 See vol. ii. of this work, pp. 216 ff.

8 See vol. ii. of this work, 212 ff, and vol. iv. 1, 2, and passim.
On all these grounds it may be confidently concluded that the mantras, or hymns, of the Rig-veda are by far the most ancient remains of Indian literature. The hymns themselves are of different periods, some being older, and some more recent. This is shown not only by the nature of the case,—as it is not to be supposed that the whole of the contents of such a large national collection as the Rigveda Sanhitā should have been composed by the men of one, or even two, generations,—but also by the frequent references which occur in the mantras themselves to older rishis, or poets, and to older hymns. It is, therefore, quite possible that a period of several centuries may have intervened between the composition of the oldest and that of the most recent of these poems. But if so, it is also quite conceivable that in this interval considerable changes may have taken place in the religious ideas and ceremonies, and in the social and ecclesiastical institutions of the people among whom these hymns were produced, and that some traces of these changes may be visible on comparing the different hymns with each other.

No sufficient data exist for determining with exactness the period at which the hymns were composed. Professor Müller divides them into two classes, the Mantras or more recent hymns, which he supposes may have been produced between 1000 and 800 years,—and the older hymns, to which he applies the name of Chhandas, and which he conceives may have been composed between 1200 and 1000 years,—before the Christian era. Other scholars are of opinion that they may be even older (see Müller's Anc. Sansk. Lit., p. 572, and the Preface to the 4th Vol. of the same author's edition of the Rig-veda, pp. iv.-xiii). This view is shared by Dr. Haug, who thus writes in his introduction to the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, p. 47: "We do not hesitate, therefore, to assign the composition of the bulk of the Brāhmaṇas to the years 1400–1200 B.C.; for the Saṁhitā we require a period of at least 500–600 years, with an interval of about two hundred years between the end of the proper Brāhmaṇa period. Thus we obtain for the bulk of Saṁhitā the space from 1450–2000; the oldest hymns and sacrificial formulas may be a few hundred years more ancient still, so that we would fix the very commencement of Vedic literature between 2000–2400 B.C."

* See vol. ii. of this work, pp. 206 ff., and vol. iii. pp. 116 ff., 121 ff.
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Next in order of time to the most recent of the hymns come, of course, the Brāhmaṇas. Of these (1) the Aitareya and Sānkhyāyana are connected with the Rig-veda; (2) the Tāṇḍya, the Panchaviṁśa and the Chhāndogya with the Sāma-veda; (3) the Tańtirīya with the Taṁtirīya or Black Yajur-veda; (4) the Satapatha with the Vājasaneyi Sanhitā or White Yajur-veda; and (5) the Gopatha with the Atharva-veda. These works, written in prose, prescribe, as I have already intimated, the manner in which the Mantras are to be used and the various rites of sacrifice to be celebrated. They also expound the mystical signification of some of the ceremonies, and adduce a variety of legends to illustrate the origin and efficacy of some of the ritual prescriptions. That in order of age the Brāhmaṇas stand next to the Mantras is proved by their simple, antiquated, and tautological style, as well as by the character of their language, which, though approaching more nearly than that of the hymns, to classical or Pāṇinean Sanskrit, is yet distinguished by certain archaisms both of vocabulary and of grammatical form which are unknown to the Itiḥāsas and Purāṇas. The most recent portions of the Brāhmaṇas are the Aranyakas and Upanishads, of which the character and contents have been already summarily indicated. The remaining works which form the basis of our investigations come under the designation of Smṛiti, as distinguished from that of Sruti, which is applied to the Mantras, Brāhmaṇas, Aranyakas, and Upanishads.

The term Smṛiti includes (1) the Vedāṅgas, such as the Nirukta of Yāska, (2) the Sūtras or aphorisms, śrauta and grihya, or sacrificial and domestic, etc., (3) the Institutes of Manu, (4) the Itiḥāsas and Purāṇas. To the class of Itiḥāsas belong (1) the Rāmayāṇa (said to be the work of Valmiki), which contains an account in great part, at least, fabulous, of the adventures of Rāma, and the Mahābhārata, which describes the wars and adventures of the Kurs and Pāṇḍus, and embraces also a great variety of episodes and numerous mythological narratives, as well as religious, philosophical, and political discussions, which are interwoven with, or interpolated in, the framework of the poem. This

---

10 For further details on these Brāhmaṇas, the reader may consult Professor Max Müller’s Ane. Sansk. Lit. pp. 346 ff.; Professor Weber’s Indische Literaturgeschichte, and Indische Studien; and Dr. Haug’s Aitareya Brahmana.

11 See, for example, the S. P. Br. xi. 5, 1, 15; and the Taṅt. Sanhitā, ii. 2, 10, 2, and ii. 6, 7, 1.
work is said to be the production of Vyāsa, but its great bulk, its almost encyclopædic character, and the discrepancies in doctrine which are observable between its different parts, lead inevitably to the conclusion that it is not the composition of a single author, but has received large additions from a succession of writers, who wished to obtain currency and authority for their several opinions by introducing them into this great and venerated repository of national tradition.  

The Purāṇas are commonly said to be eighteen in number, in addition to certain inferior works of the same description called Upapurāṇas. For an account of these books and a summary of their contents, I must refer to the late Professor H. H. Wilson's introduction to his translation of the Vishnupurāṇa.

In treating the several topics which are to be handled in this volume, I propose in each case to adduce, first, any texts bearing upon it which may be found in the hymns of the Rig-veda; next, those in the Brāhmaṇas and their appendages; and, lastly, those occurring in any of the different classes of works coming under the designation of Smṛiti. By this means we shall learn what conceptions or opinions were entertained on each subject by the oldest Indian authors, and what were the various modifications to which these ideas were subjected by their successors.

12 On the Rāmāyana and Mahābhārata, see Professor Monier Williams's "Indian Epic Poetry," which contains a careful analysis of the leading narrative of each of the poems.

13 See also the same author's analyses of the contents of the Vishnú, Váyu, Agni, and Brāhma-vaivarta Purāṇas in the "Gleanings of Science," published in Calcutta, and those of the Brāhma and Pādma Purāṇas in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, No. ix (1838) and No. x. (1839).
CHAPTER I.

MYTHICAL ACCOUNTS OF THE CREATION OF MAN, AND OF THE ORIGIN OF THE FOUR CASTES.

It will be seen from the different texts to be adduced in this chapter, that from a very early period the Indian writers have propounded a great variety of speculations regarding the origin of mankind, and of the classes or castes into which they found their own community divided. The most commonly received of these explanations is the fable which represents the Brāhmans, Kshattriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras, to have been separately created from the head, the breast or arms, the thighs, and the feet of the Creator. Of this mythical account no trace is to be found in any of the hymns of the Rig-veda, except one, the Purusha Sūkta.

Although for reasons which will be presently stated, I esteem it probable that this hymn belongs to the most recent portion of the Rigveda, it will be convenient to adduce and to discuss it first, along with certain other texts from the Brāhmaṇas, Itiḥāsas, and Purāṇas, which professedly treat of the origin of mankind and of caste, before we proceed to examine the older parts of the hymn-collection, with the view of ascertaining what opinion the authors of them appear to have entertained in regard to the earliest history of their race, and to the grounds of those relations which they found subsisting between the different classes of society contemporary with themselves.

SECT. I.—90th Hymn of the 10th Book of the Rig-veda Sanhitā, called Purusha Sūkta, or the hymn to Purusha.

This celebrated hymn contains, as far as we know, the oldest extant passage which makes mention of the fourfold origin of the Hindu race.
MYTHICAL ACCOUNTS OF THE CREATION OF MAN,

In order to appreciate the character of this passage, we must consider it in connection with its context. I therefore quote the whole of the hymn:

R. V. x. 90. 1. Sahasra-śirāḥ Puruṣaḥ sahasrakaśaḥ sahasra-
pāt | sa bhūmim viśvato viṣṇu atyatishthaḥ dasāṅgulam | 2. Puruṣaḥ
evedaṁ sarvaḥ yad bhūtaṁ yachcha bhāvyam | utāṃritatvayeyāṇo yad
annenaṭirohāti | 3. Etacān anyāṁ ato jāyāṁśca Puruṣaḥ
| pādō 'sya viśvā bhūtāni tripād asyaṁritam divi | 4. Tripād urdhva
ud ait Puruṣaḥ pādō 'syahabhavat punah | tato viśvam vyakrāmat
sūsanānasane abhi | 5. tasmād Virāj ajayata Virājo adhi Puruṣaḥ
| sa jāto aty arichyata paschād bhūmim atho puruṣ | 6. Yat Purusheṇa
havisāh devāh yajnam atanvata | vasanto asyaṁśid ājyam grishmaḥ idhmah
śarad haviḥ | 7. Taṁ yajnam barhiṣi praukshan Puruṣaṁ
jātam agrataḥ | tena devāḥ ayajanta sādhyaḥ rishayaḥ cha ye | 8.
Tasmād yajnāt sarvahutaḥ sambhritam prishadājyam | paśūn tāṁś chakre
vāyavyan āraṇyam grāmyās cha ye | 9. Tasmād yajnāt sarvahutaḥ
richaḥ sāmāṇi jajnire | chhandāṃśi jajnire tasmād yajus tasmād ajayata
| 10. Tasmād aśva ājyanta ye ke cha ubhayādatah | gāve ha
jajnire tasmāt tasmāj jātāḥ ajācayaḥ | 11. Yat Puruṣaḥ vi ada-
dhuh katidhā vi akalpayan | mukham kim asya kau bāhā ka ūru
pādā uchye | 12. Brāhmaṇo 'sya mukham aśid bāhā rājanyāh
kritah | ūru tād asya yad vaisyaḥ padbhyaṁ sūdro ajayata | 13.
chandramah manaso jātāḥ chakshoḥ sūryo ajāyata | mukhād Indraḥ
ta Agnīs cha prāñād Vāyur ajayata | 14. Nābhyāḥ aśid antarikshaṁ
śirskhaḥ dyauḥ sanavarttataḥ | padbhyaṁ bhūmīr diśah śrotṛat
thāl lokān akalpayan | 15. Saptāyāsan pariḥayas triḥ sampata
samidhah kritah | devāḥ yad yajnam tanvānāḥ abadhan Puruṣam
paśūn | 16. Yajnena yajnām ayajanta devās tānī dharmāni pratha-

mānī āsan | te ha nakam mahāmanah sahanta yatra purvo sādh-

yāh santi devaḥ |

"1. Purusha has a thousand heads, a thousand eyes, a thousand feet. On every side enveloping the earth, he overpassed (it) by a space of ten fingers. 2. Purusha himself is this whole (universe), whatever has been and whatever shall be. He is also the lord of immortality, since (or, when) by food he expands. 3. Such is his greatness, and Purusha is superior to this. All existences are a quarter of him; and three-fourths of him are that which is immortal in the sky. 4. With three quarters Purusha mounted upwards. A quarter of him was again produced here. He was then diffused everywhere over things which eat and things which do not eat. 5. From him was born Virāj, and from Virāj, Purusha. When born, he extended beyond the earth, both behind and before. 6. When the gods performed a sacrifice with Purusha as the oblation, the spring was its butter, the summer its fuel, and the autumn its (accompanying) offering. 7. This victim, Purusha, born in the beginning, they immolated on

18 The Atharva-veda (xix. 6, 1) reads sahasra-bāhuh, "having a thousand arms," the transcriber, perhaps, taking the verse literally, and considering that a being in human form, if he had a thousand eyes and a thousand feet, ought only to have five hundred heads, and not a thousand as in the text of the Rig-veda.

19 For eriteś in the R. V. the Vājasaneyi Sanhitā, 31. 1, reads spriteś, which seems to mean nearly the same.

17 The word is atyasīthah. Compare the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, xiii. 6, 1, 1, and atisīthāvānaḥ in S. P. B. iv. 5, 4, 1, 2. Professor Weber renders atyasīthah "occupies" (Indische Studien, ix. 5).

18 The sense of this is obscure. Instead of yud annenaṭirohati, the A. V. reads yud anyenaḥhavat saha, ("that which," or, "since he) was with another."

19 Compare A. V. x. 8, 7: ardhena viśeṣam bhuvanam jājina yad asya ardham keśa
tad babhūva : "with the half he produced the whole world; what became of the (other) half of him?" See also ibid. v. 13.

20 This sentence is illustrated by R. V. x. 72, 5, where it is said, Aditya Daksho ajayata Dakshād u Aditiḥ pari | "Aditi was born from Daksha and Daksha from Aditi" —a text on which Yāska remarks (Nirukta, xi. 23) : tat katham upapadyeta | samāna-janjmānaḥ syātām iti | api vē deva-dharmena itaretara-janmānau syātām it-
aretara-prakṛiti | "how can this be possible? They may have had a common birth; or, conformably with their nature as deities, they may have been produced from one another, and possess the properties of one another." Compare A. V. 13, 4. 29 ff., where Indra is said to have been produced from a great many other gods, or entities, and they reciprocally from him. In regard to Virāj, compare the notes on the verse before us in my article on the "Progress of the Vedic religion," etc., in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1865, p. 354.
the sacrificial grass. With him the gods, the Sādyhas, and the rishis sacrificed. 8. From that universal sacrifice were provided curds and butter. It formed those aerial (creatures) and animals both wild and tame. 9. From that universal sacrifice sprang the rich and sāman verses, the metres, and the yajush. 10. From it sprang horses, and all animals with two rows of teeth; kine sprang from it; from it goats and sheep. 11. When (the gods) divided Purusha, into how many parts did they cut him up? what was his mouth? what arms (had he)? what (two objects) are said (to have been) his thighs and feet?

12. The Brāhman was his mouth; the Rājanya was made his arms; the being (called) the Vaiśya, he was his thighs; the Śūdra sprang from his feet. 13. The moon sprang from his soul (manas), the sun from his eye, Indra and Agni from his mouth, and Vāyu from his breath. 14. From his navel arose the air, from his head the sky, from his feet the earth, from his ear the (four) quarters: in this manner (the gods) formed the worlds. 15. When the gods, performing sacrifice, bound Purusha as a victim, there were seven sticks (stuck up) for it

22 See, however, Vāj. Sanh. xiv. 30, to be quoted below.
23 Compare the Kaushitaki Brāhmaṇa Upanishad, ii. 9: atha pauryamāṇyam purastāḥ chandraṃ sam dṛiṣṭyamānem upatishtheta etayā eva ēverītā "soma rījaśi vichakṣaṇo panca mukhaśi prajāpatiḥ | brāhmaṇas te ekam mukham | tena mukhena rījino 'tasi | tena mukhena mām annādām kurā | rījā te ekam mukham | tena mukhena vīsō 'tasi | tena mukhena mām annādām kurā | īyenas te ekam mukham | ityādi | which is thus translated by Mr. Cowell: "Next on the day of the full moon let him in this same way adore the moon when it is seen in front of him (saying), 'thou art Soma, the brilliant, the wise, the five-mouthed, the lord of creatures. The Brāhman is one mouth of thine, with that mouth thou eatest kings, with that mouth make me to eat food. The king is one mouth of thine, with that mouth thou eatest common men, with that mouth make me to eat food. The hawk is one mouth of thine,' etc. The fourth mouth is fire, and the fifth is in the moon itself. I should prefer to render the words soma rījaśi, "thou art king Soma,"—"king" being a frequent designation of this god in the Brāhmaṇas. See also M. Bh. iii. 12, 962, where Vishnu is introduced as saying in the same mystical way: Brahma vuktraṃ bhujaṃ kṣattram īru me ṣaṃsthitāḥ viṣāḥ | pādaṃ sūdraḥ bhaveṣāṁ viṣṇum kramaṇa cha | "The Brāhman is my mouth; the Kṣattrtra is my arms; the Viṣṇa are my thighs; these Śūdras with their vigour and rapidity are my feet."
24 Instead of īru, "thighs," the Atharva-veda, xix. 6, 6, reads madhyam, "middle."
25 The Vāj. S. xxxi. 13, has a different and singular reading of the last half verse: īrtrād viyav'eṣaṃ prāṇav eṣaṃ mukhād agnir aṇyata | "From his ear came Vāyu and Prāṇa (breath) and from his mouth Agni."
(around the fire), and thrice seven pieces of fuel were made. 16. With
sacrifice the gods performed the sacrifice. These were the earliest
rites. These great powers have sought the sky, where are the former
Sadhyas, gods."

I have above (p. 7) intimated an opinion that this hymn does not
belong to the most ancient portion of the Rig-veda. This view is,
however, controverted by Dr. Haug, who, in his tract on "the origin
of Brahmanism" (published at Poona in 1865), p. 5, writes as follows:
"The few scholars who have been engaged in the study of the Vedas
unanimously regard this hymn as a very late production of Vedic
poetry; but there is no sufficient evidence to prove that. On the con-
trary, reasons might be adduced to show that it is even old. The
mystical character of the hymn is no proof at all of its late origin.
Such allegorical hymns are to be met with in every book of the col-
lection of the mantras, which goes by the name of Rig-veda samhita.
The Rishis, who were the authors of these hymns, delighted in such
speculations. They chiefly were suggested to them by the sacrificial
rites, which they daily were performing. According to the position
which is assigned to it in the Yajur-veda (where it is found among
the formulas referring to the human sacrifice), the hymn appears to
have been used at the human sacrifices. That, at the earliest period
of the Vedic time, human sacrifices were quite common with the
Brahmans, can be proved beyond any doubt. But the more eminent
and distinguished among their leaders soon abandoned the practice
as revolting to human feelings. The form of the sacrifice, however,
seems to have been kept for a long time; for the ritual required at
that occasion is actually in the Yajur-veda; but they only tied men of
different castes and classes to the sacrificial posts, and released them
afterwards, sacrificing animals instead of them."

If it could be satisfactorily shewn that this hymn, in the same form
as we now possess it, existed contemporaneously with the barbarous
practice of human sacrifices which Dr. Haug believes to have at one
time prevailed in India, we should, no doubt, have in this circumstance
a strong proof of its antiquity. But if it was merely adopted as a
part of the ceremonial at a later period, when the immolation of human

26 This verse occurs also in R. V. i. 164. 50, and is quoted in Nirukta, xii. 14. See
the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1866, p. 395, note, already referred to.
beings had ceased to be otherwise than formal and nominal, and animals were substituted as the actual victims, the evidence of its remote antiquity is greatly weakened.

If we now compare the Purusha Sūkta with the two hymns (162 and 163) of the first Mandala of the Rig-veda, it will, I think, be apparent that the first is not adapted to be used at a literal human sacrifice in the same manner as the last two are to be employed at the immolation of a horse. There are, no doubt, some mystical passages in the second of these two hymns, as in verse 3, where the horse is identified with Yama, Āditya, and Trita; and "in the last section of the Taittiriya Yajurveda the various parts of the horse’s body are described as divisions of time and portions of the universe: ‘morning is his head; the sun his eye; the air his breath; the moon his ear,’” etc. (Colebrooke’s Essays, i. 62). But the persons who officiate at the sacrifice, as referred to in these hymns, are ordinary priests of the ancient Indian ritual,—the hotṛi, adhvaryu, āvayaj, etc. (i. 162, 5); and details are given of the actual slaughter of the animal (i. 162, 11). The Purusha Sūkta, however does not contain the same indications of the literal immolation of a human victim. In it the sacrifice is not offered to the gods, but by the gods (verses 6, 7, 15, 16); no human priests are mentioned; the division of the victim (v. 11) must be regarded, like its slaughter (v. 7), as the work of the deities only. And the Purusha mentioned in the hymn could not well have been regarded as an ordinary man, as he is identified with the universe (v. 2), and he himself, or his immolation, is represented as the source of the creation (vv. 8, 10, 13, 14), and of the Vedas (v. 9).

As compared with by far the largest part of the hymns of the Rigveda, the Purusha Sūkta has every character of modernness both in its diction and ideas. I have already observed that the hymns which we find in this collection are of very different periods. This, I believe, is not disputed. The authors themselves, as we have seen, speak of newer and older hymns. So many as a thousand compositions of this description could scarcely have been produced within a very short space of time, and there is no reason to suppose that the literary activity of the ancient Hindus

27 Compare the commencement of the Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad.
28 See Dr. Haug’s own remarks (quoted above, p. 4) on the period when the hymns were composed.
was confined to the period immediately preceding the collection of the hymns. But if we are to recognize any difference of age, what hymns can we more reasonably suppose to be the oldest than those which are "at once archaic in language and style, and naive and simple in the character of their conceptions? and, on the other hand, what compositions can more properly be set down as the most recent than those which manifest an advance in speculative ideas, while their language approaches to the modern Sanskrit? These latter conditions seem to be fulfilled in the Purusha Sūkta, as well as in hymns x. 71 and 72, x. 81 and 82, x. 121, and x. 129.

On this subject Mr. Colebrooke states his opinion as follows (Miscellaneous Essays i. 309, note): "That remarkable hymn (the Purusha Sūkta) is in language, metre, and style, very different from the rest of the prayers with which it is associated. It has a decidedly more modern tone; and must have been composed after the Sanscrit language had been refined, and its grammar and rhythm perfected. The internal evidence which it furnishes serves to demonstrate the important fact that the compilation of the Vedas, in their present arrangement, took place after the Sanscrit tongue had advanced from the rustic and irregular dialect in which the multitude of hymns and prayers of the Veda was composed, to the polished and sonorous language in which the mythological poems, sacred and prophane (purāṇas and cāvya-s), have been written."

Professor Max Müller expresses himself in a similar sense (Anc. Sansk. Lit., p. 570 f.): "There can be little doubt, for instance, that the 90th hymn of the 10th book . . . . is modern both in its character and in its diction. It is full of allusions to the sacrificial ceremonial, it uses technical philosophical terms, it mentions the three seasons in the order of Vasanta, spring; Grīshma, summer; and S'arad, autumn; it contains the only passage in the Rig-veda where the four castes are enumerated. The evidence of language for the modern date of this composition is equally strong. Grīshma, for instance, the name for the hot season, does not occur in any other hymn of the Rig-veda; and Vasanta also, the name of spring, does not belong to the earliest vocabulary of the Vedic poets. It occurs but once more in the Rig-veda (x. 161. 4), in a passage where the three seasons are mentioned in the order of S'arad, autumn; Hemanta, winter; and Vasanta, spring."
Professor Weber (Indische Studien, ix. 3) concurs in this view. He observes: "That the Purusha Sūkta, considered as a hymn of the Rig-veda, is among the latest portions of that collection, is clearly perceptible from its contents. The fact that the Sāma-sañhitā has not adopted any verse from it, is not without importance (compare what I have remarked in my Academical Prelections, p. 63). The Naigeya school, indeed, appears (although it is not quite certain), to have extracted the first five verses in the seventh prapāthaka of the first Archika, which is peculiar to it."

We shall see in the following chapter that the word brāhmaṇa occurs but rarely in the Rig-veda Sanhitā, while brahman, "a priest," from which the former is derived, is of constant occurrence. From this circumstance also, it may be reasonably concluded that the hymns in which the derivative occurs are among the latest. The same remark may be made of the word vaiśya, as compared with viś.

Mr. Colebrooke's opinion of the character of the Purusha Sūkta is given in the following passage of his "Miscellaneous Essays" (vol. i. p. 161, note; or p. 105 of Williams & Norgate's ed. of 1858); "I think it unnecessary to quote from the commentary the explanation of this curious passage of the Vedas as it is there given, because it does not really elucidate the sense; the allegory is for the most part sufficiently obvious.

In his tract on "on the origin of Brahmanism," p. 4, Dr. Haug thus remarks on verses 11 and 12: "Now, according to this passage, which is the most ancient and authoritative we have on the origin of Brahmanism, and caste in general, the Brahman has not come from the mouth of this primary being, the Purusha, but the mouth of the latter became the Brahmanical caste, that is to say, was transformed into it. The passage has, no doubt, an allegorical sense. Mouth is the seat of speech. The allegory thus points out that the Brahmans are teachers and instructors of mankind. The arms are the seat of strength. If the two

29 See on this subject Weber's foot-note, p. 3.
30 Professor Aufrecht informs me that the word vaiśya does not occur in any other hymn of the Rig-veda but the Purusha Sūkta; only once in the Atharva-veda, v. 17, 9; and not at all in the Vāj. Sanh., except in the Purusha Sūkta. The same scholar remarks, as another proof of the comparatively late date of the Purusha Sūkta, that it is the only hymn which refers to the four different kinds of Vedic compositions rīch, samān, chhandas, and yajush.
arms of the Purusha are said to have been made a Kshattriya (warrior), that means, then, that the Kshattriyas have to carry arms to defend the empire. That the thighs of the Purusha were transformed into the Vaiśya means that, as the lower parts of the body are the principal repository of food taken, the Vaiśya caste is destined to provide food for the others. The creation of the Shudra from the feet of the Purusha, indicates that he is destined to be a servant to the others, just as the foot serves the other parts of the body as a firm support."

But whether the writer of the hymn intended it to be understood allegorically or not, it conveys no distinct idea of the manner in which he supposed the four castes to have originated. It is, indeed, said that the Sūdra sprang from Purusha's feet; but as regards the three superior castes and the members with which they are respectively connected, it is not quite clear which (i.e., the castes or the members) are to be taken as the subjects and which as the predicates, and consequently, whether we are to suppose verse 12 to declare that the three castes were the three members, or, conversely, that the three members were, or became, the three castes.

But whatever may be the sense of the passage, it is impossible to receive it as enunciating any fixed doctrine of the writers of what is called the Vedic age in regard to the origin of the four castes; since we find, if not in the mantras or hymns, at least in the Brāhmaṇas (which, as we have seen in page 2, are esteemed by orthodox Indian writers as being equally with the hymns a part of the Veda), not only (1) texts which agree with the Purusha Sūkta, but also (2) various other and discrepant accounts of the manner in which these classes were separately formed, as well as (3) third a class of narratives of the creation, in which the production of the human race is described without allusion to any primordial distinction of castes.

To the first of these classes (viz., that of texts which coincide more or less exactly with the Purusha Sūkta) belongs the following passage from the Taittiriya Sanhitā.

Sect. II.—Quotation from the Taittiriya Sanhitā, vii. 1. 1. 4 ff.

Prajāpatir akāmayata "prajāyeṣa" iti | sa mukhatas trieritam nir-
amimīta | tam Agnir devatā 'neṣṭuyata gāyatī chhandro rathantaram
sāma brāhmaṇo manushyāṇām ajāḥ paśūnām | tasmāt te mukhyaḥ mukhato
hy asṛṣiyanta | uraso bāhubhyām panchadaśam niraminīta | tam Indro
devatā 'neasṛṣiyata trishṭup chhando bṛihat sāma rājanyo manushyāṇām
avāḥ paśūnām | tasmāt te vīryāvanto vīryād hy asṛṣiyanta | madhye-
cataḥ saptadaśaṁ niraminīta | tam Viśvedevāḥ devatāḥ anvāsṛṣiyanta
jagati chhando vairūpam sāma vaiśyo manushyāṇām gāvah paśūnām
| tasmāt te ādyā annadhanād hy asṛṣiyanta | tasmād bhūyāṁśo 'naya-
bhyāḥ | bhūyishṭāḥ hi devatāḥ anvāsṛṣiyanta | pattaḥ ekaviśūsam
niraminīta | tam anuśṭup chhando 'neasṛṣiyata vairūjam sāma śudro
manushyāṇām āśvaḥ paśūnām | tasmāt tāv bhūta-saṅkrāmatār āśvaḥ
cha śudrāḥ cha | tasmāt śudro yajne 'navakṛipto na hi devatāḥ an-
vāsṛṣiyanta | tasmāt pādaṁ upajīvataḥ | patta hy asṛṣiyetām |

"Prajāpati desired, ‘may I propagate.’ He formed the Trivṛt
(stoma) from his mouth. After it were produced the deity Agni,
the metre Gāyatrī, the Sāman (called) Rathantara, of men the Brāhma-
man, of beasts the goats. Hence they are the chief (mukhyaḥ),
because they were created from the mouth (mukhataḥ). From (his)
breast, from (his) arms, he formed the Panchadaśa (stoma). After
it were created the god Indra, the Trishṭupb metre, the Sāman
(called) Bṛihat, of men the Rājanya, of beasts the sheep. Hence
they are vigorous, because they were created from vigour. From
(his) middle he formed the Saptadaśa (stoma). After it were created
the gods (called) the Viśvedevas, the Jagati metre, the Sāman called
the Vairūpa, of men the Vaiśya, of beasts kine. Hence they are to
be eaten, because they were created from the receptacle of food.
Wherefore they are more numerous than others, for the most numerous
deities were created after (the Saptadaśa). From his foot he formed
the Ekaviśūsa (stoma). After it were created the Anuśṭupb metre, the
Sāman called Vairāja, of men the Śudra, of beasts the horse. Hence
these two, both the horse and the Śudra, are transporters of (other)
creatures. Hence (too) the Śudra is incapacitated for sacrifice, because
no deities were created after (the Ekaviśūsa). Hence (too) these two
subsist by their feet, for they were created from the foot."
Sect. III.—Citations from the Satapatha Brahmana, the Taittiriya Brahmana, the Vajasaneya Sanhitā, and the Atharva-veda.

The following texts belong to the second class—i.e., that of those which recognize a distinct origination of the castes, but describe their creation differently from the Purusha Sukta:

S. P. Br. ii. 1, 4, 11 ff. — "Bhūr" iti vai Prajāpatir imām ajanayata "bhuvah" ity antariksham "svar" iti divam | etāvad vai idam sarvāṁ yāvad ime lokāḥ | sarvena eva ādhīyate | "bhūr" iti vai Prajāpatir brahma ajanayata "bhuvah" iti kṣhattram "svar" iti viśam | etāvad vai idam sarvāṁ yāvad brahma kṣhattrāṁ viṣ | sarvena eva ādhīyate | "bhūr" iti vai Prajāpatir ātmānam ajanayata "bhuvah" iti praṣāṁ "svar" iti paśūn | etāvad vai idam sarvāṁ yāvad ātmā praṣāḥ paśūvah | sarvena eva ādhīyate |

"(Uttering) 'bhūḥ,' Prajāpati generated this earth. (Uttering) 'bhuvah,' he generated the air, and (uttering) 'svaḥ,' he generated the sky. This universe is co-extensive with these worlds. (The fire) is placed with the whole. Saying 'bhūḥ,' Prajāpati generated the Brahman; (saying) 'bhuvah,' he generated the Kshattra; (and saying) 'svaḥ,' he generated the Viś. All this world is so much as the Brahman, Kshattra, and Viś. The fire is placed with the whole. (Saying) 'bhūḥ,' Prajāpati generated himself; (saying) 'bhuvah' he generated offspring; (saying) 'svaḥ,' he generated animals. This world is so much as self, offspring, and animals. (The fire) is placed with the whole."

Taitt. Br. iii. 12. 9, 2 — Sarvāṁ hedam brahmaṇā haiva srīṣṭām | rigbhyo jātam vaiśyaṁ varṇam āhuḥ | yajurvedam kshattriyasyāhur yonim | sāmavedo brahmaṇānāṁ prasūṭih | pūrve pūrvebhya vacha etad učuḥ |

"This entire (universe) has been created by Brahma. Men say that the Vaiśya class was produced from rich-verses. They say that the Yajur-veda is the womb from which the Kshattriya was born. The Sāma-veda is the source from which the Brāhmans sprang. This word the ancients declared to the ancients."

To complete his account of the derivation of the castes from the
Vedas, the author had only to add that the Sudras had sprung from the Atharvavangirases (the Atharva-veda); but he perhaps considered that to assign such an origin to the servile order would have been to do it too great an honour.

Vājasaneyā Sanhitā, xiv. 28 ff. (= Taittirīya Sanhitā, iv. 3, 10, 1).—ekāya astuvata prajāh adhiyanta Prajāpatir adhipatir āsīt | tisrīkhīr
astuvata brahma asriyaya Brahmanaspātir adhipatir āsīt | pañchabhir
astuvata bhūtān asriyaya Bhūtanāmpatir adhipatir āsīt | saptabhīr
astuvata saptā rishaya 'sriyaya Dhatā adhipatir āsīt | navabhīr astu-
vata pitaro 'sriyaya Adītir adhipatny āsīt | ekādasi bhūtān astuvata ritavo
'sriyaya ārtavāh adhipatayah āsan | trayodasabhīr astuvata māsā asrī-
yaya sameatsaro 'dhipatir āsīt | pañchadaśabhīr astuvata kshatravam asrīyaya
Indro 'adhipatir āsīt | saptadaśabhīr astuvata pāsavo 'sriyaya
Bṛhaspatir adhipatir āsīt | navadaśabhīr astuvata śudrāyāv asrīyetām
ahorātre adhipatn āstām | ekaviṃśatāya astuvata ekaspaḥpāh pāsavo 'sriy-
yaya Varuṇo 'dhipatir āsīt | trayoviṃśatāya astuvata kṣudrāh pāsavo
'sriyaya Pāshā adhipatir āsīt | pañchaviṃśatāya astuvata aranyāh
pāsavo 'sriyaya Vāyur adhipatir āsīt | saptaviṃśatāya astuvata dyāca-
prthivi vyāstām | Vasavo Rudrā Adityāḥ anuvyāyan | te eva adhipa-
tayah āsan | navaviṃśatāya astuvata vanaspatayo 'sriyaya Somo 'dhipatir
āsīt | ekatriṃśatā astuvata prajā asriyaya yaśās cha ayacās cha adhi-
patayah āsan | trayastriṃśatā astuvata bhūtān asāmyan Prajāpatiḥ
Parameśṭhi adhipatir āsīt |

“He lauded with one. Living beings were formed: Prajāpati was the ruler. He lauded with three: the Brahman (Brähman) was created: Brahmanaspāti was the ruler. He lauded with five: existing things were created: Bhūtānāmpatī was the ruler. He lauded with seven: the seven rishis were created: Dhāti was the ruler. He lauded with nine: the Fathers were created: Aditi was the ruler. He lauded with eleven: the seasons were created: the Ārtavas were the rulers. He lauded with thirteen: the months were created: the year was the ruler. He lauded with fifteen: the Kshattriya (the Kshatriya) was created: Indra was the ruler. He lauded with seventeen: animals were created: Bṛhaspatī was the ruler. He lauded with nineteen: the Sudra and the Arya (Vaiśya) were created: day and night were the rulers. He lauded with twenty-one: animals with undivided hoofs were created: Varuṇa was the ruler. He lauded with twenty-three:
small animals were created: Puśhan was the ruler. He lauded with twenty-five: wild animals were created: Vāyu was the ruler (compare R.V. x. 90, 8). He lauded with twenty-seven: heaven and earth separated: Vasus, Rudras, and Ādityas separated after them: they were the rulers. He lauded with twenty-nine: trees were created: Soma was the ruler. He lauded with thirty-one: living beings were created: The first and second halves of the month were the rulers. He lauded with thirty-one: existing things were tranquillized: Prajāpati Parameshṭhin was the ruler.” This passage is explained in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa viii. 4, 3, 1 ff.

The following text is of a somewhat mystical description; but appears to intimate a distinction in nature between the different castes corresponding to that of the gods with whom they are associated:

S. P. Br. xiv. 4, 2, 23 (= Brhadāraṇyaka Upanishad, i. 4, 11 ff. (p. 235).—Brahma vai idam agro āsid ekam eva] tad ekām san na vyabhacau | tat śreya rūpam aty asrijata kshattrayā yāny etāni devatā kshattrāni Indro Varuṇaḥ Somo Rudraḥ Parjanyo Yamo Mrtyur Īśanāḥ iti | tasmāt kshattrān param nāsti | tasmād brāhmaṇāḥ kshattriyād adhastād upāste rajasūye kshattre eva tad yaśo dadhāti | sā eshā kshattrasya yonir yad brahma | tasmād yadyapi rājā paramatām gachhati brahma eva antatāḥ upaniṣayati svām yonim | yaḥ u ha enaṁ hinasti svām sa yonim richhati | sa pāpiyān bhavate yathā śreyāṁsam hiṁsītvā | 24. Sa na eva vyabhacau | sa visam asrijata yāny etāni deco-jātāni ganasaḥ ākhyāyante vasavo rudrāḥ ādityāḥ visvedeṁ mahutvaḥ iti | 25. Sa na eva vyabhacau | sa saudram varnam asrijata pāśaṇam | iyaṁ vai pūṣhā iyaṁ hi idam sarvaṁ pushyatī yad idaṁ kincha | 26. Sa na eva vyabhacau | tat śreya rūpam aty asrijata dharmam | tad etat kshattrasya kshattrayā yad dharmah | tasmād dharmat paraṁ nāsti | athā bhavāyān baliyaṁsam āsamaṁ sate dharmena yathā rājā evam | yo vai sa dharmah satyaṁ vai tat | tasmāt satyaṁ vadantam āhur "dharmam vadati" iti | dharmam vai

31 The Taittirīya Sanhitā reads yāvāḥ and ayāvāḥ (instead of yāvāḥ and ayāvāḥ as in the Vājasaṇeśi Sanhitā) and in another passage, v. 3, 4, 5 (as I learn from Prof. Aufrecht), explains these terms to mean respectively months and half months (māsa vai yāvāḥ ardhanāmaṁ ayāvāḥ), whilst the commentator on the V. S. understands them to mean the first and second halves of the month, in accordance with the S. P. B. viii. 4, 3, 18, and viii. 4, 2, 11 (puraśpakhā iti yavāḥ aparapaksha ayavāḥ | te hi idaṁ sarvaṁ yevatā cha yavanaṁ yevatā cā) | Prof. Aufrecht also points out that yava is explained in Kātyāyanas Sūratas Śūtras, iv. 11, 8, as equivalent to yavanayam apūpanam, "a cake of barley."
vadantām “satyam vadati” iti | etad hy eva etad ubhayam bhavati |
27. Tad etad brahma kshattrān viṣ śudrāḥ | tad āgniṇā eva deveshu
brahmābhavad brahmāṇa manushyeshu kshattriyena kshattriyena vaisyena
vaisyāḥ śudṛṣṭaḥ śudrāḥ | tasmād āgniṇā eva deveshu lokam ichhante
brahmāṇa manushyeshu | etabhyaṁ hi rūpabhyāṁ brahma abhavat |

23. “Brahma (here, according to the commentator, existing in the
form of Āgni, and representing the Brāhman caste) was formerly this
(universe), one only. Being one, it did not develop. It energetically
created an excellent form, the Kshattrā, viz., those among the gods
who are powers (kṣattrāṇi), Indra, Varuṇa, Soma, Rudra, Parjanya,
Yama, Mṛtyu, Īśāna. Hence nothing is superior to the Kshattrā.
Therefore the Brāhman sits below the Kshattriya at the rājasūya-sacri-
fice; he confers that glory on the Kshattrā (the royal power).”

This, the Brahma, is the source of the Kshattrā. Hence, although the king
attains supremacy, he at the end resorts to the Brahma as his source.
Whoever destroys him (the Brāhman) destroys his own source. He
becomes most miserable, as one who has injured a superior. 24. He
did not develop. He created the Vīś—viz., those classes of gods who
are designated by troops, Vasus, Rudras, Ādityas, Viśvedevas, Maruts.
25. He did not develop. He created the Śūdra class, Pūshan. This
earth is Pūshan: for she nourishes all that exists. 26. He did not
develop. He energetically created an excellent form, Justice (Dharma).
This is the ruler (kṣattrā) of the ruler (kṣattrā), namely, Justice.
Hence nothing is superior to justice. Therefore the weaker seeks (to
overcome) the stronger by justice, as by a king. This justice is
truth. In consequence they say of a man who speaks truth, “he speaks

22 Atra yad utma-sabdenoktaṁ vrashaṭri Brahma tad āgniṇā arishṭvā eva āgni-rū-
pāpam na Brahmāṁ-jāty-abhimāṇavat admin vākye Brahma-sabdenābhidiśyate |
23 This rendering of the last few words is suggested by Professor Aufricht.
The commentators understand them to mean that the Brāhmans give the
king their own glory (that of being a Brahma): and they refer to a formula by which at the rājasūya-
sacrifice the king, after addressing the priest as Brāhman, is addressed in return with
the word “Thou, king, art a Brāhman” (teṣāṁ rūjan brahmāsi), etc. See the Taittiriya
Sanhitā i. 8, 16, 1, where the commentator remarks: “As in common life domestic
priests and others, sitting below a king seated on his throne after his return from con-
quering a foreign territory, address him with many benedictions and eulogies, so
here too service is presented. By this benedictory service the power of cursing and
showing kindness existing in the Brāhmans is transferred to the king.” Reference is
then made to the passage before us, as noticing this custom.
AND OF THE ORIGIN OF THE FOUR CASTES.

justice;' or of a man who is uttering justice, 'he speaks truth.' For
this is both of these. 27. This is the Brahma, Kshatttra, Viś, and
Sūdra. Through Agni it became Brahma among the gods, the Brāhma-
man among men, through the (divine) Kshattriya a (human) Kshat-
triya, through the (divine) Vaiśya a (human) Vaiśya, through the
(divine) Śūdra a (human) Śūdra. Wherefore it is in Agni among
the gods and in a Brāhma among men, that they seek after an abode."

Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, i. 2, 6, 7.—Daiyevo vai varṇo brāhmaṇāḥ ā
asuryyo śūdraḥ. “The Brāhma caste is sprung from the gods; the
Śūdra from the Asuras.”

Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, iii. 2, 3, 9.—Kāmam eva dāru-pātreṇa duhyāt ā
śūdraḥ eva na duhyāt | asato vai esha sambhūto yat śūdraḥ | ahavir eva
tad ity āhur yat śūdro dogdhi iti | agnihatram eva na duhyāt śūdraḥ |
tad hi na utpunanti | yadā khalu vai pavitram atyeti atha tad havir iti |
“Let him at his will milk out with a wooden dish. But let not a
Śūdra milk it out. For this Śūdra has sprung from non-existence.
They say that that which a Śūdra milks out is no oblation. Let not a
Śūdra milk out the Agnihotra. For they do not purify that. When
that passes beyond the filter, then it is an oblation.”

Atharva-veda, iv. 6, 1.—Brāhmaṇo jajne prathamo daśāśīraḥ daśā-
yāḥ | sa somam prathamaḥ papaṃ sa chakārārasāṃ visham | “The
Brāhma was born the first, with ten heads and ten faces. He first
drank the soma; he made poison powerless.”

As the description (which is, perhaps, a fragment of a longer
account), stops short here, we are left in the dark as to the author's
ideas about the creation of the other castes. It would have interested
us to know how many heads and faces he would have assigned to the
other three castes. The student of Indian poetry is aware that the
giant Rāvana is represented in the Rāmāyaṇa both as a Brāhma and
as having ten heads.

As implying a separate origination of the Rājanya caste, the fol-
lowing text also may find a place here:

Taittirīya Sanhitā, ii. 4, 13, 1.—Devā vai rājanyāj jayamānād abi-
bhavuh | tam antar eva santiṃ dāmnā ’paumbhan | sa vai esho ’pobdho
jāyate yad rājanyo | yad vai esho ’napobdho jāyeta vṛittṛan ghaṁś charat |
yāṃ kāmayeta rājanyam “anapobdho jāyeta vṛittṛan ghaṁś charād” iti
tasmai etam aindrā-bārhaspatyaṁ charuṁ nirvapet | aindro vai rājanyo
brahma Brihaspatiḥ | brahmanā eva enam dāmno ’pombhanād munčati |
hiraṃnayaṁ dāma dakshīṇa sākshād eva enam dañno ’pombhanād munčati |
"The gods were afraid of the Rājanya when he was in the womb. They bound him with bonds when he was in the womb. Consequently this Rājanya is born bound. If he were born unbound he would go on slaying his enemies. In regard to whatever Rājanya any one desires that he should be born unbound, and should go on slaying his enemies, let him offer for him this Aindra-Bārhaspatya oblation. A Rājanya has the character of Indra, and a Brahman is Brihaspati. It is through the Brahma that anyone releases the Rājanya from his bond. The golden bond, a gift, manifestly releases from the bond that fetters him."

In the following text of the Atharva-veda, xv. 8, 1, a new account is given of the origin of the Rājanyas:

So ’rajyata tato rājanyo ’jayata |
“He (the Vrātya) became filled with passion: thence sprang the Rājanya.”

And in the following paragraph (A. V. xv. 9, 1 ff) we have the same origin ascribed to the Brāhman also:

Tad yasya evaṁ videṇa vṛātyo rājno ’tīthir grihān āgachhet śreyāṁ sam
enam ātmano mānayet | tathā kṣattrāya nāvṛiśchate tathā rāṣṭrāya
nāvṛiśchate | ato vai brahma cha kṣattrāṁ cha udatiśkhatām | te abrātām "kam praviśāva" iti |

“Let the king to whose house the Vrātya who knows this, comes as a guest, cause him to be respected as superior to himself. So doing he does no injury to his royal rank, or to his realm. From him arose the Brahman (Brāhman) and the Kshattria (Kshatriya). They said, ‘Into whom shall we enter,’ etc.”

Secr. IV.—Further Quotations from the Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa, Sanhitā, and Āranyaka, and from the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa.

The following passages belong to the third of the classes above adverted to, as in the descriptions they give of the creation, while they refer to the formation of men, they are silent on the subject of any separate origination of castes:
Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa, ii. 3, 8, 1.—Prajāpatir akāmayata "prajāyeya" iti | sa tapo 'tapyata | sa 'ntarvān abhavat | sa haritaḥ śyāvo 'bhavat | tasmāt strī antarvātān harīṇī sātī śyāvā bhavati | sa vijāyamāno garbhena utāmyat | sa tāntaḥ krishna-śyāvo 'bhavat | tasmāt tāntaḥ krishṇaḥ śyāvo bhavati | tasya asur eva ajīvat | 2. Tena asunā asurān asrijata | tad asurāṇam asurātvaṁ | ya evam asurāṇām asurātvaṁ veda asunān eva bhavati | na enaṃ asur jāhāti | so 'sūrān srińtva pitā iva amanyata | tad anu pītṛn asrijata | tat pītṛṇām pītṛtvam | ya evam pītṛṇām pītṛtvam veda pitā iva eva svānām bhavati (3) yantry asya pitaro havam | sa pītṛn sriśtva 'manasyat | tad anu manūshyaṁ asrijata | tad manuśyāṁ manuśhyatvam | yaḥ evam manuśhyāṁ manuśhyatvam veda manasvi eva bhavati na enaṃ manur jāhāti | tasmāi manuśhyān sasrījāṇaya divā devatāvābhaḥ | tad anu devān asrijata | tad devānām devatvaṁ | ya evam devānām devatvaṁ veda divā ha eva asya devatābhavati | tān vai etānī chatevārī ambhāṃśi devāḥ manuśhyāḥ pitaro 'surāḥ | teṣu sarvesu ambho nabhāḥ iva bhavati |

"Prajāpati desired, 'may I propagate.' He practised austerity. He became pregnant. He became yellow-brown. Hence a woman when pregnant, beingy ellow, becomes brown. Being pregnant with a foetus, he became exhausted. Being exhausted, he became blackish-brown. Hence an exhausted person becomes blackish-brown. His breath became alive. 2. With that breath (asva) he created Asuras. Therein consists the Asura-nature of Asuras. He who thus knows this Asura-nature of Asuras becomes a man possessing breath. Breath does not forsake him. Having created the Asuras, he regarded himself as a father. After that he created the Fathers (Pitrīs). That constitutes the fatherhood of the Fathers. He who thus knows the fatherhood of the Fathers, becomes as a father of his own: (3) the Fathers resort to his oblation. Having created the Fathers, he reflected. After that he created men. That constitutes the manhood of men. He who knows the manhood of men, becomes intelligent. Mind does not forsake him. To him, when he was creating men, day appeared in the heavens. After that he created the gods. This constitutes the godhead of the gods. To him who thus knows the godhead of the gods, day appears in

34 Niśa-ivēta-mēra-vargaḥ, "of a mixed blue and white colour," says the Commentator.
35 Manuḥ = manana-aktiḥ, "the power of thinking." Comm.
the heavens. These are the four streams, viz., gods, men, Fathers, and Asuras. In all of these water is like the air.”

Satapatha Brahmana, vii. 5, 2, 6.—Prajapati vair idam agre asid ekaḥ eva | so ’kāmaya ta “annam srijeya praśāyey” iti | sa praśebhyaḥ eva adhi pasūn niramimita manasaḥ puruṣam chakshusho ’śvam praśād gām śrotādavīm vācico ’jam | tad yad enān praśebhyo ’dhi niramimita tasmād āhuḥ “praśāḥ paśavaḥ” iti | mano vair praśānam prathamam | tad yad manasaḥ puruṣam niramimita tasmād āhuḥ “puruśaḥ prathāmaḥ paśūnām viryavattamaḥ” iti | mano vair sarve praśāḥ | manasi hi sarve praśāḥ pratishtitaḥ | tad yad manasaḥ puruṣam niramimita tasmād āhuḥ “puruśaḥ sarve paśavaḥ” iti | puruṣāsya hy ete sarve bhaṇvanti |

“Prajapati was formerly this (universe), one only. He desired, ‘let me create food, and be propagated.’ He formed animals from his breaths, a man from his soul, a horse from his eye, a bull from his breath, a sheep from his ear, a goat from his voice. Since he formed animals from his breaths, therefore men say, ‘the breaths are animals.’ The soul is the first of the breaths. Since he formed a man from his soul, therefore they say, ‘man is the first of the animals, and the strongest.’ The soul is all the breaths; for all the breaths depend upon the soul. Since he formed man from his soul, therefore they say, ‘man is all the animals; for all these are man’s.”

S. P. Br. xiv. 4, 2, 1 (= Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad, p. 125).—Ātmā eva idam agre āsit puruṣa-vidhāḥ | so ’nuvīkṣya na anyad ātmano ’pasyat | “so ’ham asmi” ity agre vyāharat | tato ’ham-nāmā abhavat | tasmād apy etarhy āmantrito “’ham ayam” ity eva agre utkāv atha anyad nāma prabṛte yad asya bhaṇvati | 2. Sa yat pūrco ’smāt sarvasmāt sarvān pāpmanāḥ aushat tasmāt puruṣaḥ | oṣhati ha vai sa taṁ yo ’smāt pur- vam bhubhāshati yaḥ evaṁ veda | 3. So ’bibhet | tasmād ekākī bibheti |

38 The Commentary not very satisfactorily explains this as meaning, “All these four abodes of the gods, etc., are like waters—i.e., suited to yield enjoyment, as ponds, rivers, etc., are fit for bathing, drinking,” etc. The phrase is repeated in the Vishnu Purāṇa, i. 5 (vol. i., p. 79, of Dr. Hall’s edition); and in his note Professor Wilson says ambhāsai “is also a peculiar and probably a mystic term.” It is explained in the Vāyu Purāṇa, as will be seen further on. The last words of the quotation from the Brihadāraṇyaka are obscure. In another passage of the same work (iii. 8, 18, 1, 2) the terms ambhās, nabhās, and mahās, are declared to denote respectively “earth,” “air,” and “sky” (... ayaṁ vai loka ’mbhāsī ... antarikshāṁ vai nabhāsī ... asau vai loka mahāmī).
AND OF THE ORIGIN OF THE FOUR CASTES.
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sa ha ayam īkṣaṇāchakre yad "mad anyad nāstī kasmād nu bibhemi" iti | tataḥ eva asya bhayam viyāya | kasmād hy abheshyat | deviyyād vai bhayam bhavati | 4. Sa vai naiva reme | tasmād ekākī na ramate | sa devīyām aichhat | sa ha etāvān āsa yathā stri-pūnānnaṃ samparishvaktau | 5. Sa imam eva ātmānam devedhā 'pātayat | tataḥ patīḥ patnī cha abhayatām | tasmād "idam ardhavirgam iva svah" iti ha sma āha Yājnavalkyāḥ | tasmād ākāsaḥ striyā pūryate eva | tām samaḥbhavat | tato manushyāḥ ajāyanta | 6. Sā u ha iyam īkṣaṇāchakre "kathaṃ nu mā ātmānāḥ eva janayitvā sambhavati hanta tiro 'sānī" iti | 7. Sā gaur abhayat vrishabhaḥ itaras tāṁ sam eva abhayat | tato gāvah ajāyanta | 8. Vaśāva itaraḥ abhayad aśvavirashaḥ itaraḥ gardabhi itaraḥ gardabhaḥ itaras tāṁ sam eva abhayat | tataḥ ekāśupham ajāyata | 9. Ajā itarāv abhayad vasaḥ itarāv vir itarāv meshaḥ itarāḥ | tāṁ sam eva abhayat tato 'jāvayo 'jāyanta | evam eva yad idaṁ kīṛcha mithunam ā pippilikaḥpyhas tat sarvam asṛjita | 37

"This universe was formerly soul only, in the form of Purusha. Looking closely, he saw nothing but himself (or soul). He first said, 'This is I.' Then he became one having the name of I. Hence even now a man, when called, first says, 'this is I,' and then declares the other name which he has. 2. Inasmuch as he, before (pūrvah) all this, burnt up (aushat) all sins, he (is called) purusha. The man who knows this burns up the person who wishes to be before him. 3. He was afraid. Hence a man when alone is afraid. This (being) considered that 'there is no other thing but myself: of what am I afraid?' Then his fear departed. For why should he have feared? It is of a second person that people are afraid. 4. He did not enjoy happiness. Hence a person when alone does not enjoy happiness. He desired a second. He was so much as a man and a woman when locked in embrace. 5. He caused this same self to fall asunder into two parts. Thence arose a husband and a wife. 38 Hence Yājvanalkya has said that 'this one's self is like the half 39 of a split pea.' Hence the void is filled up by

37 This passage has been already translated by Mr. Colebrooke, Essays i. 64, as well as by Dr. Roer, in the Bibliotheca Indica.
38 Mana and S'atarotpā, according to the Commentator.
39 Compare Taitt, Br. i. i. 3, 3, 5. Atho arddho vai eva ātmano yat patnī | "Now a wife is the half of one's self;" and ibid. iii. 3, 3, 1: Ayajno vai eva yo 'patnīkāḥ | na prajāḥ prajayena | "The man who has no wife is unfit to sacrifice. No children will be born to him." We must not, however, suppose from these passages that the
woman. He cohabited with her. From them men were born. 6. She reflected, 'how does he, after having produced me from himself, cohabit with me? Ah! let me disappear.' 7. She became a cow, and the other a bull; and he cohabited with her. From them kine were produced. 8. The one became a mare, the other a stallion, the one a she-ass, the other a male-ass. He cohabited with her. From them the class of animals with undivided hoofs was produced. The one became a she-goat, the other a he-goat, the one a ewe, the other a ram. He cohabited with her. From them goats and sheep were produced. In this manner pairs of all creatures whatsoever, down to ants, were created.'

The next passage describes men as descendants of Vivasvat, or the Sun, without specifying any distinction of classes:

Taittirīya Sanhitā vi. 5, 6, 1 f.—Aditiḥ putrakīmā saddhyabhya deve-bhyo brahmāudanam apachat | tasyai uchchheshanam adaduḥ | tat prāśnāt sā reto 'dhatta | tasyai chatērāḥ Adityāḥ ajāyanta | sā devīyam apachat | sā 'manyata “uchchheshanād me ime 'jñata | yad agrē prāśīhāyīmi ito me vasīyāṁso janishyante” iti | sā 'gre prāśnāt sā reto 'dhatta tasyai ev'riddham āṇḍam ajāyata | sā Adityēbhyaḥ eva tītīyam apachat “bhogāya me idam śrāntam astu” iti | te 'brūvan “vayaṁ śrīmānāhī yo 'to jāyā-tai asmākāṁ sa eko 'sät | yo 'sya prajāyām pīṁdhāyāt asmākam bhogāya bhavād” iti | tato Vivasvān Adityo 'jyāta | tasya vai iyaṁ prajā yaḥ manuṣhyaḥ | tāv ekāḥ eva riddha yo yaṁaṁ sa devānām bhogāya bhavati |

"Aditi, desirous of sons, cooked a Brahmana oblation for the gods. They gave her the remnant of it. This she ate. She conceived seed. Four Adityas were born to her. She cooked a second (oblation). She reflected, 'from the remains of the oblation these sons have been born to me. If I shall eat (the oblation) first, more brilliant estimation in which women were held by the authors of the Brāhmaṇas was very high, as there are other texts in which they are spoken of disparagingly; such as the following: Taitt. Sanh. vi. 5, 8, 2.—Sa soma nātishhata sūbhya gṛihyaṁyāḥ | tam ghrītas evaṁ kriteś 'ghnan tam nīrindriyam bhūtam agraśan | tamūt striya nīrindriyā adāyādīr api pāpāṁ punaṁ upasthitaraṁ vadanti | “Soma did not abide, when being poured out to women. Making that butter a thunderbolt they smote it. They poured it out when it had become powerless. Hence women, powerless, and portionless, speak more humbly than even a poor man.” (Compare the quotation in the Commentary on the Taitt. Sanhitā, Vol. i. p. 996.) Taitt. Sanh. vi. 5, 10, 3. Tamsūt striyaṁ jātān parāyānti ut pumāṁsām karanti | “Hence they reject a female (child) when born, and take up a male.” (Compare Nirukta, iii. 4.)

60 Compare Taitt. Br. iii. 3, 10, 4. Prajāyā hi manuṣhyaḥ pūrnāḥ, “For by offspring a man is completed.”
(sons) will be born to me. She ate it first; she conceived seed; an imperfect egg was produced from her. She cooked a third (oblation) for the Ādityas, (repeating the formula) ‘may this religious toil have been undergone for my enjoyment.’ The Ādityas said, ‘Let us choose a boon: let any one who is produced from this be ours only; let anyone of his progeny who is prosperous be for us a source of enjoyment.’ In consequence the Āditya Vivasvat was born. This is his progeny, namely men. Among them he alone who sacrifices is prosperous, and becomes a cause of enjoyment to the gods.”

The passages next following do not specify separately the creation of men (who must, however, be understood as included along with other beings under the designation praṇāḥ, “offspring,” or “creatures,”) and therefore afford less distinct evidence that their authors did not hold the fourfold origin of mankind.

The first of these extracts is especially interesting, both on account of its own tenor, and because (along with Taitt. Br. ii. 3, 8, 1 ff. quoted in p. 23) it contains the germ of one of the Puranic accounts of the creation which will be adduced in a subsequent section.

Taitt. Br. ii. 2, 9, 1 ff.—Iddha vai agrne naica kinchana āsīt | na dyaur āsīd na prithivi na antariksham | tad asaḍ eva saḍ mano ‘kuruta “vyām” iti | tad atapyata | tasmāt tapanāḍ dhūno jāyata | tad bhūyo ‘tapyata tasmāt tapanāḍ Agnir ajañata | tad bhūyo ‘tapyata | 2. Tasmāt tapanāj jyotir ajāyata | tad bhūyo ‘tapyata | tasmāt tapanāḍ archir ajāyata | tad bhūyo ‘tapyata | tasmāt tapanāḍ marichayo jāyanta | tad bhūyo ‘tapyata | tasmāt tapanāḍ udārah ajāyata | tad bhūyo ‘tapyata | tad ahbhram iva

41 Compare Taitt. Br. i. 8, 8, 1. Ādityāḥ vai praṇāḥ, “Creatures are descended from Aditi.”

42 This story is told also, but with more detail of names and somewhat differently, in Taitt. Br. i. 1, 9, 10 ff.; Āditiṣṭī putraḥāna sādhyaḥbhaya deevbhya brahmadanana apachat | tasyai uchchhashrayam adaduh | tat prāṣṇat | sū reto ‘dhatta | tasyai Dhātā cha Aryanā cha ajāyetaṃ | sū deviṣyam apachat tasyai uchchhashrayam adaduh | tat prāṣṇat | sū reto ‘dhatta | tasyai Mitra ēha Varuṇa ēha ajāyetaṃ | sū triṣiṣyam apachat | tasyai uchchhashrayam adaduh | tat prāṣṇat | sū reto ‘dhatta | tasyai Ānāśīcaçcha Bhaga ēha ajāyetaṃ | sū chaturthām apachat | tasyai uchchhashrayam ada- duh | tat prāṣṇat | sū reto ‘dhatta tasyai Indras ēha Vivasvānā ēha ajāyetaṃ | “Aditi, desirous of sons, cooked a Brahmaudana oblation to the gods the Sādhyas. They gave her the remnant of it. She ate it. She conceived seed. Dhātri and Aryaman were born to her.” She does the same thing a second time, when she bears Mitra and Varuṇa,—a third time, when she bears Ānāśa and Bhaga,—and a fourth time, when she bears Indra and Vivasvata.
MYTHICAL ACCOUNTS OF THE CREATION OF MAN,

samahanyata | tud vastim abhinat | 3. Sa samudro ’bhavat | tasmät samu-

drasya na pibanti | praajanam ieva hi manyante | tasmät paso jayamānād

āpah purastād yanti | tud dasahotā avanāṣījyata | Prajāpatir vai dasa-

hotā | yah evam tapas viryaṁ vidvāṁ tapyata bhavaty eva | tud vai

idam āpah salilam āsīt | so ’rodit Prajāpatih (4) “sa kasmai ajñi yady

asyāpratishthāyāḥ” iti | yah apes avāpadyata sa prithivy abhavat | yad evam

vyamrishaṭa tad antarikṣam abhavat | yad ārdhvam udāmarishṭa sa
dyauñ abhavat | yad arodit tad anayoḥ rodastvaṃ | 5. Yah evam veda na aya

grīhe rudanti | etad vai ēśāṁ lokānāṁ janma | ya evam ēsāṁ lokānāṁ

janma veda na esu lokesho ārtītm ārthati | sa imāṁ pratishtthām avin-
data | sa imāṁ pratishtthām vittvā akāmayata “prajāyeya” iti | sa tapo ’
tapyata | so ’ntavān abhavat | sa jāhanād asuran āṣījata | 6. Tebhyo

mrignaye pātre ‘nnam aduhat | ya aṣya sa tanur āsīt tām apāhata | sa
tamisrā ’bhavat | so ‘kāmayata “prajāyeya” iti | sa tapo ’tapyata | so ’ntavān abhavat | sa prajanānād eva prajā āṣījata | tasmād imāḥ

bhūyishṭah | prajanānāḥ hy enaḥ āṣījata | 7. Tebhyo dārumaye pātre

payo ’duhat | yah evam veda na aṣa yā sa tanur āsīt tām apāhata | sa jyotsnā ’bhavat |

so ‘kāmayata “prajāyeya” iti | sa tapo ’tapyata so ’ntavān abhavat | sa
upapakshabhāyām eva ritūn āṣījata | tebhyo rajate pātre ghritam aduhat |
yah evam veda na aṣa yā sa tanur āsīt (8) tām apāhata | so ‘ho-ṛtrayoh sandhīr abhavat |
so ‘kāmayata “prajāyeya” iti | sa tapo ’tapyata | so ’ntavān abhavat |
so mukhād devān āṣījata | tebhyo harite pātre somam aduhat | yah evam veda na aṣa yā sa tanur āsīt tām apāhata | tad ahaḥ abhavat | 9. Ete vai Prajāpater dohaḥ |

ya evam veda duhe eva prajāḥ | “diva vai no ’bhūd” iti tad devānām
devatvaṃ | ya evam devānāṁ devatvaṃ veda devavān eva bhavati | etad vai

aho-ṛtrānāṁ janma | ya evam aho-ṛtrānāṁ janma veda na aho-ṛtrreshu ārtītm ārthati | 10. Asato ’dhi mano ’āṣījyata | manaḥ Prajāpatim āṣī-

jata | Prajāpātih prajā āṣījata | tad vai idam manasy eva paramam

pratishthitam yadidaṁ kīñcha | tad etat svaṣayaṇaḥ nāma Brahma |
evuchhanti evuchhanti asmai vasyai vasyai evuchhata prajāyate prajayā

paśubhiḥ pra paramesṣṭhino mātram āpnoti ya evam veda | “At first this (universe) was not anything. There was neither sky,
nor earth, nor air. Being non-existent, it resolved ‘let me be.’ It
became fervent.43 From that fervour smoke was produced. It again

43 The word thus rendered is atapyata, which has the sense of “being heated” as well as “practising austere abstraction.” I have purposely given an equivocal rendering, which may bear either sense.
became fervent. From that fervour fire was produced. It again became fervent. From that fervour light was produced. It again became fervent. From that fervour flame was produced. It again became fervent. From that fervour rays were produced. It again became fervent. From that fervour blazes were produced. It again became fervent. It became condensed like a cloud. It clove its bladder. That became the sea. Hence men do not drink of the sea. For they regard it as like the place of generation. Hence water issues forth before an animal when it is being born. After that the Daśahotri (a particular formula) was created. Prajāpati is the Daśahotri. That man succeeds, who thus knowing the power of austere abstraction (or fervour), practises it. This was then water, fluid. Prajāpati wept, (exclaiming),

(4) "For what purpose have I been born, if (I have been born) from this which forms no support?" That which fell into the waters became the earth. That which he wiped away, became the air. That which he wiped away, upwards, became the sky. From the circumstance that he wept (arōdīt), these two regions have the name of rodasi, (worlds). 5. They do not weep in the house of the man who knows this. This was the birth of these worlds. He who thus knows the birth of these worlds, incurs no suffering in these worlds. He obtained this (earth as a) basis. Having obtained (this earth as a) basis, he desired, "May I be propagated." He practised austere fervour. He became pregnant. He created Asuras from his abdomen. 6. To them he milked out food in an earthen dish. He cast off that body of his. It became darkness. He desired, "May I be propagated." He practised

44 Such is the sense the commentator gives to the word udārāḥ, which he makes uleṣaṇa-jeśuḥ. Professor Roth (s, v.) explains the word as meaning "fogs."

45 This is the mode of rendering suggested to me by Professor Aufrecht. After "if" the Commentator supplies the words—"from this non-existing earth I can create no living creature."

46 "Prajāpati's tears," etc., according to the commentator.

47 Compare S. P. Br. xi. 1, 6, 8: Atho yo 'yam avān pṛṇas tena asurāṇ asṛjyate | te imāṁ eva prātihātrn abhipadya asṛjyaṁ | tasmaj asṛjyāṁ tamaḥ eva iva āsā | 9. So 'vet "pāryān vae asṛjhyai yasmi me asṛjyāṁ tamaḥ iva abhūt" iti | tūṁ tataḥ eva pāparṇān eva ṣaṁhitā eva parabhavaṁ ityudai | "Then he created the Asuras from this lower breath of his. It was only after reaching this earth that they were created. On him, as he continued to create, darkness fell. 9. He understood, 'I have created misery, since darkness has fallen upon me as I was creating.' Then he pierced them with misery, and they in consequence succumbed," etc. The word rendered in the text by "cast off" is applied in Taitt. Sanh. i. 5, 4, 1, to serpents
austere fervour. He became pregnant. He created living beings (prajāh) from his organ of generation. Hence they are the most numerous because he created them from his generative organ. 8. To them he milked out milk in a wooden dish. He cast off that body of his! It became moon-light. He desired, 'May I be propagated. He practised austere fervour. He became pregnant. He created the seasons from his armpits. To them he milked out butter in a silver dish. He cast off that body of his. It became the period which connects day and night. He desired, 'May I be propagated.' He practised austere fervour. He became pregnant. He created the gods from his mouth. To them he milked out Soma in a golden dish. He cast off that body of his. It became day. 9. These are Prajāpati's milkings. He who thus knows milks out offspring. 'Day (dvā) has come to us:' this (exclamation expresses) the godhead of the gods. He who thus knows the godhead of the gods, obtains the gods. This is the birth of days and nights. He who thus knows the birth of days and nights, incurs no suffering in the days and nights. 10. Mind (or soul, manas,) was created from the non-existent. Mind created Prajāpati. Prajāpati created offspring. All this, whatever exists, rests absolutely on mind. This is that Brahma called Svovasyasa. For the man who thus knows, (Ushas), dawning, dawning, dawns more and more bright; he becomes prolific in offspring, and (rich) in cattle; he obtains the rank of Paramesṭhin.

S. P. Br. vi. 1, 2, 11.—Atha āhuḥ | "Prajāpatir eva imān lokān srisṭvā prithiveyam pratyatisštihat | tasmai imāh oshadhayo 'nnam apa-chyanta | tad āśnūt | sa garbhā abhavat | sa urdhvebhyaḥ eva prānebhyo devān asrijata | ye 'vānchah prānās tebhyo martyah prajāh" iti | yata-mathā 'srijata tathā 'srijata | Prajāpatis tv eva idāṁ sarvam asrijata yad idāṁ kiṁcha |

"Wherefore they say, 'Prajāpati, having created these worlds, was shedding their old skins (sarpāḥ vai jirvanto 'manyanta ... tato vai te jirnās tanūr apiāghnata).

48 Compare S. P. Br. xi. 1, 6, 7, quoted in the 4th Vol. of this work, p. 22 f.

49 The Commentator explains this word to mean "that which each succeeding day becomes transcendentally excellent (uttarottara-dīne vasīya 'tīṇyena srūṣṭhom). Here, he says, the highest and absolute Brahma is not meant, but mind, which has the form of Brahma, and, by means of the series of its volitions, is every successive moment more and more world-creating" (sankalpa-paramparasya pratikshyam uttarottara-dhika-jagat-srasṭrīvīd īdṛg-Brahma-rūpatvōd manāh praśastam |
supported upon the earth. For him these herbs were cooked as food. That (food) he ate. He became pregnant. He created the gods from his upper vital airs, and mortal offsprings from his lower vital airs. In whatever way he created, so he created. But Prajāpati created all this, whatever exists.'"

S. P. Br. x. 1, 3, 1.—Prajāpatiḥ praśāh asrijata | sa ārdheebhyah eva prānebhyaḥ devān asrijata | ye 'vānchāḥ praśās tebhya martyāh praśāh | atha ārdhevam eva mṛityum praśābhyaḥ 'ttāram asrijata |

"Prajāpati created living beings. From his upper vital airs he created the gods; from his lower vital airs mortal creatures. Afterwards he created death a devourer of creatures."

Taitt. Ar. i. 23, 1.—Āpo vai idam āsan salilam eva | sa Prajāpatir ekaḥ pushkara-parne samabhavat | tasya antar manasi kāmāḥ samavarttata "idaṁ śṛṣṭeyam" iti | tasmād yaḥ purusho manasā 'bhigachhati tad vācā vodati tat karmanā karoti | tad esā 'bhyanuktā "kāmas tad agre samavarttatādhi | manaso retaḥ prathamaṁ yad āsit | 2. Sato bandhum asati niravindan hrīdi pratishyā kavayo manīshā" iti | upa evaṁ tad upanamati yat-kāmo bhavati yah evaṁ veda | sa tapo 'tapyata | sa tapas taptvā sarīram adhūnuta | tasya yad māṁsaṁ āsit tato 'rūnāḥ Ketavo Vātaraśanāḥ rishyayā udatīṣṭhān | 3. Ye nakhās te Vaikhānasaḥ | ye bālaṁ te Bālakhilāḥ | yo vasāḥ so 'pāṁ antarataḥ kārnam bhātam sarpantam tam abravit "mama vai tvaṁ-māṁsā samabhūt" | 4. "na" ity abravit "pūrvaṁ eva aham iha āsam" iti | tat purushasya purushatvam iti | sa "saahasā-sīrśāh purushaḥ sahasrākṣaḥ sahasa-pād" bhūtvā udatīṣṭhat | tam abravit "tevaṁ ve (sic. me or vai?) pūrvaṁ samabhūt tvam idam pūrvaṁ kurusheva" iti | sa itaḥ adāya apō (5) "ājalinā purastād upādadhāt "eva ṣyā// iti | tataḥ Ādityāḥ udatīṣṭhat | sa prācī diṁ | atha Āruṇāḥ Ketar dakshinātaḥ upādadhāt "eva ṣyā Agne" iti | tato vai Agnir udatīṣṭhat | sa dakshinā dik | atha Āruṇāḥ Ketar paścāt upādadhāt "eva ṣyā Viyō" iti | 6. Tato Viyō udatīṣṭhat | sa pratīchī diṁ | atha Āruṇāḥ Ketar uttarātāḥ upādadhād "eva hi Indrā" iti | tato vai Indrāḥ udatīṣṭhat | sa udīchī diṁ | atha Āruṇāḥ Ketar madhye upādadhād "eva hi Pāshān" iti | tato vai Pāshā udatīṣṭhat | sa iyam diṁ | 7. Atha Āruṇāḥ Ketar uparishṭād upādadhād "eva hi devāḥ" iti | tato deva-manushyaḥ pitaro gandharvāpsarasas cha udatīṣṭhaḥ | sa ārthvā diṁ | yaḥ vṛipravo vi parāpana tābhya 'surāḥ rakṣānaṁ piṣaḥcha udatīṣṭhaḥ | tasmāt te parabhavān vṛiprōbhya 'hi samabhavaḥ | tau
esā ḫyanākta (8) "āpo ha yad brīhatir garbham āyan dakṣham dadhānāḥ janayantiḥ svayambhūṃ | tataḥ ime 'dhyaśriyanta sargāḥ | adbhya vai idam samabhūt | tasmād idam sāvam Brahma svayambhū" iti | tasmād idam sāvaiḥ sīthilam iev ādhrūvaṃ iev ābhavat | Prajāpatir āça taṭātāmā ātmānaṃ vidhāya tad eva anuprācīṣat | tād esā 'bhyanākta (9) "vidhāya lokān vidhāya bhūtānī vidhāya sāreḥ pradiśo diśaṣcā | Prajāpatirī prathamajāḥ ētāvya ātmānaṃ 'tmānam abhisāmeveśa" iti |

"This was water, fluid. Prajāpati alone was produced on a lotus-leaf. Within, in his mind, desire arose, 'Let me create this.' Hence whatever a man aims at in his mind, he declares by speech, and performs by act.50 Hence this verse has been uttered, 'Desire formerly arose in it, which was the primal germ of mind, (2) (and which) sages, searching with their intellect, have discovered in the heart as the bond between the existent and the non-existent' (R. V. x. 129, 4). That of which he is desirous comes to the man who thus knows. He practised austere fervour. Having practised austere fervour, he shook his body. From its flesh the rishis (called) Arunās, Ketus, and Vātaraśanas arose. 3. His nails became the Vaikhānasas, his hairs the Bālakhilyas. The fluid (of his body became) a tortoise moving amid the waters.52 He said to him, 'Thou hast sprung from my skin and flesh.'53 4. 'No,' replied the tortoise, 'I was here before.' In that (in his having been 'before' pūrvaṃ) consists the manhood of a man (puruṣha). Becoming 'a man (puruṣha) with a thousand heads, a thousand eyes, a thousand feet.'

50 Compare Taitt. S. vi. 3, 10, 4, (quoted by Roth. s. v. abhigam) yad vai hridayena abhigachchati tai jīveryā vadati |
51 They are mentioned again in Taitt. Ar. i. 24, 4. See Böhlinglek and Roth's Lexicon s.v. Ketu (where the Arunās Ketu are stated to be a sort of superior beings or demons); Artharva-veda, xi. 10, 2; Weber's Indische Studien, ii. 177; and the verse of the M. Bṛ. xii. 774: Arunās Ketavās chaive svādhāyena dividu gatāḥ | "By sacred study the Arunās and Ketus have ascended to heaven."
52 The Sanskrit scholar will observe that the text here is rather obscure. It is either corrupt, elliptical, or grammatically irregular.
53 Here the Sanskrit, if it be not corrupt, must be irregular and incorrect. On the style of the Aranyakas, see Mr. E. B. Cowell's Preface to the Kaushitaki Upanishad, p. viii., where it is remarked: "The Aranyakas appear to belong to a class of Sanskrit writings, whose history has not yet been thoroughly investigated. Their style, if we may judge from that of the Taittiriya and Kaushitaki, is full of strange solecisms which sometimes half remind us of the gāthās of the Lalita Vistara. The present Upanishad has many peculiar forms, some of which are common to both recensions, while others appear only in one. Such are: nīshīncha, in p. 10; praiti for pryayanti, in p. 51; samāvīyan, in p. 56; vēti for eyeti, in p. 78; ādīghaṃ, in p. 89, etc."
(R.V. x. 90, 1), he arose. Prajāpati said to him, 'Thou wert produced before me: do thou first make this.' He took water from this (5) in the cavity of his two hands, and placed it on the east, repeating the text, 'so be it, o Sun.' From thence the sun arose. That was the eastern quarter. Then Aruṇa Ketu placed (the water) to the south, saying, 'so be it, o Agni.' Thence Agni arose. That was the southern quarter. Then Aruṇa Ketu placed (the water) to the west, saying 'so be it, o Vāyu.' Thence arose Vāyu. That was the western quarter. Then Aruṇa Ketu placed (the water) to the north, saying 'so be it, o Indra.' Thence arose Indra. That is the northern quarter. Then Aruṇa Ketu placed (the water) in the centre, saying 'so be it, o Pūshan.' Thence arose Pūshan. That is this quarter. 7. Then Aruṇa Ketu placed (the water) above, saying 'so be it, o gods.' Thence arose gods, men, fathers, Gandharvas and Apsaras. That is the upper quarter. From the drops which fell apart arose the Asuras, Rakshasas, and Piśāchas. Therefore they perished, because they were produced from drops. Hence this text has been uttered; (8) 'when the great waters became pregnant, containing wisdom, and generating Svayambhū, from them were created these creations. All this was produced from the waters. Therefore all this is Brahma Svayambhū.' Hence all this was as it were loose, as it were unsteady. Prajāpati was that. Having made himself through himself, he entered into that. Wherefore this verse has been uttered; (9) 'Having formed the world, having formed existing things and all intermediate quarters and quarters, Prajāpati, the firstborn of the ceremonial, entered into himself with himself.'"

From an examination of the legends contained in the Brāhmaṇas, of which some specimens have just been given, it appears (1) that they are generally, if not always, adduced, or invented, with the view of showing the origin, or illustrating the efficacy, of some particular ceremony which the writer wished to explain or recommend; (2) that the accounts which they supply of Prajāpati’s creative operations are

24 The formula is in the original eva hy eva. The Commentator says that the first word means "objects of desire to be obtained," and that the second eva signifies "the moving (Sun);" the sense of the entire formula being, "Thou, o Sun, art thyself all objects of desire." The six formulas here introduced had previously occurred at the close of a preceding section, i. 20, 1.
various and even inconsistent; and (3) that they are the sources of many of the details which are found in a modified form in the cosmogonies of the Purānas.

When we discover in the most ancient Indian writings such different and even discrepant accounts of the origin of man, all put forth with equal positiveness, it is impossible to imagine that any uniform explanation of the diversity of castes could have been received at the period when they were composed, or to regard any of the texts which have been cited as more orthodox and authoritative than the rest. Even, therefore, if we should suppose that the author of the Purusha Sūkta meant to represent the four castes as having literally sprung from separate parts of Purusha's body, it is evident that the same idea was not always or even generally adopted by those who followed him, as a revealed truth in which they were bound to acquiesce. In fact, nothing is clearer than that in all these cosmogonies, the writers, while generally assuming certain prevalent ideas as the basis of their descriptions, gave the freest scope to their individual fancy in the invention of details. In such circumstances, perfect coincidence cannot be expected in the narratives.

We shall hereafter see that the Puranic writers reproduce some of these discrepancies in the traditions which descended to them from earlier generations, and add many new inconsistencies of their own, which they themselves, or their commentators, endeavour to explain away by the assumption that the accounts so differing relate to the occurrences of different Kalpas or Manvantaras (great mundane periods). But of a belief in any such Kalpas or Manvantaras no trace is to be found in the hymns or Brāhmaṇas: and, as we shall hereafter see, they must be held to be the inventions of a later age. The real explanation of these differences in the Brāhmaṇas is that the writers did not consider themselves (as their successors held them) to be infallibly inspired, and consequently were not at all studious to avoid in their narratives the appearance of inconsistency with the accounts of their predecessors.
Sect. V.—Manu’s Account of the Origin of Castes.

I shall first quote a few verses from the beginning of Manu’s account of the creation:


“8. He (the self-existent) having felt desire, and willing to create various living beings from his own body, first created the waters, and threw into them a seed. 9. That seed became a golden egg, of lustre equal to the sun; in it he himself was born as Brahmâ, the parent of all the worlds. 10. The waters are called nàrâh, for they are sprung from Nara; and as they were his first sphere of motion (ayâna-path), he is therefore called Nârâyana. 11. Produced from the imperceptible, eternal, existent and non-existent, cause, that male (purusha) is celebrated in the world as Brahmâ. 12. After dwelling for a year in the egg, the glorious being, himself, by his own contemplation, split it in twain.”

After a description of various other preparatory creative acts (vv. 13–30) the author proceeds in vv. 31 ff. to inform us how the four castes were produced:

i. 31. Lokânâm tu vairiddhyartham mukhabhâhur-pâdatah | brahmâna kshattriya-vaiyâm sûдраm cha niravarttayat | 32. Dvidhâ kritâvâtmano deham ardheṇa puruho 'bhavat | ardheṇa nàri tasâyâm sa Virâj-an asrijat prabhuh | 33. Tapatâ taptâvā 'srîjat yaûn tu sa svayam puruho

55 The ideas in this passage are derived (with modifications expressive of the theories current in the author’s own age) from the S’atapatha Brahmâna, xi. 1, 6, 1 ff. (see vol. iv. of this work, p. 311 f.); or from some other similar account in another Brâhmaṇa.
56 See S.’P. Br. i. 7, 4, 1: Prajôpatir ha vai svâm duhîtaram abhidadhau.
57 In the M. Bh. iii. 12952, Krishna says: apîma nàrîh iti purâ sañjâ-karma kritam mañjâ | tena Nârâyâno py uktu mama tat te ayânaî nasci | “The name of nàrîh was formerly assigned by me to the waters: hence I am also called Nârâyâna, for there has always been my sphere of motion.”

31. "That the worlds might be peopled, he caused the Brāhmaṇ, the Kshattriya, the Waiśya, and the Śūdra to issue from his mouth, his arms, his thighs, and his feet.\(^{28}\)

32. Having divided his own body into two parts, the lord (Brāhmaṇ) became, with the half a male (purusha), and with the half, a female; and in her he created Virāj.\(^{29}\)

33. Know, O most excellent twice-born men, that I, whom that male, (purusha)\(^{30}\) Virāj, himself created, am the creator of all this world. 34. Desiring to produce living creatures, I performed very arduous devotion, and first created ten Maharṣis (great rishis), lords of living beings, (35) viz., Marīchi, Atri, Angiras, Pulastaṇa, Pulaha, Kratu, Prachetas, Vasīśṭha, Bhṛgu, and Nārada.\(^{41}\) 36. They, endowed with

\(^{28}\) On this Kullūka the Commentator remarks: *Daiyeśa ca śaktya mukhaśivyo brāhmaṇa-viśeṣo na visākṣitaṁ śeṣamśeśo na vratasiddhaṁ* | "It is not to be doubted that, by his divine power, Brahmā formed the Brāhmaṇ and the other castes from his mouth and other parts, since it is proved by the Veda. He then quotes the 12th verse of the Purusha Śūkta.

\(^{29}\) See the Purusha Śūkta, verse 5.

\(^{30}\) It will be observed that Manu applies this term *purusha* to three beings, first to Brāhmaṇ (v. 11), second to the male formed by Brahmā from the half of his own body (v. 32), and third to Virāj, the offspring of the male and female halves of Brahmā's body (v. 33). It will be noticed that this story of Brahmā dividing his body is borrowed from the passage of the S. P. Br. xiv. 4, 2, 1, quoted above.

\(^{41}\) In the Rāmāyaṇa, ii. 110, 2 ff., a different account is given of the origin of the world, in which no reference is made to Manu Svāyambhuva. The order of the creation there described is as follows: First everything was water. Then Brahmā Svāyambhū, with the deities, came into existence—Brahmā being said to have sprung
great energy, created other seven Manus, gods, and abodes of gods, and Maharshis of boundless might; (37) Yakshas, Rakshases, Piśāchas, Gandharvas, Apsarasæ, Asuras, Nāgas, Serpents, great Birds, and the different classes of Pitrīs; (38) lightnings, thunderbolts, clouds, Indra's bows unbent and bent, meteors, portentous atmospheric sounds, comets, and various luminaries; (39) Kinnaras, apes, fishes, different sorts of birds, cattle, deer, men, beasts with two rows of teeth; (40) small and large reptiles, moths, lice, flies, fleas, all gadflies and gnats, and motionless things of different sorts. 41. Thus by my appointment, and by the force of devotion, was all this world both motionless and moving, created by those great beings, according to the (previous) actions of each creature."

The different portions of the preceding narrative of the creation of the human species are not easily reconcileable with each other. For it is first stated in verse 31, that men of the four castes proceeded separately from different parts of Brahmā's body,—prior (as it would appear) (1) to the division of that body into two parts and to the successive production (2) of Virāj, (3) Manu, and (4) the Maharshis, who formed all existing creatures. And yet we are told in verse 39, that men were among the beings called into existence by those Maharshis, and in verse 41, that the entire moving as well as motionless world was their work. It is not said that the men created by the Maharshis were distinct from those composing the four castes, and we must, therefore, assume that the latter also are included under the general appellation of men. But if men of the four castes had been already produced before the formation of all living creatures by the Maharshis, what necessity existed for the men of these castes being a second time called into being as a part of that later creation? It is possible that this

from the æther (ākāśa). Brahmā, with his sons, created the world. From Brahmā sprang Marichi; from Marichi, Kaśyapa; from Kaśyapa, Vivasvat; and from Vivasvat, Manu Vaivasvata. The original of this passage is quoted in the 4th vol. of this work, p. 29 ff.

These great rishis seem to be the beings denoted by the word viivasaśyajah, “creators of the universe,” in the verse of Manu (xii. 50), which will be quoted below. Reference to rishis, or to seven rishis, as “formers of existing things” (bhūta-kritah), is also found in the Atharvaveda, vi. 108, 4; vi. 133, 4, 6; xi. 1, 1, 3, 24; xii. 1, 39; and the word bhūtakritah, without the addition of rishis, is found in the same work iii. 28, 1; iv. 35, 2, and xix. 16, 2.
allegation of the separate creation of castes may have been engrafted as an after-thought on the other account. 63

After other details, regarding the propagation, nature, etc., of created things (vv. 42-50), the re-absorption of Brahmā into the Supreme Spirit, and his alternations of sleep and repose, etc. (vv. 50-57), Manu proceeds:

58. Idaṁ śāstraṁ tu kṛtvā 'sau mām eva svayam āditiḥ | vidhivad grāhāyāṁśa Marichyaśāṁś te-aham munīn  | 59. Etad vo 'yam Bṛgūḥ śāstraṁ śrāvatishyaty aśeṣhataḥ | etad hi matte 'dhijage sarvam eho 'khilam munih  | 60. Tatas tathā sa tenokto maharshīr Manunā Bṛgūḥ  

īdān ābraṇid rishīn sarvān prītāmā "śrūyatām" itī | 61. Svāyambhuśasya Manoḥ shaḍ-vaiśyā Manavo 'pare | śṛṣṭavantāḥ prajāḥ svāḥ 

svāḥ mahātmāṅṇa mahaujasāḥ  | 62. Śvarochīśaḥ chaautāmīs cha Ṭāmāso Raivatas tathā | Chākṣhushaḥ cha mahātejā Vivasvat-suta eva cha | 63. Svāyambhuśādyāḥ saoptāte Manavo bhūritejasāḥ | see see 'ntare sarvam ādam utpādyātpuṣ charācharam |

59. "Having formed this Scripture, he (Brahmā) himself in the beginning caused me to comprehend it according to rule; as I did to Marichi and the other munis. 60. This Bṛgūḥ will give you to hear this scripture in its entirety; for this muni learned the whole from me. 61. Then that Maharshi (great rishi), Bṛgūḥ being so addressed by Manu, with pleasure addressed all those rishis, saying, 'Let it be heard.' 62. 'From this Manu Svāyambhuva sprang other Manus in six successive generations, great and glorious, who respectively created living beings of their own,—(63) viz., Śvarochisha, Aunftami, Tāmasu, Raivata, Chākṣhusha, and the mighty son of Vivasvat. 64. These seven. 64 Manus of great power, of whom Svāyambhuva was the first, have each in his own period (antara) produced and possessed the world.'"

63 In the same way it may be observed that in v. 22 Brahmā is said to have formed the subtle class of living gods whose essence is to act, and of the Śādhyas (karmātmanāṁ cha devinām so 'svijat prōjinām prabhū | sādhyaṁcha garāṁ sūkṣham), and in v. 25, to have "called into existence this creation, desiring to form these living beings" (śrīśṭan samarṣa chaievām svraśṭān iĉchahāṁ imāh prajāh). But if the gods and all other creatures already existed, any such further account of their production by the Maharshīs, as is given in verse 36, seems to be not only superfluous but contradictory.

64 It will be observed that here Svāyambhuva is included in the seven Manus, although in verse 36 (see above) it is said that the ten Maharshīs, who had themselves been created by Svāyambhuva (vv. 34 f.), produced seven other Manus.
AND OF THE ORIGIN OF THE FOUR CASTES.

After some preliminary explanations regarding the divisions of time as reckoned by men and gods, etc. (vv. 64-78), the author proceeds to tell us how long each of these Manus reigns:

• 79. Yat prāk deśāda-sāhāsram uditāṁ daivikaṁ yugam | tad eka- saptati-yugam manvantaram iḥochyate | 80. Manvantarāṇy asankhyāṇi sargaḥ sāṁhāra eva cha | kriḍann āvaitat kurute Parameshthi punah punah |

“The age (yuga) of the gods mentioned before, consisting of twelve thousand (years), when multiplied by seventy-one, is here called a manvantara. 80. There are innumerable manvantaras, creations and destructions. The Supreme Being performs this again and again, as if in sport.”

A more detailed account of these great mundane periods will be given in the next section, when I come to take up the Vishnu Purana. Meanwhile it may be remarked that the present manvantara is that of the last of the Manus above enumerated, or Manu Vaivasvata, who, according to verse 63, must have created the existing world. But if such be the case, it does not appear why the creation of Manu Svayambhuva, with which the present race of mortals can have little to do, should have been by preference related to the rishis in vv. 33 ff. It must, however, be observed that in v. 33 Manu Svayambhuva described himself as the former of “this” (i.e., the existing) universe, and there is no doubt that the whole code of laws prescribed in the sequel of the work is intended by the author to be observed by the existing race of Indians (see verses 102 ff. of the first book). We must, therefore, suppose that the creations of the later Manus are substantially identical with that of the first; or that there is some confusion or inconsistency in the accounts which I have cited. Perhaps both suppositions may be correct.

In vv. 81-86, the four Yugas (or great ages of the world) the Krita, Tretā, Dwāpara, and Kali, their gradual deterioration, and the special duties peculiar to each, are described.65

65 In v. 86 these predominant duties are said to be austere fervour in the Krita age, knowledge in the Tretā, sacrifice in the Dwāpara, and liberality alone in the Kali (tapah param Krita-yuga tretāyōou jñānam uchyate | dvāpara yojam evahur dūnam ekam kāle ugye). This, as remarked in Weber’s Indische Studien, 282 f., note, is not quite in conformity with the view of the Mūḍāka Upanishad, i. 2, 1, which states:
At verse 87, Bhrigu recurs to the four castes:

87. Sarvasayásya tu sargasya gupt-yartham sa mahādyutih | mukhabähuru-paj-janām prithak karmāṇy akalpayat |

"For the preservation of this whole creation, that glorious being (Brahmā) ordained separate functions for those who sprang from his mouth, his arms, his thighs, and his feet."

These functions are then detailed (vv. 88-92). In verse 93, the grounds of the Brāhmans' pre-eminence are stated:

93. Uttamaṅgobhavāy jyaishthyād brāhmaṇās chaiva dhāraṇāt | sarvasayāsva sarasāvya dharmato brāhmaṇāḥ prabhuh | 94. Tum hi sarvamānduḥ svād āśyāt tapas taptaḥ "dito sprijat |

Since the Brahman sprang from the most excellent organ, since he is the first-born and possesses the Veda, he is by nature the lord of this whole creation. Him, the self-existent (Brahmā) after exercising fervid abstraction, formed at the first from his own mouth."

But as there are grades of excellence among created things, and among men themselves (96), so are there also among Brahmans:

97. Brāhmaṇeshu cha videśamsa videntu kriṭa-buddhayaḥ | kriṭabuddhishu karttāraḥ karttrishu brahma-cedinaḥ |

"Among Brāhmans the learned are the most excellent, among the learned the resolute, among the resolute those who act, and among them who act they who possess divine knowledge."

In a subsequent part of the work (xii. 40 ff.) we find men in general, the castes, and indeed all existing things, from Brahmā downwards, classified according to their participation in different degrees in the three guṇas, or qualities (sattva, "goodness," rajas, "passion," and tamas, "darkness").

39. Yena yāṁ tu guṇenaishāṁ saṁsārāṁ pratipadyate | tāṁ samāsena vakṣyāmi sarvasayāsya yathākraram | 40. Devatvaṁ sātvikā yānti manushya-cavāṁ cha rājasāḥ | tiryaktvaṁ tāmasāḥ nityam ity eśā tri-tāt etat satyam mantresu karmāṇi kāvayo yāṁ apāśyaṁ tāṁ tretāyāṁ bahudhā santatiṁ | "This is true: the rites which sages behold in the hymns, are in great variety celebrated in the Tretā." In the same way the M. Bh. iii. v. 11,248, says that sacrifices and rites prevail in the Tretā (tato yojayṣ pravartante dharmāṇaḥ chaividhāḥ kriyāḥ | tretāyāṁ ityād). See also M. Bh. xii. 13,090. The word kriṇa, as the name of the first yuga is thus explained in a previous verse of the former of these two passages (11,235): kriṇam eva na karttavyāṁ tasmin kōle guṇottamaḥ | "In the time of that most excellent Yuga (everything) has been done, (and does) not (remain) to be done."
vidhā gatiḥ | . . . 43. Hastinaś cha turangāś cha śūdrā mlecchās cha garhitāḥ | simhā vyāghrā varāhās cha madhyamā tāmasī gatiḥ | . . . 46. Rājānāh kṣhattriyāḥ chaiva rājnas chaiva purohitāḥ | vāda-
pradhānās cha madhyamā rājasa gatiḥ | . . . 48. Tāpasa yatayo viprā ye cha vaimāniḥ gaṇāḥ | nakshatrāṇi cha dāityās cha prathamā sattvāk gatiḥ | 49. Rājeṇa rishayo deva ārthaṁ viyutiṁ vatsarāḥ | pitaras chaiva sādhyaśa cha devītvā sattvāk gatiḥ | 50. Brah-
ma viśvaśaṁ dharmo mahān avyaktaṁ eva cha | uttamāṁ sattvākāṁ etāṁ gatim āhur maṇḍāṁ | . . . 39. I shall now declare succinctly in order the states which the
soul reaches by means of each of these qualities. 40. Souls endowed
with the sattra quality attain to godhead; those having the rajās
quality become men; whilst those characterized by tamaṁ always be-
come beasts—such is the threefold destination . . . 43. Elephants,
horses, Śūdras and contemptible Mlecchas, lions, tigers, and boars
form the middle dark condition . . . 46. Kings, Kṣhattriyas, a
king’s priests (purohitāḥ), and men whose chief occupation is the war
of words, compose the middle condition of passion . . . 48. Devotees,
asetics, Brāhmans, the deities borne on aerial cars, constellations,
and Dāityas, constitute the lowest condition of goodness. 49. Sacrificing
priests, rishis, gods, the vedas, the celestial luminaries, years, the
fathers, the Śādhyas, form the second condition of goodness. 50. Brah-
ma, the creators,66 righteousness, the Great One (mahāt), the Unap-
parent One (avyakta), compose the highest condition of goodness.”

66 These “creators” (viśvaśaṁ) are thus mentioned in Taṁb. Br. iii. 12, 9, 2,
Adarśam Agniś chārvānāḥ pūrve viśvaśaṁ viśvaśaṁ | 3. tatraṁ vāraṁ saṁśaṁ saṁśaṁ dūṣhi-
taḥ satram āsata | 3. tatraṁ āsīd guṇahatpatib Brahma brāhma bhavat svaṁ | satyāṁ
ha hatośhāṁ āsīd yad viśvaśaṁ āsata | aṁritam āhvaṁ udāgaṁ yatah saṁśaṁ pariśat-
saṁ | būtaṁ ha prastotaśhāṁ āsīd bhavīshyati prati chāharat | pṛṇo adhvaṁ
dhavād ādāṁ āvarāṁ sīvaṁ āsataṁ | . . . 7. Viśvaśaṁ prathamāṁ satram āsata | . . . .
tato ha jānne bhavavanāṁ gopāṁ hiranyaṁ yahun vahputi Brahma nūma | yena
sūryaṁ tataṁ tejasadāḥ | . . . . 8. Etena vā viśvaśaṁ ādāṁ viśvaṁ āsaṁ ṣaṁjñaṁ |
yad viśvaṁ āsaṁ jñaṁ samād vāśaṁ viśvaṁ āsaṁ viśvaṁ ādāṁ viśvaṁ prajñaṁ | “2. The
ancient and immortal creators of the universe, keeping fire kindled till they saw the
new moon, and consecrated, were engaged in a sacrifice for 100,000 years. 3. Austere
fervour was the householder; Prayer itself (brahma) was the brahma priest; Truth
was their hotri, when the creators were so occupied. Immortality was their udgāti
for a thousand years. The Past was their prastotra, the Future their pratihaṁtra;
Breath was the adhvarya, whilst they were seeking to obtain all this.” After
a good deal more of this allegory, the author proceeds in para.: 7. “These first
It will be observed that the different parts of this account of the mode in which the three qualities are distributed, are not quite in harmony. From v. 40 it would appear that all souls having the quality of passion become men; and yet we find from vv. 43, 48, and 49, that Sūdras belong to the tāmasa class, and Brāhmans, of different descriptions, to two of the Sattvika grades. According to the rule enunciated in v. 40, the latter ought to have been born as gods.

It is, further, remarkable that in this enumeration Sūdras are found in the same category with Mlechhas (v. 43), that the Vaiśyas are not accommodated with a position in any of the classes, that Kshattriyas and kings' domestic priests, who are of course Brāhmans, and others (who must be Brāhmans) fond of disputations on learned questions⁴⁷ (though not stated to be heretical) are ranked together as "passionate" (v. 46), while other Brāhmans of different characters are placed in two of the higher grades, Brāhmans simply so called (viprāḥ) being regarded as "good" in the lowest degree (v. 48), and sacrificing priests (yajvānah) sharing with rishis, gods, the vedas, etc., the honour of the middle condition of goodness. It is not clear whether the devotees, and ascetics, mentioned in v. 48, belong to the same caste as the Brāhmans with whom they are associated, or may also be men of the inferior classes. Nor is it evident for what reason the sacrificing priests (yajvānah), specified in v. 49, are so much more highly estimated than the king's priests (rajaṇaḥ purohitāḥ) in v. 46, since the latter also officiate at sacrifices. The honourable position assigned to Daityas in the lowest class of "good" beings (v. 48) is also deserving of notice. We shall see in the following chapter that the Purāṇas variously describe mankind as belonging entirely to the "passionate" class (see v. 40, above) and as characterized by the three other "qualities," according to their caste.

creators were engaged in sacrifice ... Thence was born the preserver of the world, the golden bird called Brahma, by whom the sun glows, kindled with light. ... 8. ... Through this the creators created this universe. As they created the universe, they are called visvasrijah. Everything is created after them." See above the reference made to rishayo bhūta-kritāḥ in p. 36. The allegory in this extract from the Taitt. Br. resembles in its character that in the sixth verse of the Purusha Sūkta.

⁴⁷ Sārstārthakalaha-priyāḥ cha | Comm.
I shall in the next section adduce the description given in the Vishnū Purāṇa of the creation of living creatures, and the origin of the four castes, after first supplying in the present some explanation of the great mundane periods, the Yugas, Manvantaras, Kalpas, etc.

The computations of these great periods are stated in the third chapter of the first book, and in the first chapter of the sixth book, and are clearly explained by Professor Wilson in his notes to page 50 of his translation.

One year of mortals is equal to one day of the gods. 68

12,000 divine years are equal to a period of four Yugas, which is thus made up, viz.:

Krīta Yuga with its mornings and evenings.....4,800 divine years

Tretā Yuga " " " " " " " " " "3,600 " " " "

Dvāpara Yuga " " " " " " " " " "2,400 " " " "

Kali Yuga " " " " " " " " " "1,200 " " " "

making... 12,000 divine years. 69

As a day of the gods is = to one year of mortals, the 12,000 divine years must be multiplied by 360, the assumed number of days in a year, to get the number of the years of mortals in this great period of four yugas, thus: 12,000 divine years \times 360 = 4,320,000 years of mortals. 1000 of these periods of 12,000 divine, or 4,320,000 human, years—i.e., 4,320,000,000 human years are = 1 day of Brah- mā, 70 and his night is of the same duration. Within that period of a day of Brahma, 14 Manus reign, 71 and a Manvantara, or period of Manu,

68 Vishnu P. vi. 1, 4 ahorutram pitṛṇṇaḥ tu māso 'bdat śrīdivāukasām | See also Manu i. 66 and 67. The Taitt. Br. iii. 9, 22, 1, too, states: ekaṁ vai etad devānām ahaḥ yat saśvatsaraḥ | "This period of a year is one day of the gods."

69 i. 3. 10. Divyair varsha - sahasraistu krīta - tretā - sanjñitam | chaturyugaṁ dvādasabhis tad-vibhāgaṁ nibodha me | 11. chavrī trīṇi dev chaikam kṛṣṇidatu yathākramam | divyabānāṁ sahasraṁ yogesvā āho puruṣaḥ | 12. Tat-pramāṇaṁ nātaṁ sandhīyā puruṣā tatātihidhīyate | sandhīānākāraḥ ca tat-tulya yogasyānantaro hi saḥ | 13. Sandhīyā-sandhīyānāyaṁ antar yah kūlo muni-sattama | yogākhyāh sa tu vijneyah krīta-tretā-sanjñitāḥ |

70 V. P. i. 3, 14. Krītān tretā dvāparaṁ cha kaliḥ chaiva chaturyugam | prochṣyate tat-sahasraṁ cha Brahmano divasaṁ munē | See also Manu i. 72.

71 V. P. i. 3, 15. Brahmano devasa brahan Manucaśa cha chaturdātaṁ | bhavanti |
is consequently the 14th part of a day of Brahmā. In the present Kalpa (= a day of Brahmā) six Manus, of whom Svāyambhuva was the first, have already passed away, the present Manu being Vaivasvata. In each Manvantara seven rishis, certain deities, an Indra, a Mana, and the kings, his sons, are created and perish. A thousand of the systems of 4 Yugas, as has been before explained, occur coincidently with these 14 Manvantaras; and consequently about 71 systems of 4 Yugas elapse during each Manvantara, and measure the lives of the Manu and the deities of the period. At the close of this day of Brahmā a collapse (pratisancharāḥ) of the universe takes place, which lasts through a night of Brahmā, equal in duration to his day, during which period the three worlds are converted into one great ocean, when the lotus-born god, expanded by his deglutition of the universe, and contemplated by the yogis and gods in Janaloka, sleeps on the serpent Sesha. At the end of that night he awakes and creates anew.

A year of Brahmā is composed of the proper number of such days and nights; and 100 such years constitute his whole life. The period of his life is called Para, and the half of it Parāṛddha, or the half of a Para. One Parāṛddha, or half of Brahmā’s existence, has now expired, terminating with the great Kalpa, called the Pādma Kalpa. The now existing Kalpa, or day of Brahmā, called Vāraha (or that of the boar), is the first of the second Parāṛddha of Brahmā’s existence. The

72 This is stated by Manu i. 62 ff. (see above), as well as in the third book of the V. P. i. 3, which gives the names in the same order: Svāyambhuva Manuḥ pūrvo Manuḥ Svārochhisā tathā | Auttamāś Tāmasāś chaiva Raivatas Čokshushhas tathā | shad eie Manavo ‘titāḥ sāmpatraṁ tuīaveh sutāḥ | Vaivasvato ‘yaṁ yasminat saptamāṁ varttate ‘ntram |

73 V. P. i. 3, 16. Saptarshayaṁ surūḥ Saṅkro Manus tat-sūnavo nṛpāḥ | ekakāle hi śriyante saṁkriyante cha pūrvacat |

74 Ibid ver. 17. Chaturvyuḥnāṁ sankhyātā sūdhikā hy eka saptatiḥ | manvantaram Manoḥ kālaḥ suradabāṁ cha sattama | See also Manu i. 79.

75 The birth of Prajāpati on a lotus-leaf is mentioned in the Taitt. Ārany. i. 23, 1, quoted above, p. 32.


dissolution, which occurs at the end of each Kalpa, or day of Brahmā, is called naimittika, incidental, occasional, or contingent. (See Wilson's Vishnu Purana, vol. i. of Dr. Hall's edition, p. 52, with the editor's note; and vol. ii. p. 269. For an account of the other dissolutions of the universe I refer to the same work, vol. i. p. 113, and to pp. 630–633 of the original 4to. edition.)

Of this elaborate system of Yugas, Manvantaras, and Kalpas, of enormous duration, no traces are found in the hymns of the Rig-veda. Their authors were, indeed, familiar with the word Yuga,78 which frequently occurs in the sense of age, generation, or tribe. Thus in i. 139, 8; iii. 26, 3; vi. 8, 5; vi. 15, 8; vi. 36, 5; x. 94, 12, the phrase yuge yuge79 means "in every age." In iii. 33, 8; x. 10, 10, we have uttara yugāni, "future ages," and in x. 72, 1, uttare yuge, "in a later age;" in vii. 70, 4, purvāni yugāni, "former ages,"80 and in i. 184, 3, yuga jārnā, "past ages." In i. 92, 11; i. 103, 4; i. 115, 2; i. 124, 2; i. 144, 4;81 ii. 2, 2; v. 52, 4; vi. 16, 23; vii. 9, 4; viii. 46, 12; viii. 51, 9; ix. 12, 7;82 x. 27, 19; x. 140, 683 (in all of which places, except i. 115, 2, the word is combined with manushyā, mānushā, manuḥā, or janāṇām), yuga seems to denote "generations" of men, or parārddhasya var titāminasya vai deiva | Vārāhaḥ iti kalpo 'yan prathamaḥ pari- kalpitaḥ |

78 In Professor Willson's Dictionary three senses are assigned to yuga (neuter) (1) a pair; (2) an age as the Krita, Tretā, etc.; (3) a lustre, or period of five years. When used as masculine the word means, according to the same authority, (1) a yoke; (2) a measure of four cubits, etc.; (3) a particular drug.

79 Sāyana, on iii. 36, 3, explains it by pratidinam, "every day;" on vi. 8, 5; vi. 15, 8; vi. 36, 5, by kūle kūle, "at every time."

80 Sāyana takes the phrase for former "couples of husbands and wives," mithunāni jāyāpatirūpāni.

81 In i. 92, 11 and i. 124, 2, Ushas (the Dawn) is spoken of as, praminati manushya yugāni, "wearing away human terms of existence, or generations." In commenting on the former text Sāyana explains yugāni as equivalent to krita-treteṇāni, "the Krita, Tretā, and other ages," whilst in explaining the second, he takes the same word as signifying yugopalakhitān nimeshādi-kālāvayavan, "the seconds and other component parts of time indicated by the word," or as equivalent to yugāni, "the conjunctions of men,"—since the dawn scatters abroad to their several occupations men who had been previously congregated together! In his note on i. 144, 4, he gives an option of two different senses: manoh sambhandhāni yugāni jāyāpati-rūpāni hotradihvarya-rūpāni eva | "couples consisting of husband and wife, or of the hotṛi and adhvaryu priests."

82 This verse, ix. 12, 7, is also found in Sāma V. ii. 552, where, however, yujā is substituted for yugā.

83 This verse occurs also in Sāma V. ii. 1171, and Vāj. S. xii. 111.
rather, in some places, "tribes" of men. In v. 73, 3, the phrase nāhusā yuga must have a similar meaning. In i. 158, 6, it is said that the rishi Dirghatamas became worn out in the tenth yuga; on which Professor Wilson remarks (R. V. vol. ii. 104, note): "The scholiast understands yuga in its ordinary interpretation; but the yuga of five years is perhaps intended, a lustrum, which would be nothing marvellous." Professor Aucrecht proposes to render, "in the tenth stage of life." The first passage of the Rig-veda, in which there is any indication of a considerable mundane period being denoted, is x. 72, 2 ff., where "a first," or, "an earlier age (yuga) of the gods" is mentioned (devānām pūrye yuge; devānām prathame yuge) when "the existent sprang from the non-existent" (asataḥ sad ajāyata); but no allusion is made to its length. In the same indefinite way reference is made in x. 97, 1, to certain "plants which were produced before the gods,—three ages (yugas) earlier" (yāḥ oshadhiḥ pūreḥ jātah devebhyaḥ tri-yugam purā). In one verse of the Atharva-veda, however, the word yuga is so employed as to lead to the supposition that a period of very long duration is intended. It is there said, viii. 2, 21: sataṁ te ayutāṁ hāyanāṁ dece yuge trīṇi chatvāri kriyamah | "we allot to thee a hundred, ten thousand, years, two, three, four ages (yugas)."54 As we may with probability assume that the periods here mentioned proceed in the ascending scale of duration, two yugas, and perhaps even one yuga, must be supposed to exceed 10,000 years.

The earliest comparison between divine and human periods of duration of which I am aware is found in the text of the Taitt. Br. quoted above in a note to p. 42: "A year is one day of the gods."55 But so far as that passage itself shows, there is no reason to imagine that the statement it contains was anything more than an isolated idea, or that the conception had, at the time when the Brāhmaṇas were compiled, been developed, and a system of immense mundane periods, whether

54 For the context of this line see Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1866, page 42.
55 An analogous idea is found in the S'atapatha Brāhmaṇa xiv. 7, 1, 33 ff. (= Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad pp. 817 ff. of Cal. ed.) aha ye sataṁ manushyaṁ ñānandabh sa ekah pitriṇāṁ jitalokāṁ ñānandabh | "now a hundred pleasures of men are one pleasure of the Pitris who have conquered the worlds." And so on in the same way; a hundred pleasures of the Pitris equaling one pleasure of the Karmadevas (or gods who have become so by works); a hundred pleasures of the latter equaling one pleasure of the gods who were born such, etc.
human or divine, had been elaborated. That, however, the authors of the Brāhmanas were becoming familiar with the idea of extravagantly large numbers is clear from the passage in the Taitt. Br. iii. 12, 9, 2, quoted above, p. 41, in the note on Manu xii. 50, where it is said that the creators were engaged in a sacrifice for 100,000 years.

Professor Roth is of opinion (see his remarks under the word Kṛita in his Lexicon) that according to the earlier conception stated in Manu i. 69, and the Mahābhārata (12,826 ff.), the four Yugas—Kṛta, Tretā, Dvāpara, and Kali, with their mornings and evenings, consisted respectively of no more than 4,800; 3,600; 2,400; and 1,200 ordinary years of mortals; and that it was the commentators on Manu, and the compilers of the Purāṇas, who first converted the years of which they were made up into divine years. The verse of Manu to which Professor Roth refers (i. 69), and the one which follows, are certainly quite silent about the years composing the Kṛta age being divine years:

Chatvāry āhuḥ sahasrāni varṣhāṇaṁ tu kṛitaṁ yugam | tasya tavach-
chhati sandhyā śandhyāṁśchāscha tathāvidhaḥ | 70. Itaresu sasandhyeshu
sasandhāṁśeshu cha triṣhu | ekapayena vartante sahasrāṇi ṣatāni cha |
“They say that four thousand years compose the kṛta yuga, with as many hundred years for its morning and the same for its evening. 70. In the other three yugas, with their mornings and evenings, the thousands and hundreds are diminished successively by one.”

Verse 71 is as follows: Yad etat parisankhyātam ādāveva chatur-
yugam | etad dvādaśa-sahasrām devānāṁ yugam uchyate | which, as explained by Medhatithi, may be thus rendered: “Twelve thousand of these periods of four yugas, as above reckoned, are called a Yuga of the gods.” Medhatithi’s words, as quoted by Kullūka, are these: Chaturyugair eva dvādaśa-sahasra-sankhyair divyam yugam | “A divine Yuga is formed by four yugas to the number of twelve thousand.” Kullūka, however, says that his predecessor’s explanation is mistaken, and must not be adopted (Medhatither bhrāmo nādartaṁvṛṣyaḥ). His own opinion is that the system of yugas mentioned in vv. 69 and 71 are identical, both being made up of divine years. According to this view, we must translate v. 71 as follows: “The period of four yugas, consisting of twelve thousand years, which has been reckoned above, is called a Yuga of the gods.” This certainly appears to be the
preferable translation, and it is confirmed by the tenor of verse 79. Verse 71, however, may represent a later stage of opinion, as it is not found in the following passage of the Mahābhārata, where the previous verse (69) is repeated, and verse 70 is expanded into three verses, though without any alteration of the sense:

M. Bh. iii. 12826 ff. — Ādito manuṣya-vyāghra kṛitrasya jagataḥ kshaye | chaiteśārya āhuḥ sahasrāni varshānāṁ tat kṛitaṁ yugam | tasya tāvacchhhati sandhyāṁ sandhyāṁśe tathāvidhaḥ |

"In the beginning, after the destruction of the entire universe, they say that there are four thousand years: that is the Kṛta Yuga, which has a morning of as many hundred years, and an evening of the same duration." And then, after enumerating in like manner the other three Yugas with their respective thousands and hundreds successively diminished by one, the speaker (the sage Mārkaṇḍeya) proceeds in verse 12831: Eshā devādāsahasrī yugākhyā parikṛttā tā | etat sahasraparyantam aho brāhmaṁ udākṛitam | "This period of twelve thousand years is known by the appellation of the Yugas. A period extending to a thousand of these is called a day of Brahmā."

Nowhere, certainly, in this passage is any mention made of the years being divine years.

The earliest known text in which the names of the four Yugas are found is a verse occurring in the story of Sunahśepha in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa vii. 15: Kaliḥ śayāno bhavati sanjīhānas tu devāparah | utsīṅ-thaṁs tretā bhavati kṛitaṁ sampadyate charan | "A man while lying is the Kali; moving himself, he is the Dvāpara; rising, he is the Tretā; walking, he becomes the Kṛita." But this brief allusion leaves us

---

66 This verse has been already translated no less than six times; twice into German by Weber and Roth (Ind. Stud. i. 286 and 460), once into Latin by Streiter (see Ind. Stud. ix. 315), and thrice into English, by Wilson (Journ. R. A. S. for 1851, p. 99), Müller (Ane. Sāsk. Lit. p. 412), and Haug (Ait. Br. ii. 464). All these authors, except the last, concur in considering the verse as referring to the four Yugas. Dr. Haug, however, has the following note: "Sāyana does not give any explanation of this important passage, where the names of the Yugas are mentioned for the first time. These four names are, as is well known from other sources, ... names of dice, used at gambling. The meaning of this Gāthā is, There is every success to be hoped; for the unluckiest die, the Kali is lying, two others are slowly moving and half fallen, but the luckiest, the Kṛita, is in full motion. The position of dice here given is indicatory of a fair chance of winning the game." Both Dr. Haug’s translation and note are criticised by Professor Weber (Ind. Stud. ix. 319). Of the following verses, which occur in Manu ix. 301 f., the second is a paraphrase of that in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.
quite in the dark as to the duration which was assigned to these yugas in the age when the Brähmana was compiled.

SECT. VII.—Account of the different creations, including that of the castes, according to the Vishnu Purāṇa.

I commence with the following general account of the cosmogony of the Vishnu Purāṇa, extracted from Professor Wilson's Preface to his translation of that work, vol. i. p. xciii.:

"The first book of the six, into which the work is divided, is occupied chiefly with the details of creation, primary (sarga), and secondary (pratisarga); the first explains how the universe proceeds from Prakṛti, or eternal crude matter; the second, in what manner the forms of things are developed from the elementary substances previously evolved, or how they re-appear after their temporary destruction. Both these creations are periodical; but the termination of the first occurs only at the end of the life of Brahmā, when not only all the gods and all other forms are annihilated, but the elements are again merged into primary substance, besides which only one spiritual being exists. The latter takes place at the end of every Kalpa or day of Brahmā, and affects only the forms of inferior creatures and lower worlds, leaving the substances of the universe entire, and sages and gods unharmed." 89

87 [See Book i. chapter ii.]
88 [See the fourth and following chapters of Book i.]
89 See Book i. at the close of chapter viii. p. 113 of vol. i. of Professor Wilson's translation, 2nd edition, and also p. 621 and 630 of the original 4to. edition. As regards,
I proceed with the details of the creation which took place in the Vārāha Kalpa, as described in book i. chapter 4, vv. 2, ff.:

Ātita-kalpāvasāne nīśa-suptottitaḥ prabhuḥ | sattvodriktas tato
Brahmā śunyaṁ lokam avākshata | 3. Nārāyaṇaḥ paro 'chintyaḥ
paresahām api sa prabhuḥ | Brahma-scaraṇi bhavaṇān anādiḥ sarva-
sambhavaḥ | . . . 6. Toyāntaḥ sa mahiṁ jñātā jagaty ekārṇave prabhuḥ
| anumāṇād tad-uddhāraṁ karttu-kāmaḥ prajāpatiḥ | 7. Akarot sa
tanum anyāṁ kalpadisau yathā purā | matsya-kūrmaśikāṁ tadeva
vārahaṁ vāpur āsthītaḥ | 8. Veda-yojnamayaṁ rūpam aśesha-jagataḥ
sthitaḥ sthirātmā sarvaṁ paramātmā prajāpatiḥ | 9. Jana-
loka-gataiḥ siddhāhair Sanakādyair abhishtutaḥ | praciṣeṣa tatā toyam
ātmāhāro dharā-aharaḥ | . . . 45. Evam śaṁstāyaṁmaṇaṁ pram-
ātmā mahādharāḥ | ujjahāra mahaṁ kāhiprayaṁ nyastavāṁśe cha mahām-
bhavi | 46. Tasyopari jalaughasya mahati naiv iva sthitā | vitattatavat
| tu dehasya na mahī yati sampicam | tataḥ kshitiṁ samāṁ kīrtvā prithi-
vyāṁ so 'chinch girin | yathā-vibhāgam bhagavān anādiḥ purushottamaḥ
| 47. Prāk-sarga-ādghān akhilāṁ pavātāṁ prithivīvālaṇa | amoghena
prabhāvena sasarjāmogha-vāuchhitaḥ | 48. Bhūri bhāgaṁ tataḥ kīrtvā
saṁpa-āvāpaṇa yathātathā | bhūr-adyāṁś chaturu lokān pāvevat sama-
kalyṇa | 49. Brahma-rūpadharo decas tato 'sau rajāsam "vritaḥ | chakāra śrishtim bhagavāṁś chatur-vaktra-dharo Hariḥ | 50. nimitta-
mātram evāsau sriyāṇām sarga-karṇāṇām | pradhāna-kāraṇibhaṁ
yato vai sriyya-saktayaḥ | 51. Nimitta-mātram muktvaikam nānyat
kinchid apeksaye | niyate tapatāṁ śreshṭha saha-saktīyā vastu vastutām |

"2. At the end of the past (or Pādma) Kalpa, arising from his night slumber, Brahmā, the lord, endowed predominantly with the quality of goodness, beheld the universe void. 3. He (was) the supreme lord Nārāyaṇa, who cannot even be conceived by other beings, the deity without beginning, the source of all things, existing in the form of Brahmā." [The verse given in Manu i. 10, regarding the derivation of the word Nārāyaṇa (see above p. 35) is here quoted].

"6. This lord of creatures, discovering by inference,—when the world had become one ocean,—that the earth lay within the waters, and being desirous to raise it up, (7) assumed another body. As formerly, at the beginnings of the Kalpas, he had taken the form of a fish,
a tortoise, and so forth,—a form composed of the Vedas and of sacrifice,—the lord of creatures, who, throughout the entire continuance of the world, remains fixed, the universal soul, the supreme soul, self-sustained, the supporter of the earth,—being hymned by Sanaka and the other saints, who had (at the dissolution of the lower worlds) proceeded to Janaloka,—entered the water." [He is then addressed by the goddess Earth in a hymn of praise, as Vishṇu, and as the supreme Brahmā, vv. 10-24. The boar then rises from the lower regions, tossing up the earth with his tusk, and is again lauded by Sanandana and other saints in a second hymn, in the course of which he himself is identified with sacrifice, and his various members with its different instruments and accompaniments, vv. 25-44]. "45. Being thus lauded, the supreme soul, the upholder of the earth, lifted her up quickly and placed her upon the great waters. 46. Resting upon this mass of water, like a vast ship, she does not sink, owing to her expansion. Then, having levelled the earth, the divine eternal Purushottasana heaped together mountains according to their divisions. 47. He whose will cannot be frustrated, by his unfailing power, created on the surface of the earth all those mountains which had been burnt up in the former creation. 48. Having then divided the earth, just as it had been, into seven dvīpas, he formed the four worlds Bhūrloka and others as before. 49. Becoming next pervaded with the quality of passion, that divine being Hari, assuming the form of Brahmā, with four faces, effected the creation. 50. But he is merely the instrumental cause of the things to be created and of the creative operations, since the properties of the things to be created arise from Pradhāna as their (material) cause. 51. Excepting an instrumental cause alone, nothing else is required. Every substance (vastu) is brought into the state of substance (vastutā) by its own inherent power." 51

90 No mention is made in the Brāhmaṇas (as I have already observed) of any such periods as the Kalpas. But here an attempt is made to systematize the different stories scattered through those older works which variously describe the manner in which the creation was effected—with the view, perhaps, of reconciling the discrepancies in those free and artless speculations which offended the critical sense of a later age.

91 See Professor Wilson's translation of these verses, and the new version proposed by the editor of the second edition, Dr. Hall, p. 66, note. I do not think the phrase
[Before proceeding further with the narrative of the Vishnu Purana, I wish to quote or refer to some passages from the Taittiriya Sanhitā and Brāhmaṇa and from the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, which appear to furnish the original germs of the legends of the boar, fish, tortoise, and dwarf incarnations.

The first of these texts is from the Taittiriya Sanhitā, vii. 1, 5, 1 ff:

Āpo vai idam agre salilam āsīt | tasmīn Prajāpatir vāyur bhūtvā aḥarat | sa imām apaśyat | taṁ varāhā bhūtvā āharat | tām Viśvakarmā bhūtvā eyamārt | sā aprathata | sā prithivy abhavat | tat prithivyai prithivi vam | tasyām aśrāmyat Prajāpatiḥ | sa devān asrījata Vasūn Rudrān Ādityān | te devāḥ Prajāpatiṁ abruvan “prajāyamahai” iti | sa \‘brahā “yathā aham yushmāṁs tapasā asrīkshi evam tapasi prajananaṁ ichchhadheam” iti | tebhya \‘gnim ayatanam prāya chhad “etena ayatanena śrāmyata” iti | te \‘gninā ayatanena aśrāmyan | te samvatsare ekāṁ gām asrījanta |

“Thus this universe was formerly waters, fluid. On it Prajāpati, becoming wind, moved. He saw this (earth). Becoming a boar, he took her up. Becoming Viśvakarman, he wiped (the moisture from) her. She extended. She became the extended one (prithivi). From this the earth derives her designation as the extended one. In her Prajāpati performed arduous devotion. He created gods, Vasus, Rudras, and Adityas. The gods said to Prajāpati, ‘let us be propagated.’ He answered, ‘As I have created you through austere fervour, so do ye seek after propagation in austere fervour.’ He gave them Agni as a resting-place (saying), ‘With this as a resting-place perform your devotion.’ They (accordingly) performed devotion with Agni as a resting-place. In a year they created one cow, etc.”

sva-saktyā can be properly rendered, as Dr. Hall does, “by its potency.” The reading of the MSS. in v. 50, pradhāna-kūraṇabhūtah seems to me doubtful, as it would most naturally mean “have become the Pradhāna-cause.” I conjecture pradāhana-kūraṇodbhūtah, which gives the sense which seems to be required.

It is possible that the idea assigned to the word Nārāyana (see Manu i. 10, above), “he whose place of movement is the waters,” may be connected with this passage. See also Genesis i. 2, “And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.”

After having noticed this passage in the Taittiriya Sanhitā, I became aware that it had been previously translated by Mr. Colebrooke (Essays i. 75, or p. 44 of Williams & Norgate’s edition). Mr. Colebrooke prefaces his version by remarking, “The pre-
The second passage is from the Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa, i. 1, 3, 5 ff. Āpo vai idam agrē sarīlam āsit | tena Prajāpatir āśrayat "katham idām syād" iti | so 'pasyat pushkara-parnāṁ tiṣṭhat | so 'manyata "asti vai tād yasminn idam adhitishṭhati" iti | sa varāho rūpāṁ kriyā upanyamājat | sa prithviṃ adhāḥ āvekhata | tasyā upahatyā udāmañjat | tat pushkara-parne 'prathayat | yaṛ "apratathā" tat prithiyai prithivitvam | "abhūd vai idam" iti tād bhūmyai dhāmitvam | tāṁ diśo 'nu vātāḥ samavahat | tāṁ śarcarābhīṁ adṛśīhat |

"This (universe) was formerly water, fluid." With that (water) Prajāpati practised arduous devotion (saying), 'how shall this (universe be (developed) ?' He beheld a lotus-leaf standing. He thought, 'there is somewhat on which this (lotus-leaf) rests.' He as a boar—having assumed that form—plunged beneath towards it. He found the earth down below. Breaking off (a portion of) her, he rose to the surface. He then extended it on the lotus-leaf. Inasmuch as he extended it, that is the extension of the extended one (the earth). This became (abhūt). From this the earth derives its name of bhūmi. The wind carried her, to the four quarters. He strengthened her with gravel, etc., etc.

The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, xiv. 1, 2, 11, has the following reference to the same idea, although here Prajāpati himself is not the boar:

Iyati ha vai iyam agrē prithivy āsa prādesa-mātṛi | tām Emūshaḥ iti varāha ujjaghāna | so 'syāḥ patih Prajāpatis tena eva enam etan-mithunena priyena dhāmnā samardhayati kriṣṭnam karoti |

"Formerly this earth was only so large, of the size of a span. A boar called Emūsha raised her up. Her lord Prajāpati, therefore, prospers him with (the gift of) this pair, the object of his desire, and makes him complete."

Another of the incarnations referred to in the preceding passage of sent extract was recommended for selection by its allusion to a mythological notion, which apparently gave origin to the story of the Varāha-avatāra, and from which an astronomical period, entitled Calpa, has perhaps been taken." 94 The Commentator gives an alternative explanation, viz., that the word sarīla is the same as sarīra, according to the text of the Veda, "these worlds are sarīra" ("iṣv eva lokāḥ sarīram" iti śrutah).

95 "Supported upon the end of a long stalk" (dirghanādiśe vasthitam), according to the Commentator. In a passage from the Taitt. Āranyaka, already quoted (p. 32, above), it is said that Prajāpati himself was born on a lotus-leaf.
the Vishnu Purana is foreshadowed in the following text from the Satapatha Brhamana, vii. 5, 1, 5:

Sa yat kuru nam | etad vai rapan kriv Prajapatiḥ prajah asrijata | yad asrijata akarot tat | yad akarot tasmad karmah | kasyapa vai karmah | tasmad ahuh "sarvah prajah kasyapyaḥ" iti | sa yah sa kuru sa Aditya |

"As to its being called kurma (a tortoise); Prajapati having taken this form, created offspring. That which he created, he made (akarot); since he made, he is (called) kurmaḥ. The word kasyapa means tortoise; hence men say all creatures are descendants of Kasyapa. This tortoise is the same as Aditya."

The oldest version of the story of the fish incarnation, which is to be found in the Satapatha Brhamana, i. 8, 1, 1 ff., will be quoted in the next chapter.

For the passages which appear to supply the germ of the dwarf incarnation, the reader may consult the fourth volume of this work, pp. 54-58 and 107 ff.

It will have been noticed that in the passage above adduced from the Vishnu Purana, the word Narayana is applied to Vishnu, and that it is the last named deity who (though in the form of Brahma) is said to have taken the form of a boar. In the verses formerly cited from Manu (i. 9, 10), however, Narayana is an epithet, not of Vishnu, but of Brahma; and in the following text, from the Ramayana, xi. 110, 3, it is Brahma who is said to have become a boar:

Sarvam satilam evasit prithivi tatra nirmittā | tathā samabhavad Brahma svayambhur daicataliḥ saha | sa varahas tato bhūtav āpraṭjagaha vaśundhāram ityādi |

"All was water only, and in it the earth was fashioned. Then arose

36 With this compare the mention made of a tortoise in the passage cited above, p. 32, from the Taitt. Aranyaka.

37 Such is the reading of Schlegel's edition, and of that which was recently printed at Bombay, both of which, no doubt, present the most ancient text of the Rāmāyana. The Gauda recension, however, which deviates widely from the other, and appears to have modified it in conformity with more modern taste and ideas, has here also introduced a various reading in the second of the lines quoted in the text, and identifies Brahma with Vishnu in the following manner: tathā samabhavad Brahma svayambhūr Vishnu svayyayah | "Then arose Brahma the self-existent and imperishable Vishnu."
Brahmā, the self existent, with the deities. He then, becoming a boar, raised up the earth,” etc.

I now return to the narrative of the Vishnu Purāṇa.]

* The further process of cosmogony is thus described in chapter v.:

Maitreya uvācha | 1. Yathā sasarjya devo’sau devarshi-pitri-dānavaṁ 
manushya-tiragy-ārikshāṁ bhā-vyoma-salilaukasah | 2. Yad-guṇam 
yat-svābhavaṁ cha yad-rūpaṁ cha jagad devīja | sargadau srishtavaṁ 
Brahmā tad manāchakṣhe vistarāt | Paraśara uvācha | 3. Maitreya 
kathyāmy eha śrīnushva susamāhitāḥ | yathā sasarjya devo’sau devadān 
akhilān vibhuḥ | srishtīṁ chintayatas tasya kalpañishu yathā purā 
abuddhi-pūrvekalāḥ sargāḥ prādurbhātas tamomayaḥ | 4. Tamo moho ma-
ḥāmosta tāṁśro hy andha-saṁjñitaḥ | avidyā para-pareivāḥ prā-
durbhāta mahātmanaḥ | 5. Panchadhā’vasthitāḥ sargo dhīyāyato prati-
bodhavaṁ | vahir-antoprakalāsas cha samvrittatūm nagatmakah | 6. 
Mukhyaṇa nāga yataḥ chokta mukhya-sargaṁ tatas te ayam | 7. Taṁ āri-
śtvā’sādhakaṁ sargam amandya aparam punah | tasyābhidhiyāyataḥ sargas 
tiryak-srotāḥ | bhavyavarttata | 8. Yasmat tiryak-pravrittaḥ sa tiryak-
srotas tataḥ sritis | 9. Paścādayas te vikhyāyati tamaḥ-prayaḥ hy aev-
dinaḥ | utpatha-grāhiṇāḥ chaiva te jnānā jnāna-māninaḥ | 10. Ahaṅkṛita 
ahamānā ashtāviśad-vadhānevitatāḥ | antaḥ-prakāsas te sarve avṛtitaḥ cha 
parasparam | 11. Tatu apy asādhakam matvā dhīyāyato ‘nyas tato bhavat 
urdhvasrotas trītyas tu sattvekordhvaṁ avarttata | 12. Te sukha-priti-
bahuḥ bahir antas cha nāveṛtāḥ | prakāśa bahir antaḥ cha urdhve-
srotos-bhavāḥ sritis | 13. Tushṭy-ātmakas trītyas tu deva-sargaṁ tu 
yāḥ sritis | tasmin sarge ‘bhavat pritī niruppanne Brahmānas tadā | 
14. Tato ‘nyaiṣa tadā dadhaya sādhakaṁ sargam uttamam | asādhakāṁ 
tu tān jnāte mukhya-saṅgādi-sambhavān | 15. Tathā bhidhiyāyatas 
tasya satyābhidyaiyinaṁ tataḥ | prādurbhātas tato ‘vyaktād arvāk-srotas 
tu sādhaṁ | 16. Yasmad arvāc evavarttanta tato ‘rvāk-srotastus tu te | 
che prakāśa-bahulā tamodrīktaḥ | rajo ‘dhikāḥ | tasmin te duḥkha-
bahuḥ bhūyā bhūyāḥ cha kārīṇāḥ | prakāśa bahir antās cha manuskhaṁ 
sādhaṁ tu te | . . . . 23. Ity ete tu samākhyaṁ nava sargaṁ Prajā-

92 iti sandhir ‘ārshaḥ.—Comm. 
93 The reading of the Vāyu P., in the parallel passage, is tasyābhidhiyāyataṁ nītyaṁ sattvekāraṁ sanvarttataḥ | urdhvārājotāṁ trītyaṁ tu sa chaicordhvaṁ avavasthitāḥ | The combination sattvekordhvaṁ in the text of the Vishnu P. must be ‘ārsha. 
100 For saṁveṛtāḥ the Vāyu P. reads saṁveṛtāḥ. 
101 Iti sandhir ‘ārshaḥ | Comm. But there is a form tama. The Vāyu P. has tamaḥ-
saktāḥ.
pateḥ | prākritā vaikritāḥ chaiva jagato mūla-hetavāḥ | sijato jagudīśa-
sya kim anyach chhrotum ichhami | Maitreya uvācha | 24. Saṁkshepat
kathitaḥ sargo devādīnāṁ teeyā muno | vistarāch chhrotum ichhami
teatto munivarottama | Parāśara uvācha | karmabhīr bhāvitaḥ pūrveḥ
kusālākūsalais tu tāḥ | khyātya tayā hy anirmuktaḥ saṁkhāre hy upa-
saṁkritaḥ | 25. Sīhāvarāntāḥ surādyāśeṣa praṣā brahmaṁ chaturevi-
dhāḥ | Brahmanāḥ kurvataḥ srisṭīṁ jajnie māṇaṁis tu tāḥ | 26. Tato
devaśurapitrīn mūnāmāṁs cha chatushtayam | sīriṣkshur ambhāṁsy
etāni svam ātmānam ayāyuṣat | 27. Yuktātmānaṣa tamomāṭrā udriktā
ḥūt Prajāpateḥ | sīriṣkshor jaghaṇāt pūrveḥ asurāḥ jajnie tataḥ | 28. Utsarṣa
rata tasām tu tamo-mātrātmikāṁ tanaṁ | sū tu taykā
tanuṣa tēna Maitrayābhūd vibhāvaṁ | 29. Sīriṣkshur anya-deha-sthoḥ
pritiṁ āpa tataḥ surāḥ | sattvedriktāḥ samudbhūtāḥ mukhato Brah-
mano deyā | 30. Tyakā tū pi tanuṣa tēna sette-prāyam abhū dinam |
tato hi balino rātrāv asurā devaṭa divā | 31. Sattvaṁātrātmikāṁ eva
tato 'nyāṁ jāgrihe tanum | pitriyaṁ manyamanāsyas pitaras tasya
jajnie | 32. Utsarṣa pitṛin srishtvā tatas tāṁ api sa prabhūḥ | sū
chotrisīṣṭāḥ bhavat sandhyā dīna-naktāntara-sthitīḥ | 33. Rajo-mātrāt-
mikāṁ anyāṁ jāgrihe sa tanuṁ tataḥ | rajo-mātrotkaṭaṁ jāta manushyā
devja-sattama | tāṁ apy āsu sa tatyāja tanum adyāḥ Prajāpatiḥ |
żyotnā samabhavat sū pi prāk-sandhyā yā 'bhūdhīyate | 34. Żyotnā-
dūgama tu balino manushyāḥ pitaras tataḥ | Maitreya sandhyā-samaye
tasmād ete bhavanti vai | 35. Żyotnā-rātry-ahanī sandhyā chatvāry
etāni vai vibhōḥ | Brahmanas tu sarirāṇi trīguṇāpārayāṇi cha |
36. Rajo-mātrātmikāṁ eva tato 'nyāṁ jāgrihe tanum | tataḥ kṣudra
Brahmaṇo jāta jajne kopas tayā tataḥ | 37. Kṣhit-khaṁān andhakāre
tha so srijad bhagavāṁs tataḥ | Virūpāḥ smaśrula jātās te 'bhuyadhā-
vaṁs tataḥ prabhūm | 38. “Maivaṁ bho rakṣhayatam esha” yair uktaṁ
rākṣasās tu te | ucchu "khādāma" ity anye ye te yakṣhās tu yakṣhanāt |

“Maitreya said: 1. Tell me in detail how at the beginning of the
creation that deity Brahmā formed the gods, rishis, fathers, dānavas,
men, beasts, trees, etc., dwelling respectively on the earth, in the sky,
and in the water; 2. and with what qualities, with what nature, and
of what form he made the world. Parāśara replied: 3. I declare to
thee, Maitreya, how that deity created the gods and all other beings;
listen with attention. While he was meditating on creation, as at the
beginnings of the (previous) Kalpas, there appeared an insentient crea-


tion, composed of gloom (tamas). 4. Gloom, illusion, great illusion, darkness, and what is called utter darkness—such was the five-fold ignorance, which was manifested from that great Being, 5. as he was meditating—an insensible creation, under five conditions, devoid of feeling either without or within, closed up, motionless. 6. And since motionless objects are called the primary objects, this is called the primary (mukhya) creation. 7. Beholding this creation to be ineffective, he again contemplated another. As he was desiring it the brute (tiryaksrotas) creation came forth. 8. Since (in its natural functions) it acts horizontally it is called Tiryaksrotas. 9. The (creatures composing it) are known as cattle, etc., distinguished mainly by darkness (tamas) ignorant, following irregular courses, while in a state of ignorance having a conceit of knowledge, (10) self-regarding, self-esteeming, affected by the twenty-eight kinds of defects, endowed with inward feeling, and mutually closed. 11. As Brahmā, regarding this creation also as ineffective, was again meditating, another creation, the third, or ārdhvasrotas, which was good, rose upward. 12. They (the creatures belonging to this creation) abounding in happiness and satisfaction, being unclosed both without and within, and possessed both of external and internal feeling, are called the offspring of the Ārdhvasrotas creation. 13. This third creation, known as that of the gods, was one full of enjoyment. When it was completed, Brahmā was pleased. 14. He then contemplated another creation, effective and most excellent, since he regarded as ineffective the beings sprung from the primary and other creations. 15. While he, whose will is efficacious, was so desiring, the Arvāksrotas, an effective creation, was manifested. 16. They

102 The Vāyu P. here inserts an additional line, sarvatas tamasā chaiva śīpaḥ kumbha-vad evaitaḥ | "and covered on all sides with darkness, as a lamp by a jar."

103 Vahr-anto'prakāśascha appears to be the true reading, as the Commentator renders the last word by prakṛiṣṭa-jnāna-sūnyah, "devoid of knowledge." But if this be the correct reading, it is ungrammatical, as antah and aprakāśa would properly make antar-apraśa, not anto'prakāśa. But the Purāṇas have many forms which are irregular (ārsha, "peculiar to the rishis," "vedic," or "antiquated" as the Commentators style them). The Taylor MS. of the Vāyu Purāṇa reads in the parallel passage bahr-antah-prakāśascha.

104 See Dr. Hall’s note p. 70 on Professor Wilson’s translation; and also the passage quoted above p. 16 from the Taitt. Sanh. vii. 1, 1, 4, where the word mukhya is otherwise applied and explained.

105 Bhakṣyāūdā-viçekakā-hīnaḥ | "Making no distinction in food, etc., etc." Comm.

106 Compare M. Bh. xiv. 1038.
(the creatures belonging to it) are called Arvāksrotas, because (in their natural functions) they acted downwardly. And they abound in sensation (prakāśa) and are full of darkness (tamas) with a preponderance of passion (rajas). Hence they endure much suffering, and are constantly active, with both outward and inward feeling. These beings were men, and effective.\footnote{107}

In the next following verses, 17-22, the names of the different creations, described in the first part of this section, and in the second chapter of the first book of the Vīshṇu Purāṇa, are recapitulated, and two others, the Anugraha and the Kaumāra, are noticed, but not explained.\footnote{108}

The speaker Parāśara then adds: "23. Thus have the nine creations of Prajāpati, both Pārākṛta and Vaikṛta, the radical causes of the world, been recounted. What else dost thou desire to hear regarding the creative lord of the world? Maitreya replies: 24. By thee, most excellent Muni, the creation of the gods and other beings has been summarily narrated; I desire to hear it from thee in detail. Parāśara rejoins: Called into (renewed) existence in consequence of former actions, good or bad, and unliberated from that destination when they were absorbed at the (former) dissolution of the world, (25) the four descriptions of creatures, beginning with things immovable and ending with gods, were produced, o Brāhmaṇa, from Brahma when he was creating, and they sprang from his mind. 26. Being then desirous to create these streams (ambhāṃsi)\footnote{109}—the four classes of Gods, Asuras, Fathers, and Men, he concentrated himself. 27. Prajāpati, thus concentrated, received a body, which was formed of the quality of gloom (tamas); and as he desired to create, Asuras were first produced from his groin. 28. He then abandoned that body formed entirely of gloom; which when abandoned by him became night. 29. Desiring to create, when he had occupied another body, Brāhmaṇa experienced pleasure; and then gods, full of the quality of goodness, sprung from his mouth. 30. That body

\footnote{107} The Vāyu P. adds here: Lakṣmanaś tārakadositha ashtadhiḥ cha evamasthitah | siddhātmanusya manushyas te gandharva-saha-dharmiḥ | ity eva tajjasah sargyo hy arvākṣrotāḥ prakṛttitaḥ | "Constituted with preservative characteristics, and in an eightfold manner. These were men perfect in their essence, and in nature equal to Gandharvas. This was the lustrous creation known as Arvāksrotas."

\footnote{108} See Dr. Hall’s edition of Wilson’s V. P. pp. 32 ff.; and pp. 74 ff.

\footnote{109} This word is borrowed from the passage of the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, ii. 3, 8, 3, quoted above, p. 23. Most of the particulars in the rest of the narrative are imitated from another passage of the same Brāhmaṇa, ii. 2, 9, 5 ff., also quoted above, p. 28.
also, being abandoned by him, became day, which is almost entirely good. Hence the Asuras are powerful by night and the gods by day. 31. He then assumed another body formed of pure goodness; and the Fathers were born from him, when he was regarding himself as a father. 32. The Lord, after creating the Fathers, abandoned that body also; which, when so abandoned, became twilight, existing between day and night. 33. He next took another body entirely formed of passion; and men, in whom passion is violent, were produced. The primeval Prajāpati speedily discarded this body also, which became faint light (jyotisna), which is called early twilight. 34. Hence, at the appearance of this faint light, men are strong, while the fathers are strong at evening-twilight. 35. Morning-twilight, night, day, and evening-twilight, these are the four bodies of Brahmā, and the receptacles of the three qualities. 36. Brahmā next took another body entirely formed of passion, from which sprang hunger, and through it anger was produced. 37. The Divine Being then in darkness created beings emaciated with hunger, which, hideous of aspect, and with long beards, rushed against the lord. 38. Those who said, 'Let him not be preserved' (rakṣhayatam) were called Rakshasas, whilst those others who cried, 'Let us eat (him)' were called Yakshas from 'eating' (yakshanāt).

It is not necessary for my purpose that I should quote at length the conclusion of the section. It may suffice to say that verses 39 to 51 describe the creation of serpents from Brahmā's hair; of Bhūtas; of Gandharvas; of birds (vāyānsi) from the creator's life (vayās), of sheep from his breast, of goats from his mouth, of kine from his belly and sides, and of horses, elephants, and other animals from his feet; of plants from his hairs; of the different metres and vedas from his eastern, southern, western, and northern mouths. Verses 52 ff. contain a recapitulation of the creative operations, with some statement of the

110 In the Rāmāyaṇa, Sundara Kāṇḍa 82, 13 f. (Gorresio's edit.) we read: Rakṣasāṁ rajanī-kūlaḥ samyugeshu prāśayate | 14. Tasmād rajan niśī-yuddhe jayo 'smākaṁ na saṁśayaḥ | "Night is the approved time for the Rakshases to fight. We should therefore undoubtedly conquer in a nocturnal conflict."

111 This idea also is borrowed from Taitt. Br. ii. 3, 8, 2.

112 See Wilson's V. P. vol. i. p. 83, and Dr. Hall's note.

113 See the passage from the Taitt. Sanh. vii. 1, 1, 4 ff. quoted above, p. 16, where the same origin is ascribed to horses.
principles according to which they were conducted. Of these verses I quote only the following: 55. Teshāṁ ye yāni karmāṇi praś-śriṇḍhaṁ pratiṇḍaṁ | tāny eca pratipadyante sṛtyayamānaṁ punaḥ punaḥ | . . . 60. Yathārtāṁ rītu-lingāṇi nānārūpāṇi paryaye | dṛṣṭyaṁ tāṁ tāneyaṁ tathā bhāvaṁ yugādīśu | 61. Karoty evaṁvādhaṁ śrīśiṁ kalpaṁva sa punaḥ punaḥ | sīrśikṣaṁṣati-yukto 'sau sṛṣya-śakti-prachoditaḥ | “These creatures, as they are reproduced time after time, discharge the same functions as they had fulfilled in the previous creation . . . 60. Just as, in each season of the year, all the various characteristics of that season are perceived, on its recurrence, to be the very same as they had been before; so too are the beings produced at the beginnings of the ages.114 61. Possessing both the will and the ability to create, and impelled by the powers inherent in the things to be created, the deity produces again and again a creation of the very same description at the beginning of every Kalpa.”

The sixth section of the same book of the V. P., of which I shall cite the larger portion, professes to give a more detailed account of the creation of mankind.


114 Verses similar to this occur in Manu i. 30; and in the Mahābhārata xii. 8560 f.
AND OF THE ORIGIN OF THE FOUR CASTES.


115 There are no verses numbered 12 and 13, the MSS. passing from the 11th to the 14th.
functions of the Brāhmans and others. Parāśara replies: 3. When, true to his design, Brahmā became desirous to create the world, creatures in whom goodness (sattva) prevailed sprang from his mouth; (4) others in whom passion (rajas) predominated came from his breast; others in whom both passion and darkness (tamas) were strong, proceeded from his thighs; (5) others he created from his feet, whose chief characteristic was darkness. Of these was composed the system of four castes, Brāhmans, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Sūdras, who had respectively issued from his mouth, breast, thighs, and feet. 6. Brahmā formed this entire fourfold institution of classes for the performance of sacrifice, of which it is an excellent instrument. 7. Nourished by sacrifices, the gods nourish mankind by discharging rain. Sacrifices, the causes of prosperity, (8) are constantly celebrated by virtuous men, devoted to their duties, who avoid wrong observances, and walk in the right path. 9. Men, in consequence of their humanity, obtain heaven and final liberation; and they proceed to the world which they desire. 10. These creatures formed by Brahmā in the condition of the four castes, (were) perfectly inclined to conduct springing from religious faith, (11) loving to dwell wherever they pleased, free from all sufferings, pure in heart, pure, spotless in all observances. 14. And in their pure minds,—the pure Hari dwelling within them,—(there existed) pure knowledge whereby they beheld his highest station, called (that of) Vishnu. 15. Afterwards that which is described as the portion of Hari consisting of Time infused into those beings direful sin, in the form of desire and the like, ineffective (of man’s end), small in amount, but gradually increasing in force, (16) the seed of unrighteousness, and sprung from darkness and cupidity. 17. Thenceforward their innate perfectness was but slightly evolved: and as all the other eight perfections called rasollāsa and the rest (18) declined, and sin increased, these creatures (mankind) were afflicted with suffering arising

116 How does this agree with the statements made in the Taitt. Sanh. vii. 1, 1, 4 ff. as quoted above, p. 16, and in the Taitt. Br. iii. 2, 3, 9, p. 21, that the Sūdra is incapacitated for sacrifice, and that anything he milks out is no oblation?

117 This alludes to an expression in the Rig-veda, i. 22, 20. See the 4th vol. of this work, p. 54.

118 In regard to Kāla, “Time,” see Wilson’s V. P. vol. i. p. 18 f., and the passages from the Atharva-veda, extracted in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1865, pp. 380 ff.
out of the pairs (of susceptibilities to pleasure and pain, etc., etc.)
19. They then constructed fastnesses among trees, on hills, or amid
waters, as well as artificial fortresses, towns, villages, etc. 20. And in
these towns, etc., they built houses on the proper plan, in order to
counteract cold, heat, and other discomforts. 21. Having thus provided
against cold, etc., they devised methods of livelihood depending upon
labour, and executed by their hands." The kinds of grain which
they cultivated are next described in the following verses 22 to 25.
The text then proceeds, verse 26: "These are declared to be the
fourteen kinds of grain, cultivated and wild, fitted for sacrifice; and
sacrifice is an eminent cause of their existence. 27. These, too,
along with sacrifice, are the most efficacious sources of progeny.
Hence those who understand cause and effect celebrate sacrifices.
28. Their daily performance is beneficial to men, and delivers from
sins committed. 29. But that drop of sin which had been created by
time increased in men's hearts, and they disregarded sacrifice. 30.
Reviling the Vedas, and the prescriptions of the Vedas, the gods, and
all sacrificial rites, etc., obstructing oblations, (31) and cutting off the
path of activity," they became malignant, vicious, and perverse in their
designs. 32. The means of subsistence being provided, Prajāpati, having
created living beings, established a distinction according to their position
and qualities (see verses 3 to 5 above), (and fixed) the duties of the castes
and orders, and the worlds (to be attained after death) by all the castes
which perfectly fulfilled their duties. 33. The world of Prajāpati is
declared to be the (future) abode of those Brāhmans who are assiduous
in religious rites; the realm of Indra the abode of those Kshattriyas
who turn not back in battle; (34) that of the Maruts the abode of those
Vaishyas who fulfil their duties; and that of the Gandharvas the abode
of the men of Sudra race who abide in their vocation of service." In
the remaining verses of the chapter (35 to 39) the realms of blessedness
destined for the reception of more eminent saints are briefly noticed, as
well as the infernal regions, to which the wicked are doomed.

119 Pravṛtti-mārga-vaṇekchhāt-tābhiḥ-kāriyaḥ. The Commentator ascribes this to the
human race being no longer sufficiently propagated, for he adds the explanation:
vyājñānapunāstham evavārṣṭhāvād annābhāvena prajā-vṛddhāh asiddhāh | "because
population did not increase from the want of food caused by the gods ceasing to send
rain in consequence of the non-celebration of sacrifice."
At the beginning of the seventh section, without any further enquiry on the part of Maitreya, Parāśara proceeds as follows:


“1. Then from him, as he was desiring, there were born mental sons with effects and causes derived from his body. 2. Embodied spirits sprang from the limbs of that wise Being. All those creatures sprang forth which have already been described by me, (3) beginning

The Commentator explains these words kāryais taīḥ kāranaṁ saha to mean "bodies and senses."
with gods and ending with motionless objects, and existing in the condition of the three qualities. Thus were created beings moving and stationary. 4. When none of these creatures of the Wise Being multiplied, he next formed other, mental, sons like to himself, (5) Bhṛigu, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu, Angiras, Marichi, Daksha, Atri, and Vasishṭha, all born from his mind. These are the nine Brahmās who have been determined in the Purāṇas. 6. But Sanandana and the others who had been previously created by Vedhas (Brahmā) had no regard for the worlds, and were indifferent to offspring. They had all attained to knowledge, were freed from desire, and devoid of envy. 7. As they were thus indifferent about the creation of the world, great wrath, sufficient to burn up the three worlds, arose in the mighty Brahmā. 8. The three worlds became entirely illuminated by the wreath of flame which sprang from his anger. 9. Then from his forehead, wrinkled by frowns and inflamed by fury, arose Rudra, luminous as the midday sun, with a body half male and half female, fiery, and huge in bulk. After saying to him, ‘Divide thyself,’ Brahmā vanished. 10. Being so addressed, Rudra severed himself into two, into a male and a female form. The god next divided his male body into eleven parts, (11) beautiful and hideous, gentle and ungentle; and his female figure into numerous portions with appearances black and white. 12. Brahmā then made the lord Svāyambhuva, who had formerly sprung from himself, and was none other than himself, to be Manu the protector of creatures. 13. The god Manu Svāyambhuva took for his wife the female Satarūpā, who by austere fervour had become freed from all defilement. 14. To that Male the goddess Satarūpā bore Priyavrata and Uttānapāda, and two daughters called Prasūti and Akūti, distinguished by the qualities of beauty and magnanimity. 15. He of old gave Prasūti in marriage to Daksha, and Akūti to Ruchi.”

From a comparison of the preceding narratives of the creation of mankind, extracted from the fifth and sixth chapters of the First Book of the Vishṇu Purāṇa, it will be seen that the details given in the different accounts are not consistent with each other. It is first of all stated in the fifth chapter (verse 16) that the arvāksrotas, or human creation was characterized by the qualities of darkness and passion. In the second account (verse 33) we are told that Brahmā assumed a body composed of passion, from which men, in whom that quality is power-
ful, were produced. In neither of these narratives is the slightest allusion made to there having been any primeval and congenital distinction of classes. In the third statement given in the sixth chapter (verses 3 to 5) the human race is said to have been the result of a fourfold creation; and the four castes, produced from different parts of the creator's body, are declared to have been each especially characterized by different qualities (gunaś), viz., those who issued from his mouth by goodness (satteva), those who proceeded from his breast by passion (rajas), those who were produced from his thighs by both passion and darkness (tamas), and those who sprang from his feet by darkness. In the sequel of this account, however, no mention is made of any differences of conduct arising from innate diversities of disposition having been manifested in the earliest age by the members of the different classes. On the contrary, they are described (verses 10 ff.) in language applicable to a state of perfection which was universal and uniform, as full of faith, pure-hearted and devout. In like manner the declension in purity and goodness which ensued is not represented as peculiar to any of the classes, but as common to all. So far, therefore, the different castes seem, according to this account, to have been undistinguished by any variety of mental or moral constitution. And it is not until after the deterioration of the entire race has been related, that we are told (in verses 32 ff.) that the separate duties of the several castes were fixed in accordance with their position and qualities. This sketch of the moral and religious history of mankind, in the earliest period, is thus deficient in failing to explain how beings, who were originally formed with very different ethical characters, should have been all equally excellent during their period of perfection, and have also experienced an uniform process of decline.

In regard to the variation between the two narratives of the creation found in the fifth chapter of the Vishnu Purana, Professor Wilson remarks as follows in a note to vol. i. p. 80: "These reiterated, and not always very congruous, accounts of the creation are explained by the Puranas as referring to different Kalpas or renovations of the world, and therefore involving no incompatibility. A better reason for their appearance

---

121 Compare the passage given above at the close of Sect. V. pp. 41 ff., from Manu xii. 39 ff. and the remarks thereon.
is the probability that they have been borrowed from different original authorities.”

As regards the first of these explanations of the discrepancies in question, it must be observed that it is inapplicable to the case before us, as the text of the Vishnu Purana itself says nothing of the different accounts of the creation having reference to different Kalpas: and in absence of any intimation to the contrary we must naturally assume that the various portions of the consecutive narration in the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh chapters, which are connected with each other by a series of questions and answers, must all have reference to the creation which took place at the commencement of the existing or Varaha Kalpa, as stated in the opening verse of the fourth chapter. Professor Wilson’s supposition that the various and discrepant accounts “have been borrowed from different original authorities” appears to have probability in its favour. I am unable to point out the source from which the first description of the creation, in the early part of the fifth chapter, verses 1 to 23, has been derived. But the second account, given in verses 26 to 35, has evidently drawn many of its details from the passages of the Taittiriyapa Brahmana ii. 2, 9, 5–9, and ii. 3, 8, 2 ff., and Satapatha Brahmana xi. 1, 6, 6 ff. which I have quoted above. And it is possible that the references which are found in the former of these descriptions in the Vishnu Purana to different portions of the creation

132 The discrepancies between current legends on different subjects are occasionally noticed in the text of the Vishnu Purana. Thus in the eighth chapter of the first book, v. 12, Maitreya, who had been told by Parasar that Sri was the daughter of Bharugu and Khyati, enquires: _Kshirodhau Srih puropanu sriyate wishna-mithane | Bharugho Khyatiyo samutpanneto etad aha katham bhavun _ “It is reported that Sri was produced in the ocean of milk when ambrosia was churned. How do you say that she was born to Bharugu by Khyati?” He receives for answer: _13. Nityaiva su jagam-matato Vishnoh S'ri anapayini (another MS. reads anuyayini) yatho sarvegate Vishno tathaicegam devjitam | “Sri, the mother of the world, and wife of Vishnu, is eternal and undecaying” (or, according to the other reading, “is the eternal follower of Vishnu”). “As he is omnipresent, so is she,” and so on. The case of Daksha will be noticed further on in the text. On the method resorted to by the Commentators in cases of this description Professor Wilson observes in a note to p. 203 (4to. edition), “other calculations occur, the incompatibility of which is said, by the Commentators on our text and on that of the Bhagavata, to arise from reference being made to different Kalpas; and they quote the same stanza to this effect: _Kvachit kvachit puruseshu virodho yadi lakshyate | kalpa-bhedadhis tatra virodhah sadbhiv ishyate _ ‘Whenever any contradictions in different Puranas are observed, they are ascribed by the pious to differences of Kalpas and the like.’ ”
being ineffective may have been suggested by some of the other details in the Brāhmaṇas, which I shall now proceed to cite. At all events some of the latter appear to have given rise to the statement in the fourth verse of the seventh chapter of the Vīṣṇu P. that the creatures formed by Brahmā did not multiply, as well as to various particulars in the narratives which will be quoted below from the Vāyu and Mārkandēya Purāṇas. The Brāhmaṇas describe the creative operations of Prajāpati as having been attended with intense effort, and often followed by great exhaustion; and not only so, but they represent many of these attempts to bring living creatures of various kinds into existence, to sustain them after they were produced, and to ensure their propagation, as having been either altogether abortive, or only partially successful. The following quotations will afford illustrations of these different points:

Taitt. Br. i. 1, 10, 1. Prajāpatiḥ praJAḥ asrijata | sa ririchāno 'man-yata | sa tapo 'tapyata | sa ātman vṛtyam apāṣyat tad avardhata |

"Prajāpati created living beings. He felt himself emptied. He performed austere abstraction. He perceived vigour in himself. It increased, etc."

Taitt. Br. i. 2, 6, 1. Prajāpatiḥ praJAḥ sriṣṭvā vṛito133 'sayat | tāṁ devāḥ bhūtānāṁ rasāṁ tejāḥ sambhārītya tena enam abhishayyan "mahān avavartti" iti |

"Prajāpati after creating living beings lay exhausted. The gods, collecting the essence and vigour of existing things, cured him therewith, saying he has become great, etc."

Taitt. Br. ii. 3, 6, 1. Prajāpatiḥ praJAḥ sriṣṭvā vyasraṅsata | sa hri-dayam bhūto 'sayat |

"Prajāpati, after creating living beings, was paralysed. Becoming a heart, he slept."

S. P. Br. iii. 9, 1, 1. Prajāpatir vai praJAḥ sasrijāno ririchānāh ica amanyata | tasmāt parāchyaḥ praJAḥ āsuḥ | na asya praJAḥ śriye 'nnādyāya jajnire | 2. Sa aikshata "'arikshy aham asmai (?) Yasmai) u kāmāya asrikihi na me sa kāmaḥ samārdhi parāchya mat-praJAḥ abhūvan na me praJAḥ śriye 'nnādyāya asthishta" iti | 3. Sa aikshata Prajāpatiḥ "’kathaṁ nu punar ātmānam āpyādyeya upa mā praJAḥ samācarteraṁ tisṭheran me praJAḥ śriye annādyāya" iti | so 'rchhan śrāmyami cha-

133 Srōntaḥ—Comm.
chāra prajā-kāmāḥ | sa etām ekādaśinīm apasyat | sa ekādaśinyā ishteṇā
Prajāpatiḥ punar ātmānam āpyāyayata upa enam prajāḥ samāvarttanta
atishthaṇta asya prajāḥ śriye 'mādyāya sa vasyāṇ eva ishteṇa 'bhavat |
'Prajāpati when creating living beings felt himself as it were emptied. The living creatures went away from him. They were not produced so as to prosper and to eat food.

2. He considered: 'I have become emptied: the object for which I created them has not been fulfilled: they have gone away, and have not gained prosperity and food.'

3. He considered: 'how can I again replenish myself; and how shall my creatures return to me, and acquire prosperity and food?' Desirous of progeny, he went on worshipping and performing religious rites. He beheld this Ekādaśinī ( Eleven); and sacrificing with it, he again replenished himself; his creatures returned to him, and gained prosperity and food. Having sacrificed, he became more brilliant.'

S. P. Br. x. 4, 2, 2. So 'yaṁ saṁvatsaraḥ Prajāpatiḥ sarvāṇi bhūtāni
sacriye yath cha prāṇi yath cha aprāṇam ubhayān deva-manushyān | sa
sarvāṇi bhūtāni srishtvā ririchāna iva mene | sa mṛtyor bibhiyānchakāra | 2.
Sa ha ikshānchakra 'kathanuḥ nu aham imāni sarvāni bhūtāni punar
ātmann ācayeṇa punar ātmān dadhiya kathanuḥ nu aham eva eṣāṁ sar
veshām bhūtānāṁ punar ātmā syāṁ' iti |

'This Year, (who is) Prajápati, created all beings, both those which breathe and those that are without breath, both gods and men. Having created all beings he felt himself as it were emptied. He was afraid of death.

2. He reflected, 'How can I again unite all these beings with myself, again place them in myself? How can I alone be again the soul of all these beings?'

S. P. Br. x. 4, 4, 1. Prajāpatiṁ vai prajāḥ sṛjamānam pāṃma mṛt-
yur abhiparījagāna | sa tapo 'tapyata sahasrāṁ saṁvatsarān pāṃmaṁ
vijñāṇaḥ |

'Misery, death, smote Prajápati, as he was creating living beings. He performed austere abstraction for a thousand years, with the view of shaking off misery.'

S. P. Br. ii. 5, 1, 1. Prajāpatīr ha vai idam agne ekāḥ eva āsa | sa
aikshata 'kathanu nu prajāyeṇa' iti | so 'śrāmyat sa tapo 'tapyata | sa
prajāḥ asrījata | tāḥ asya prajāḥ srishtāḥ parābhubhuvuḥ | tāṇi imāni
vayāmśi | purusho vai Prajāpater nedishtham | dvipād vai ayam puru-
shaḥ | tasmād dvipādo vayāmśi | 2. Sa aikshata Prajāpatiḥ | 'yathā
MYTHICAL ACCOUNTS OF THE CREATION OF MAN,

nw eva purā eko 'bhūvam evam u nw eva apy etarhy eka eva asmi" iti | sa devitiyāh sarṣiye | tāh asya para eva babhūvah | tad idāṃ kshudram sarṣripaṃ yad anyat sarpebhyyah | tritiyāh sarṣiye ity āhūs tāh asya para eva babhūvah | te ime sarpaḥ . . . . | 3. So 'rchhan śrāmyan Prajñāpatir īkshānchakre "kathānu me prajāh srisṭṭāh parābhavanti" iti | sa ha etad eva dadasā "anāsānatayā vai me prajāh parābhavanti" iti | sa ātmah eva agre stana-vah páya āpyayānchakre | sa prajāh asrijata | tāh asya prajāh srisṭṭāh stana eva abhipadya tās tataḥ sambabhūvah | tāh imāh aparābhātāh |

"1. Prajñāpati alone was formerly this universe. He reflected, 'How can I be propagated?' He toiled in religious rites, and practised austere fervour. He created living beings. After being created by him they perished. They were these birds. Man is the thing nearest to Prajñāpati. This being, man, is two-footed. Hence birds are two-footed creatures. Prajñāpati reflected, 'As I was formerly but one, so am I now also only one.' He created a second set of living beings. They also perished. This was the class of small reptiles other than serpents. They say he created a third set of beings, which also perished. They were these serpents . . . 3. Worshipping and toiling in religious rites, Prajñāpati reflected, 'How is it that my creatures perish after they have been formed?' He perceived this, 'they perish from want of food.' In his own presence he caused milk to be supplied to breasts. He created living beings, which resorting to the breasts were then preserved. These are the creatures which did not perish."

Tatt. Br. i. 6, 2, 1. Vaiścavedeva vai Prajñāpatih prajāh asrijata | tāh srisṭṭāh na prajāyanta | so'gnir akāmaya "aham imāh prajanayeyam" iti | sa Prajñāpataye śucham adadhat | so 'sochat prajām ichhamānah | tasmād yaṁ cha prajā bhunakti yaṁ cha na tāv ubhau śochatāḥ prajām ichhamānau | tāsv Agrīm apy asrijat | tā Agrīm adhyait (2) Somo reto 'دادह Sāvītā prajānayat | Sarasvatī vāhham adadhat | Pushā 'poshayat | te vai ete triḥ saṁcātsarasaya pranyujante ye devāḥ pushtipatayah | saṁcātsaro vai Prajñāpatih | saṁcātsarena eva asmai prajāh prajānayat | tāḥ prajāḥ jatāḥ Maruto 'ghan "asmān api na prayuk-şāta" iti | 3. Sa etam Prajñāpatir mārutaṁ saptakapālam apaśyat | taṁ niravapat | tato vai prajābhyo 'kalpata | . . . sa Prajñāpatir aśochat "yaḥ pūrvāḥ prajāh asrikshi Marutas tāh avaḥhisuḥ katham aparāḥ
"Prajāpati formed living creatures by the vaśvadeva (offering to the Vaśvadevas). Being created they did not propagate. Agni desired' 'let me beget these creatures.' He imparted grief to Prajāpati. He grieved, desiring offspring. Hence he whom offspring blesses, and he whom it does not bless, both of them grieve, desiring progeny. Among them he created Agni also. Agni desired (?) them. Soma infused seed. Savitṛi begot them. Sarasvatī infused into them speech. Pūshan nourished them. These (gods) who are lords of nourishment are employed thrice in the year. Prajāpati is the Year. It was through the year that he generated offspring for him. The Maruts killed those creatures when they had been born, saying 'they have not employed us also.

3. Prajāpati saw this Māruta oblation in seven platters. He offered it. In consequence of it he became capable of producing offspring . . . . Prajāpati lamented, (saying) 'the Maruts have slain the former living beings whom I created. How can I create others?' His vigour sprang forth in the shape of an egg. He took it up. He cherished it. It became productive."

Taitt. Br. iii. 10, 9, 1. Prajāpatir devān asrījata | te pāpmanā sanditaḥ ajāyanta | tān evadāyat |

"Prajāpati created gods. They were born bound by misery. He released them."

Taitt. Br. ii. 7, 9, 1. Prajāpatiḥ prajāḥ asrījata | tāḥ asmāt śrishtāḥ parāchār āyan | sa etam Prajāpatir odanam apāsyat | so 'nām bhāto 'tishṭhat | tāḥ anyatra annādyam avitevā Prajāpatīm prajāḥ upāvartanta |

"Prajāpati created living beings. They went away from him. He beheld this odana. He was turned into food. Having found food nowhere else, they returned to him."

Taitt. Br. i. 6, 4, 1. Prajāpatiḥ Savitāḥ bhūtvā prajāḥ asrījata | tā enam atyamanvantā | tā asmād apākrāman | tā Varuṇo bhūtvā prajāḥ Varuṇena agrāhāyat | tāḥ prajāḥ Varuṇa-grhiṭāḥ Prajāpatim punar upādāvan nātham ichhamānāḥ |

"Prajāpati, becoming Savitṛi, created living beings. They disregarded him, and went away from him. Becoming Varuṇa he caused Varuṇa to seize them. Being seized by Varuṇa, they again ran to Prajāpati, desiring help."
Taitt. Br. ii. 2, 1, 1. Tato vai sa (Prajāpatiḥ) prajah aṣṭijata | tāḥ asmāt sṛṣṭāṇāḥ aprakrāman |

"Prajāpati then created living beings. They went away from him."

I have perhaps quoted too many of these stories, which are all similar in character. But I was desirous to afford some idea of their number as well as of their tenor.

As regards the legend of Satarūpā, referred to in the seventh chapter of the first book of the Vishṇu Purāṇa, I shall make some further remarks in a future section, quoting a more detailed account given in the Matsya Purāṇa.

Of the two sons of Manu Svāyambhuva and Satarūpā, the name of the second, Uttānapāda, seems to have been suggested by the appearance of the word Uttānapad in Rig-veda x. 72, 3, 4, as the designation (nowhere else traceable, I believe) of one of the intermediate agents in the creation.134 A Priyavrata is mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa vii. 34, and also in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa x. 3, 5, 14, (where he has the patronymic of Rauhiṇīyana) but in both these texts he appears rather in the light of a religious teacher, who had lived not very long before the age of the author, than as a personage belonging to a very remote antiquity. Daksha also, who appears in this seventh chapter as one of the mindborn sons of Brahmā, is named in R. V. ii. 27, 1, as one of the Ādityas, and in the other hymn of the R.V. just alluded to, x. 72, vv. 4 and 5, he is noticed as being both the son and the father of the goddess Aditi. In the S. P. ii. 4, 4, he is identified with Prajāpati.135 In regard to his origin various legends are discoverable in the Purāṇas. Besides the passage before us, there are others in the V.P. in which he is mentioned. In iv. 1, 5, it is said that he sprang from the right thumb of Brahmā, and that Aditi was his daughter (Brahmaṇaścha dakṣiṇāṅgusuhṭha-janmā Dakṣah | Prajāpatēr Dakshasyāpy Aditiḥ). In another place, V. P. i. 15, 52, it is said that Daksha, although formerly the son of Brahmā, was born to the ten Prachetases by Mārishā (Daśabhyaḥ tu Prachetobyāḥ Mārishāyām Prajñapatiḥ | jaṅga Dakṣho mahābhāgo yaḥ pūrvam Brahmaṇo 'bhavat |). This double pa-

134 See the 4th vol. of this work, pp. 10 f.
135 See the 4th vol. of this work, pp. 10 ff. 24, 101; Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, for 1865, pp. 72 ff.; Roth in the Journal of the German Oriental Society, vi. 75.
rentage of Daksha appears to Maitreya, one of the interlocutors in the Purāṇa, to require explanation, and he accordingly enquires of his informant, vv. 60 ff.: Angushṭhād dakshiṇād Dakṣaḥ pūrvāṁ jātaḥ śrutam mayā | katham Prāchetasō bhūyaḥ sa sambhūto mahāmune | esha me saṁśayo brahmaṇa sumahān hṛidi vartate | yad dāvhitraś cha somasya punaḥ śrāvīrataṁ gataḥ | Parāśara uvācha | utpattiś cha nirodhaś cha nityau bhūteshu vai mune | rishayo 'tra na muhyanti ye chāanye divya- chakṣhushaḥ | 61. Yuge yuge bhavanty ete Dakṣaḥdāya muni-sattama | punaḥ chaiva nirudhyante videvaṁ tatra na muhyati | 62. Kānishaḥyaṁ jyaishthyaṁ apy eshāṁ pūrvāṁ nābhūd dvijottama | tapa eva gariyo 'bhūt prabhāvas chaiva kāragam |

“60. I have heard that Daksha was formerly born from the right thumb of Brahmā. How was he again produced as the son of the Prachetases? This great doubt arises in my mind; and also (the question) how he, who was the daughter’s son of Soma, afterwards became his father-in-law. Parāśara answered: Both birth and destruction are perpetual among all creatures. Rishis, and others who have celestial insight, are not bewildered by this. In every age Daksha and the rest are born and are again destroyed: a wise man is not bewildered by this. Formerly, too, there was neither juniority nor seniority: austere fervour was the chief thing, and power was the cause (of distinction).”

The reader who desires further information regarding the part played by Daksha, whether as a progenitor of allegorical beings, or as a creator, may compare the accounts given in the sequel of the seventh and in the eleventh chapters of Book I. of the V. P. (pp. 108 ff. and 152 ff.) with that to be found in the fifteenth chapter (vol. ii. pp. 10 ff.).

I will merely add, in reference to Akūti, the second daughter of Manu Svāyambhuva and Satarūpā, that the word is found in the Rig-veda with the signification of “will” or “design;” but appears to be personified in a passage of the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, iii. 12, 9, 5 (the context of which has been cited above, p. 41), where it is said: Irā pātai vīśvāśrijām akūtir apiṇād havih | “Irā (Īdā) was the wife of the creators. Akūti kneaded the oblation.”

126 See Wilson’s V. P. vol. ii. p. 2, at the top.
SECT. VIII.—Account of the different creations, including that of the castes, according to the Vāyu and Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇas.

I now proceed to extract from the Vāyu and Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇas the accounts which they supply of the creation, and which are to the same effect as those which have been quoted from the Vishṇu Purāṇa, although with many varieties of detail.

I shall first adduce a passage from the fifth chapter of the Vāyu (which to some extent runs parallel with the second chapter of the Vishṇu Purāṇa127), on account of its containing a different account from that generally given of the triad of gods who correspond to the triad of qualities (gunaś).


11, 12. At the beginning of the day, the supreme Lord Mahēśvara, sprung from Prakṛiti, entering the egg, agitated with extreme intentness both Pradhāna (= Prakṛiti) and Purusha. 13. From

127 See pp. 27 and 41 f. of Wilson’s V. P. vol. i.
128 The Gaikwär MS. of the India office, No. 2102, reads āsthitāḥ, instead of āśritāḥ, the reading of the Taylor MS.
Pradhāna, when agitated, the quality of passion (rajas) arose, which was there a stimulating cause, as water is in seeds. 14. When an inequality in the Guṇas arises, then (the deities) who preside over them are generated. From the Guṇas thus agitated there sprang three gods (15), indwelling, supreme, mysterious, animating all things, embodied. The rajas quality was born as Brahmā, the tamas as Agni, the sattva as Vishṇu. 16. Brahmā, the manifester of rajas, acts in the character of creator; Agni, the manifester of tamas, acts in the capacity of time; Vishṇu, the manifester of sattva, abides in a condition of indifference. These deities are the three worlds, the three qualities, the three Vedas, the three fires; they are mutually dependent, mutually devoted. 19. They exist through each other, and uphold each other; they are twin-parts of one another, they subsist through one another. 20. They are not for a moment separated; they never abandon one another. Iśvara (Mahādeva) is the supreme god; and Vishṇu is superior to Mahat (the principle of intelligence); while Brahmā, filled with rajas, engages in creation. Purusha is to be regarded as supreme, as Prakṛiti is also declared to be."

The sixth section of the Vāyu P., from which the next quotation will be made, corresponds to the fourth of the Vishṇu P. quoted above.


129 The Märk. P. chap. 46, verse 18, has the same line, but substitutes Rudra for Agni, thus: Ṛajo Brahmā tamo Rudro Vīṣṇuḥ sattvām jagat-patīḥ | The two are often identified. See Vol. IV. of this work, 282 ff.
130 See Wilson’s Vishṇu Purāṇa, p. 57, with the translator’s and editor’s notes. Verses 1 to 6 are repeated towards the close of the 7th section of the Vāyu P. with variations.
9. Akarot sa tanunhy anyam kalpadishyu yathā purā | tato mahātmā manasā divyaṁ rūpam achintayat
10. Salienāplutam bhūnim drishtvā sa tu samantataḥ | “kim nu rūpam mahat kritvā uddharyam aham ma-hīm”
11. Jala-krīḍā-suruchiram vārāhāṁ rūpam asmarat | adhrisyāṁ sarva-bhūtānāṁ vānmayam dharma-sanjñitam

“1. When fire had perished from the earth, and this entire world motionless and moving, together with all intermediate things, had been dissolved into one mass, and had been destroyed—waters first were produced. As the world formed at that time but one ocean, nothing could be distinguished. Then the divine Brahmā, Purusha, with a thousand eyes, a thousand feet, (3) a thousand heads, of golden hue, beyond the reach of the senses—Brahmā, called Nārāyana, slept on the water. 4. But awaking in consequence of the predominance (in him) of the sattva quality, and beholding the world a void—: Here they quote a verse regarding Nārāyana: 5. ‘The waters are the bodies of Nara: such is the name we have heard given to them; and because he sleeps upon them, he is called Nārāyana.’ 6. Having so continued for a nocturnal period equal to a thousand Yugas, at the end of the night he takes the character of Brahmā in order to create. 7. Brahmā then becoming Vāyu (wind) moved upon that water, 131 hither and thither, like a firefly at night in the rainy season. 8. Discovering then by inference that the earth lay within the waters, but unbewildered, (9) he took, for the purpose of raising it up, another body, as he had done at the beginnings of the (previous) Kalpas. Then that Great Being devised a celestial form. 10. Perceiving the earth to be entirely covered with water, (and asking himself) ‘what great shape shall I assume in order that I may raise it up?’—he thought upon the form of a boar, brilliant from aquatic play, invincible by all creatures, formed of speech, and bearing the name of righteousness.”

The body of the boar is then described in detail, and afterwards the elevation of the earth from beneath the waters, and the restoration of its former shape, divisions, etc. 132—the substance of the account being

131 This statement, which is not in the corresponding passage of the Vishnu P., is evidently borrowed, along with other particulars, from the text of the Taittirīya Sanhitā, vii. 1, 5, 1, quoted above p. 52.
132 Following the passage of the Taittirīya Sanhitā, quoted above, the writer in one verse ascribes to Brahmā as Visvakarman the arrangement of the earth, tatas teshu evī ryeṣu lokadāhi-girishv ato | Visvakarmā vibhajate kalpādīshu punah punah |
much the same, but the particulars different from those of the parallel passage in the Vishnu Purana.

Then follows a description of the creation coinciding in all essential points\textsuperscript{133} with that quoted above, p. 55, from the beginning of the fifth chapter of the Vishnu Purana.

The further account of the creation, however, corresponding to that which I have quoted from the next part of the same chapter of that Purana, is not found in the same position in the Vayu Purana,\textsuperscript{134} but is placed at the beginning of the ninth chapter, two others, entitled Pratisandhi-kirttana and Chaturasrama-vibhaga, being interposed as the seventh and eighth. With the view, however, of facilitating comparison between the various cosmogonies described in the two works, I shall preserve the order of the accounts as found in the Vishnu Purana, and place the details given in the ninth chapter of the Vayu Purana before those supplied in the eighth.

The ninth chapter of the Vayu Purana, which is fuller in its details than the parallel passage in the Vishnu Purana, begins thus, without any specific reference to the contents of the preceding chapter:


\textsuperscript{133} This is also the case with the details given in the M ârk. P. xlvii. 15-27 and ff.
\textsuperscript{134} The M ârk. P. however observes the same order as the Vishnu P.
\textsuperscript{135} The reading in the passage of the Taitt. Br. ii. 2, 9, 6, from which this narrative is borrowed (see above, p. 28), is apahata,—which, however, does not prove that that verb with ei prefixed should necessarily be the true reading here; as the Taylor and Gaikowar MSS. have vyapohata throughout, and in one place vyapohat.
MYTHICAL ACCOUNTS OF THE CREATION OF MAN,

"Sūta says: 1. Then, as he was desiring, there sprang from him mind-born sons, with those effects and causes derived from his body. 2. Embodied spirits were produced from the bodies of that wise Being. 3. Then willing to create these four streams (ambhāmsi) gods, Asuras, Fathers, and men, he fixed his spirit in abstraction. As Svayambhū was thus fixed in abstraction, a body consisting of nothing but darkness (invested him). 4. While desiring this creation, Prajāpati put forth an effort. Then Asuras were first produced as sons from his groin. 5. Asū is declared by Brahmans to mean breath. From it these beings were produced; hence they are Asuras. He cast aside the body with which the Asuras were created. 6. Being cast away by him, that body immediately became night. Inasmuch as darkness predominated in it, night consists of three watches. 7. Hence, being enveloped in darkness, all creatures sleep at night. Beholding the Asuras, however, the Lord of gods took another body, (8) imperceptible, and having a predominance of goodness, which he then fixed in abstraction. While he continued thus to fix it, he experienced pleasure. 9. Then as he was sporting, gods were produced in his mouth. As they were born from him, while he was sporting (divyatah), they are known as Devas (gods). 10. The root div is understood in the sense of sporting. As they were born in a sportive (divya) body, they are called Devatās. 11. Having created the deities, the Lord of gods then took another body, consisting entirely of goodness (sattva). 12. Regarding himself as a father, he thought upon these sons: he created Fathers (Pātrīs) from his armpits in the interval between night and day. 13. Hence these Fathers are gods: therefore that sonship belongs to them. He cast aside the body with which the Fathers were created. 14. Being cast away by him, it straightway became twilight. Hence day belongs to the gods, and night is said to belong to the Asuras. 15. The body intermediate between them, which is that of the Fathers, is the most important. Hence gods, Asuras, Fathers, and men (16) worship intently this intermediate body of Brahmā. He then took again another body. But from that body, composed altogether of passion (rajas),

140 This statement, which is not found in the parallel passage of the Vīshnū Purāṇa, is borrowed from Taitt. Br. ii. 3, 8, 2, quoted above.

141 Divya properly means "celestial." But from the play of words in the passage, the writer may intend it to have here the sense of "sportive."
which he created by his mind, he formed mind-born sons who had almost entirely a passionate character. 18. Then from his mind sprang mind-born sons. Beholding again his creatures, he cast away that body of his. 19. Being thrown off by him it straightway became morning twilight. Hence living beings are gladdened by the rise of early twilight. 20. Such were the bodies which, when cast aside by the Great Being, became immediately night and day, twilight and early twilight. 21. Early twilight, twilight, and day have all the character of pure goodness. Night has entirely the character of darkness (*tamas*); and hence it consists of three watches. 22. Hence the gods are beheld with a celestial body, and they were created from the mouth. As they were created during the day, they are strong during that period. 23. Inasmuch as he created the Asuras from his groin at night, they, having been born from his breath, during the night, are unconquerable during that season. 24, 25. Thus these four streams, early twilight, night, day, and twilight, are the causes of gods, Asuras, Fathers, and men, in all the Manvantaras that are past, as well as in those that are to come. 26. As these (streams) shine, they are called *ambhaṇśī*. This root *bhā* is used by the intelligent in the senses of pervading and shining, and the Male, Prajāpati, declares (the fact). 27. Having beheld these streams (*ambhaṇśī*), gods, Dānavas, men, and fathers, he again created various others from himself. 28. Abandoning that entire body, the lord created another, a form consisting almost entirely of passion and darkness, and again fixed it in abstraction. 29. Being possessed with hunger in the darkness, he then created another. The hungry beings formed by him were bent on seizing the streams (*ambhaṇśī*). 30. Those of them, who said ‘let us preserve (*rakṣāma*) these streams,’ are known in the world as Rākshasas, wrathful, and prowling about at night.”

This description is followed by an account of the further creation corresponding with that given in the same sequence in the Vishnu Purāṇa; and the rest of the chapter is occupied with other details which it is not necessary that I should notice. I therefore proceed to make some quotations from the eighth chapter, entitled *Chaturāśrama-vibhāga*, or “the distribution into four orders,” which corresponds, in

142 Mānasū. We might expect here however, mūnavūn or mūnushān, “human,” in conformity with the parallel passages both in the Vishnu Purāṇa (see above, p. 56), and the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, xlviii. 11.
its general contents, with the sixth chapter of the Vishnu Purana, book i., but is of far greater length, and, in fact, extremely prolix, as well as confused, full of repetitions, and not always very intelligible.

The chapter immediately preceding (i.e. the seventh), entitled Pratisandhi-kirttanam, ends with the words: "I shall now declare to you the present Kalpa; understand." Suta accordingly proceeds at the opening of the eighth chapter to repeat some verses, which have been already quoted from the beginning of the sixth chapter, descriptive of Brahma's sleep during the night after the universe had been dissolved, and to recapitulate briefly the elevation of the earth from beneath the waters, its reconstruction, and the institution of Yugas. At verse 22 the narrative proceeds:


¹⁴³ The narrative in the 49th chapter of the Markandeya Purāṇa (verses 3–13) begins at this verse, the 37th of the Vāyu Purāṇa, and coincides, though with verbal differences, with what follows down to verse 47. After that there is more variation.
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tasya satyābhidhyāyinas tadā | mithunānāṁ sahasram tu so 'srijad vai
mukkāt tadā | 38. Janās te hy upapadyante sattvodriktāḥ suchetasah
| sahasram anyad vakshato mithunānāṁ sasarja ha | 39. Te saree rajasodriktāḥ śushmiṇāḥ chāpy aśushmiṇāḥ
| sriṣṭvā sahasram anyat tu dvandvānāṁ ūruṭaḥ pūnaḥ | 40. Rajas-tamodbhāyām uδriktaṁ thāśīlās tu
te smṛtīḥ | padbhīyam sahasram anyat tu mithunānāṁ sasarja ha | 41. Udriktās tamasa sarve niḥśrīkā hy alpa-tejasāḥ | tato vai harshamāyāgas
te dvandvotpannāṁ tu prāṇinaḥ | 42. Anyonya-ḥriśhayāvīśta maithunānāyopachakramuḥ | tataḥprabhṛti kalpe 'śmin maithunottattar uchyate |
43. Māsi māsy āṛttacān yat tu na tadā "sīt tu yoshitām" | tasmāt tadā
na sushuvhā svitair api mithunāḥ | 44. Āyusho 'nte prasūyante mithunān eya tāḥ sakrit
| kuṇṭhakāḥ kuṇṭhikaś chaiva utpadyante mumūr-
| shatām | 45. Tataḥ prabhṛti kalpe 'śmin mithunānāṁ hi sambhavah |
dhyāne tu manasā tāsām prajānāṁ jayate sakrit | 46. Subdādi-viśayaḥ
| sūdhāḥ pratyekam pancha-lakshaṇāḥ | ity evam mānasī pürvam prāk-
| śrishtir yā Prajāpatēḥ | 47. Tasyānaveṇyo sambhūta yair idam pūritum
| jagat | sarit-saraḥ-samudrāṁś cha sevante paretaṁ api | 48. Tadā
nātyanta-śītoshnā yuge tasmin charanti vai | prīthvi-rasodbhavaṁ nāma
| āharaṁ hy āharanti vai | 49. Tāḥ prajāḥ kāma-chārīnyo mānasīn
| siddhim āsthitāḥ | dharmādharmau na tās ev ātēm nirviśeṣāh prajās tu
| tāḥ | 50. Tulyam āyuḥ sūkhāṁ rūpāṁ tāsāṁ tasmin krite yuge | dharmādharmau na tās ātēm kalpaṁdau tu krite yuge | 51. Scena senadhi-
kāreṇa jajnire te krite yuge | chatvāri tu sahasraṁ yevāṁ śivāṁ
| svaṁkhyāyā | 52. Ādyaṁ kripa-yugam prāhuḥ sandhyānāṁ tu chatuḥ-
| śatam | tataḥ sahasraṁ tās ātēm prathitāv api | 53. Na tāsāṁ
pratighāto 'sti na dvevaṁ nāpi cha klamaḥ | parvatadhi-sevīnyo hy
| aniketāśrayaṁ tu tāḥ | 54. Viśokāḥ sattva-bahulaḥ hy ekānta-sukhitāḥ
| prajāḥ | tāḥ vai niṣkāma-chārīnyo nityam muditaṁ-mānasāḥ | 55. Paśa-

144 For suchetasah the Mārk. P. reads sutejasah.
145 For aśushmiṇāḥ the Mārk. P. reads amarṣhināḥ, "iraśible."
146 I have corrected this line from the Mārkṣaṭa Purāṇa, 49, 9 b. The reading of
the MSS. of the Purāṇa cannot be correct. It appears to be: māṣe māṣe
ṛttaveṇī yad yat tat tatāsid hi yoshitām The negative particle seems to be indis-
penable here.
147 This half verse is not found in the Mārk. P.
148 The Mārk. P. has mānasīḥ, "human," instead of mānasī, "mental."
149 This verse is not in the Mārk. P.; and after this point the verses which are
common to both Purāṇas do not occur in the same places.
150 Verses 53–56 coincide generally with verses 14–18 of the Mārk. P.
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āhō | sarva-pratuyapbhagos tu tāsāṁ tebhyaḥ praśyāte | 83. Vart-

tayanti hi tebhyaḥ tās tretā-yuga-mukhe praśāḥ | tataḥ kālaṁ mahatā 
tāsāṁ eva viprayāyat | 84. Rāgalbhāṭāmako bhavas tadā hy ākakmiko 'bhavat | yat tad bhavati nārijāṁ jīvitaṁ te dārtyaṁ | 85. Tadā tad 
vai na bhavati punar yuga-balena tu | tāsāṁ punah pravicite tu māśe māse 
tad ārtyaṁ (–ve?) | 86. Tatas tenāva yogena varttattāṁ maithune tadā | 
tāsāṁ tāt-kāla-bhāvade māśy māśy upayachhatāma | 87. Akāla hy ārtyayot- 
pattāṁ gurhāḥ-pattāṁ ajāyata | viprayayaṁ tāsāṁ tu tenā kālaṁ bhācina | 88. Pranāśyantyataḥ sarve erikshās tu giha-saṁsthi- 

āhō | tatas teṣha praṇaśṭahsu vibhrānta āyakulendiryaḥ | 89. Abhidhiyantyataṁ siddhiṁ 
satyābhidhyāyinaṁ tadā | prādurabahvavus tāsāṁ tu erikshās te giha-saṁsthi- 

āhō | 90.133 Vastraṁ cha pravāyante phaleshin abharaṅgini cha | 
tesha eva jāyate tāsāṁ gandha-varṇa-varāneitām | 91. Amākhikam ma-
hāvīrayam puṭake puṭake madhu | tena tā varttayantyena mukhe tretā-
yogasya vai | 92. Hrīṣṭa-tushiṁ tayaḥ siddhyā praṣāḥ vai viṣvata-jcaṛāḥ | 
punah kālāntareṇaiva punah lobha-eritita tu tāh | 93. Vikriṣhās tān 
parvyagrihanta mahād hu chāmākhikam balāt | tāsāṁ tenāpachāreṇa punah 
lobha-kriṣenā vai | 94. Pranāśṭā madhunā sārdham kalpa-erikshāḥ kva-

133 Verses 27–35 of the Mārk. P. correspond more or less to this and the following 
verses down to 98. 

134 This and the following verses correspond more or less closely to the Mārk. P. 
30 ff.
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127 I have corrected this line from Mārk. P. xlix. 35.
128 Verses 52-54 of the Mārk. P. correspond in substance to verses 123-128 of the Vāyu P.
129 Verses 55-62 of the Mārk. P. correspond to verses 129-137 of the Vāyu P.
bhāvinā 'rthena tretā-yuga-vaśena tu | 137. Tatas tāh paryagrihyanta
nadiḥ khetraṇī paravān | vṛkṣhān guñmaudhahī chaiva prasahya tu
yathā-balam | 138. Siddhātmānas tu ye pūrcan vyākhyaṭāḥ prāk kriṭe
mayā | Brahmaṇo mānasās te vai utpannā ye janād iha | 139. Sāntāś
daśuḥ śushmaṇaḥ chaiva karmīgo duḥkhīnas tadā | tataḥ pravarttamānās te
tretāyāṃ jajnire punah | 140. Brahmaṅgah kshattriya vaiśyāḥ śādrā
drohijanās tathā | bhāvitāḥ pāvea-jātishu karmabhīṣ cha śubhāsbhāiḥ |
141. Itas tebhya 'balā ye tu śatyasīlā ha ahimśakaḥ | vitta-lohbā jītāmānō
tīvra nivasānti sma teshu vai | 142. Pratigrihyanti kurtanti tebhyaśs
chānaya 'lpa-tejasāḥ | evam vipratipannesu prapanneṣu parasparam |
143. Tena dosheṇa teshāṃ tā ośadhyo mīshatāṃ tada¹⁰⁰ | pranāṣṭaḥ kriya-
maṇā vāi muṣṭiḥ-bhyāḥ sikatā yathā | 144.¹⁰¹ Agraśad bhūr yuga-balād
gṛmānyāraṇyāḥ chaturdaśaḥ | phalam grihyantī pushpaiṣha phalaiḥ patraṇī
punah punah | 145.¹⁰² Tatas tāṣu pranāṣṭaḥsu vibhrantās tāḥ prajūs
tadā | Sevāmbhuvam prabhūn jagmuḥ kṣudhāvinītāḥ prajāpatim | 146. vṛtty-artheṁ abhīlīpsaṇaḥ ādaṇu tretā-yugasya tu | Brahmaṇ Sevāṃbhūr
bhagavān jñātvā tāsāṃ maniśhitam | 147. Yuktam pratyakṣa-ārṣīṣṭena
darsanena vichāryya cha | grastāḥ prithivyā oṣadhyo jñātvā pratyadhut
punah | 148. Kṛiteva vatsaṁ sugeṣum tu dudoḥa prithivīṁ imām | dudghe-
yāṁ gauṣ tada tena viṇi prithivī-ṭale | 149. Jajnire tiṇi viṇi gṛmā-
nyāraṇyās tu tāḥ punah | oṣadhyoḥ phala-paṅkāntāḥ śāna-saptadāśas tu tāḥ |
... 155. Utpannaḥ prathamāṁ hy etā ādaṇu tretā-yugasya tu | 156. Āphāla-kriṣṭa oṣadhyo gṛmānyāraṇyās tu sarvasaḥ | vṛkṣhā guṇma-
lata-vallyo vīrudhas tṛṣṇa-jātayāḥ | 157. Malaṁ phalaiḥ cha rohīnyo
grihyam pushpaiṣha yāḥ phalam | prithvī dudhā tu viṇi yāṇi pūr-
evam Sevāmbhuvā | 158. Rītu-pushpa-phalas tā vai oṣadhyo jajnire tē
iha | ¹⁰³ yadā prasṛṣṭā oṣadhyo na prarohanti tāḥ punah | 159. Tataḥ
sa tāsāṁ vṛtty-artheṁ vaṛttopāyaḥ chakāra ha | Brahmaṇ Sevāṃbhūr
bhagavān hasta-siddhāṁ tu karma-jām | 160. Tatas-prabhṛty athau-
shadhyāḥ kriṣṭa-pachyās tu jajnire | sāṃsiddhāyaṁ tu vaṛtāyāṁ tataś
prasāṁ Sevāṃbhuvāḥ | 161. Maryādāḥ sthāpayāmāḥ yathāraḥdhaḥ
cetasya parasmāṃ | ¹⁰⁴ ye vai parigrihitāras tāsāṃ āsan badhātmakāḥ | 162. Ilaṃsāṁ kriṣṭa-trāṇaḥ sthāpayāmāma kṣhatrīyāṁ | upatiṣṭhānti ye tān

¹⁰⁰ Mārk. P. verse 63a.
¹⁰¹ Mārk. P. verse 68b.
¹⁰² Verses 64–67 of the Mārk. P. correspond to verses 145–149 of the Vāyu P.
¹⁰³ Verses 73–75 of the Mārk. P. correspond to verses 158–160 of the Vāyu P.
¹⁰⁴ This with all what follows down to verse 171 is omitted in the Mārk. P.
vai yāvanto nirbhayās tathā | 163. Satyam brahma yathā bhūtām bru-
vanto brāhmaṇās tu te | ye chāntyop abalās teshāṁ vaiśāmin karma
saṃsthitāḥ | 164. Kināśā nāsayanti sma prithivyām prāg atarṣātīḥ |
vaiṣāyān eva tu tān āhuḥ kināśān vṛtti-sādhakān | 165. Sochatāsa cha
dravantaś cha paricharyāsyu ye rataḥ | nisteyaso 'ipa-vṛtyās cha südrān
tān abraevit tu saḥ | 166. Teshāṁ karmāṇi dharmāṇāṁ cha Brahmā 'nu-
vyadādhāt prabhuḥ | saṃsthītāu prakritāyāṁ tu chāturvarṇasya sar-
vasāḥ | 167. Punaḥ prayās vā tā mohāt tān dharmān nācapanālayan
varṇa-dharmair ajivantyo vyarūdhya ṣanta parasparam | 168. Brahmā tān
artham buddheā tu yāthātathyaṇa vai prabhuḥ | kṣhattriyānāṁ balam
danāṁ yuddhāṁ ājīvam ādīsāt | 169. Yājanādhyayanam chaiva śrī-
yān cha parigrahān | brāhmaṇānāṁ vibhus teshāṁ karmāṇy etāṁ atha-
dīsāt | 170. Pāsūpaṃyaṃ vāniṃyaṃ cha kriṣṇām chaiva viṣām dadau |
silpājīvam bhūtṛīm chaiva südrāṇāṁ vyadādhāt prabhuḥ | 171. Sāmā-
yānī tu karmāṇi brahma-kṣhattr-vaśīm punaḥ | yājanādhyayanamāṁ dānam
sāmāṇānī tu teshu vai | 172. Karmājīvam tato dare tebhyaḥ chaiva
parasparam | lokāntareshu sūtāṇāṁ teshāṁ siddhyāyā | 180 adāt prabhuḥ |
173. Prājāpatyaṃ brāhmaṇānāṁ smṛtaṁ sūtāṇāṁ kriyāvatām | sū-
naṁ āindraṁ kṣhattriyānāṁ sangrāmesu apalāyinām | 174. Vaiśyānāṁ
mārutāṁ sūtāṇāṁ eva-dharmam upajīvinām | gāndharvānā śūdra-jātinām
pratichārena (parichārena ?) tishṭhatām | 175. Sūtāṇāṁ etāṁ varṇāṅāṁ
evayācāravatāṁ evayam | tataḥ stheticu varṇēhū sūtraṇām āśramaṁ
| 176. Grihasṭham brahmacārītevaṁ vanaprastham sābhikshukam |
āśramāṁs chaturū hy etāṁ purvam asthāpayat prabhuḥ | 177. Varna-ka-
māṇi ye kehit teshām īha na kucate | kṛita-karmakshitiḥ (?) prahur āśra-
ma-sūtāṇā-vāsnāḥ | 178. Brahmā tān sthāpayāmāsa āśramān nāma nā-
mataḥ | nirdeśārthaṁ tataḥ teshāṁ Brahmā dharmaṁ prābhāṣhatā | 179.
Prasthāṇānī cha teshāṁ vai yaṁāṁscha niyamaṁs cha ha | chāturvarṇyāt-
makām purvaṁ grihasṭham te āśramāṁ smṛtaḥ | 180. Trayaṅgam āśram-
āṅāṁ cha pratishthā yonir eva cha | yathākramam pravakṣhyāmi yamiṁ
cha niyamaṁ cha taiḥ | . . . . . 190. Vedāḥ sāṅgās cha yaṁāṁs cha vra-
tāṇi niyamaṁ cha ye | 191. Na siddhyanti pradoshaṁ bhāvadoshe upā-
gate | bahiḥ-karmāṇi sāvāṇi prasiddhyanti (na siddhyanti ?) kadāchana |

165 I conjecture siddhyāyā adāt to be the proper reading. The MSS. have siddhyā-
dadāt, or siddhyādadāt, etc.
166 Verses 173 f. are found in the Mārk. P. verses 77 f.; but all that follows down
to verse 193 is omitted there.
192. Antar-bhāva-pradushtasya kurvato 'hi parakramat | sarvasvam api 
yo dadyāt kalushena taratmanā | 193. Na tāna dharma-bhāk vu syād 
bhāva eva hi kāryan | | 199. Evaṁ varṇāsramānāṁ vai pratī 
 bhāge kṛite tadā | 200. Yādā 'syā na vyavardhanta prajā varṇāsramat 
 mikaḥ | tato 'nyā mānasiḥ so 'tha tretā-madhyaḥ 'srijat prajāḥ | 201. Āt 
manas tāḥ sarvāchhe tulyās chaivatmanā tu vai | tasmin tretā-yuge 
prāpte madhyam prāpte kramena tu | 202. Tato 'nyā manasia tatras pr 
jāḥ vrashtum prakramame | tataḥ satva-rajodriktāḥ prajāḥ so 'thaśrijat 
prabhuh | 203. Dharmārtha-kāma-mokṣhānāṁ varttāyās chaiva sādhī 
kāḥ | devās cha pitarās chaiva rishayo manavas tathā | 204. Yājñau 
rūpā dharmena yair ima vichitāḥ prajāḥ | upasthite tadā tasmin prajā 
dharme (-sarge?) Sevamāvivekah | 205. Abhidādhyau prajāḥ sarvā nānā 
rūpas tu mānasiḥ | pūrvekta ya mayā tubhyāṁ jana-lokān samāsritaḥ | 206. Kālpe 'tite tu tā hy asan devādyās tu prajā iha | dhyāyatas tasya tāh 
sarvāṁ sambhūty-artham upasthitāḥ | 207. Manvantara-kramene kā 
nishthe prathame matāḥ | khyātyā 'nubandhais tais tais tu sarvārthhair 
iha bhāvitāḥ | 208. Kusulākushala-pravaiḥ karmabhis tāḥ sadā prajāḥ | 
tat-karma-phala-śeṣena upasītabhiḥ prajāṇaśre | 209. Devāvira-pitri 
tvaṁ tu paśu-pakshi-sarisyipaiḥ | ekaśaka-nāraka-kītatevaih tais tair bhā 
vair upasthitāḥ | ādhiṇārtham prajānāṁ cha atmanā vai vinirmame | 

"22. At the beginning of the Kalpa, in the first Kṛta age, he 
created those living beings (23) which I have formerly described to 
thee; but in the olden time, at the close of the Kalpa, those crea 
tures were burnt up by fire. 24. Those of them who did not reach 
the Tapoloka took refuge in the Janaloka; and when the creation 
again commences, they form its seed. 25. Existing there as a seed 
for the sake of another creation, they then, as they are created, are 
produced with a view to progeny. 26. These are declared to accom 
plish, in the present state (the four ends of human life, viz.), duty, 
the acquisition of wealth, the gratification of love, and the attain 
ment of final liberation,—both gods, Fathers, Rishis, and Manus. 27. They, then, filled with austere fervour, replenish (all) places. 
These are the mental sons of Brahmā, perfect in their nature. 28. 
Those who ascended to the sky by works characterized by devotion to 
external objects, but not by hatred, return to this world and are born 
in every age. 29. As the result of their works, and of their destination, 
(returning) from the Janaloka, they are born of the same character (as
before), in consequence of the (previous) deeds by which they are bound.\footnote{Karma-sānśaya-bandhanāt. I am unable to state the sense of sānśaya in this compound.} 30. It is to be understood that the cause of this is their tendency (or fate), which itself is the result of works. In consequence of these works, good or bad, they return from Jamāloka and are born, (31) and receive various bodies in (different) wombs. They are produced again and again in all states, from that of gods to that of motionless substances. 32. These creatures, as they are born time after time, receive the same functions as they had obtained in each previous creation. 33. Destructiveness and undestructiveness, mildness and cruelty, righteousness and unrighteousness, truth and falsehood—actuated by such dispositions as these, they obtain (their several conditions); and hence particular actions are agreeable to particular creatures. 34. And in succeeding periods they for the most part obtain the forms and the names which they had in the past Kalpas. 35. Hence they obtain the same names and forms. In the different Kalpas they are born with the same name and form. 36. Afterwards, when the creation had been suspended, as Brahmā was desirous to create, (37) and, fixed in his design, was meditating upon offspring,—he created from his mouth a thousand couples of living beings, (38) who were born with an abundance of goodness (sattva) and full of intelligence.\footnote{Suchetanaḥ. The reading of the Mārk. P. sutejasah, "full of vigour," is recommended, as an epithet of the Brāhmaṇas, by its being in opposition to alpa-tejasah, "of little vigour," which is applied to the Śūdras a few lines below.} He then created another thousand couples from his breast: (39) they all abounded in passion (rajas) and were both vigorous and destitute of vigour.\footnote{The reading of the Mārk. P. amarashiniḥ, "irascible," gives a better sense than asūrmiṇiḥ, "devoid of vigour," which the Vāyu P. has.} After creating from his thighs another thousand pairs, (40) in whom both passion and darkness (tamas) prevailed, and who are described as active,—he formed from his feet yet another thousand couples (41) who were all full of darkness, inglorious, and of little vigour. Then the creatures sprung from the couples (or thus produced in couples) rejoicing, (42) and filled with mutual love, began to cohabit. From that period sexual intercourse is said to have arisen in this Kalpa. 43. But at that time women had no monthly discharge: and they consequently bore no children, although cohabit-
atation was practised. 44. At the end of their lives they once bore twins. Weak-minded boys and girls were produced when (their parents) were on the point of death. 45. From that period commenced, in this Kalpa, the birth of twins; and such offspring was once only born to these creatures by a mental effort, in meditation (46),—(offspring which was) receptive (?) of sound and the other objects of sense, pure, and in every case distinguished by five marks. Such was formerly the early mental creation of Prajapāti. 47. Those creatures by whom the world was replenished, born as the descendants of this stock, frequented rivers, lakes, seas, and mountains. 48. In that age (yuga) they lived unaffected by excessive cold or heat, and appropriated the food which was produced from the essences of the earth. 49. They acted according to their pleasure, existing in a state of mental perfection. They were characterized neither by righteousness nor unrighteousness; were marked by no distinctions. 50. In that Kṛita yuga, in the beginning of the Kalpa, their age, happiness, and form were alike: they were neither righteous nor unrighteous. 51. In the Kṛita age they were produced each with authority over himself. Four thousand years, according to the calculation of the gods, (52) and four hundred years for each of the morning and evening twilights, are said to form the first, or Kṛita, age.120 Then, although these creatures were multiplied by thousands, (53) they suffered no impediment, no susceptibility to the pairs of opposites (pleasure and pain, cold and heat, etc.) and no fatigue. They frequented mountains and seas, and did not dwell in houses. 54. They never sorrowed, were full of goodness (satteya), and supremely happy; acted from no impulse of desire,171 and lived in continual delight. 55. There were at that time no beasts, birds, reptiles, or plants,172 (for these things are produced by unrighteousness),173 (56) no roots, fruits,

110 The first of the verses, which will be quoted below, in a note on verse 63, from the Mārk. P., seems to be more in place than the description of the Kṛita age given here, of which the substance is repeated in verses 68 and 69.

111 Perhaps we should read here niḥkāma-chārīgīvo instead of niśkāma: if so, the sense will be, “they moved about at will.”

120 The text adds here nārakāḥ or nārakāḥ, which may mean “hellish creatures.”

122 This, although agreeing with what is said further on in verses 82, 133, and 155, does not seem in consonance with what is stated in the Vīshṇu Purāṇa, verse 45, where it is declared: oshadhyaḥ phala-mūlīnyo rupabhyvas tasya jñāvīre | tretā-yuga-mukhā Bhrahmā kalpayādu dvijottama | srishtvā pāś-oshadhīḥ sanyay yuyog sa tādā ṛdhvare | “Plants bearing roots and fruits sprang from his hairs. At the com-
flowers, productions of the seasons, nor seasons. The time brought with it every object of desire and every enjoyment. There was no excess of heat or cold. 57. The things which these people desired sprang up from the earth everywhere and always, when thought of, and had a powerful relish. 58. That perfection of theirs both produced strength and beauty, and annihilated disease. With bodies, which needed no decoration, they enjoyed perpetual youth. 59. From their pure will alone twin children were produced. Their form was the same. They were born and died together. 60. Then truth, contentment, patience, satisfaction, happiness, and self-command prevailed. They were all without distinction in respect of form, term of life, disposition and actions. 61. The means of subsistence were produced spontaneously without forethought on their parts. In the Kṛita age they engaged in no works which were either virtuous or sinful. 62. And there were then no distinctions of castes or orders, and no mixture of castes. Men acted towards each other without any feeling of love or hatred. 63. In the Kṛita age they were born alike in form and duration of life, without any distinction of lower and higher,\(^{74}\) with abundant happiness, free from grief, (64) with hearts continually exulting, great in dignity

mencement of the Tretā age Brahmā—having at the beginning of the Kalpa created animals and plants—employed them in sacrifice.” Although the order of the words renders the sense in some degree uncertain, it appears to be that which Prof. Wilson assigns in his translation (i. 84), “Brahmā, having created, in the commencement of the Kalpa, various [animals and] plants, employed them in sacrifices in the beginning of the Tretā age.” This interpretation is supported by the Commentator, who remarks: Tad evam kalasyādhāve eva paśūn oshadhīs cha sīrāsī tān nantaraṁ tretā-yuga-mukhe prūptā sati sāmyag grāmyārya-vyasthāyā tadā ‘dhvare sanatayā (sāmyak-tayā?) yuyoja kṛita-yuge yajnasyapravritteḥ | “Having then thus at the very beginning of the Kalpa created animals and plants, he afterwards, when the commencement of the Tretā age arrived, employed them properly, according to the distinction of domestic and wild, in sacrifice,—since sacrifice did not prevail in the Kṛita age.” This agrees with the course of the preceding narrative which makes no allusion to plants and animals having been produced in a different Yuga from the other beings whose creation had been previously described. (See Wilson i. 82–84.) The parallel passage in the Vāyu P. x. 44–46, is confused.

\(^{74}\) The Märk. P. xlix. 24 inserts here the following lines: “They lived for four thousand years of mortals, as the measure of their existence, and suffered no calamities from distress. 25. In some places the earth again enjoyed prosperity in every respect. As through lapse of time the creatures were destroyed, so too those perfections everywhere gradually perished. 26. When they had all been destroyed, creeping-plants fell from the sky, which had nearly the character of Kalpa-trees (i.e. trees which yield all that is desired), and resembled houses.”
and in force. There existed among them no such things as gain or loss, friendship or enmity, liking or dislike. 65. It was through the mind (alone, i.e. without passion?) that these disinterested beings acted towards each other. They neither desired anything from one another; nor showed any kindness to each other. Contemplation is declared to be supreme in the Kṛita age, knowledge in the Tretā; sacrifice began in the Dwāpara; liberality is the highest merit in the Kali. 67. The Kṛita age is goodness (sattva), the Tretā is passion (rajas), the Dwāpara is passion and darkness (tamas), in the Kali it is to be understood that darkness (prevails), according to the necessary course of these ages. 68. The following is the time in the Kṛita age: understand its amount. Four thousand years constitute the Kṛita; (69) and its twilights endure for eight hundred divine years. Then their life was (so long?) and no distresses or calamities befel them. 70. Afterwards, when the twilight in the Kṛita was gone, the righteousness peculiar to that age was in all respects reduced to a quarter (of its original sum). 71. When further the twilight had passed, at the close of the Yuga, and the righteousness peculiar to the twilight had been reduced to a quarter, (72) and when the Kṛita had thus come altogether to an end,—then perfection vanished. When this mental perfection had been destroyed, there arose (73) another perfection formed in the period of the Tretā age. The eight mental perfections, which I declared (to have existed) at the creation, (74) were gradually extinguished. At the beginning of the Kalpa mental perfection alone (existed), viz., that which existed in the Kṛita age. 75. In all the Manvantaras there is declared to arise a perfection proceeding from works, produced by the discharge of the duties belonging to castes and orders, according to the fourfold division of Yugas. 76. The (morning) twilight (deteriorates) by a quarter of the (entire) Kṛita,—and the evening twilight by (another) quarter;—(thus) the Kṛita, the morning twilight, and the evening

175 This representation of the condition of mankind during the Kṛita age, the period of ideal goodness, was no doubt sketched in conformity with the opinions which prevailed at the period when the Purāṇa was compiled; when dispassion was regarded as the highest state of perfection.

176 It would seem as if the writer here meant to state that the period of life was that which in the verse of the Märk. P. (xlix. 24), quoted in the note on verse 63, it is declared to have been. But the expression here is, from some cause or other, imperfect.
twilight (together) deteriorate successively to the extent of three quarters, in the duties peculiar to the Yuga, and in austere fervour, sacred knowledge, strength, and length of life.\textsuperscript{177} Then after the evening of the Kṛita had died out, (78) the Tretā age succeeded,—(which) the most excellent rishis regarded as the evening of the Kṛita. But when the evening of the Kṛita had died out, (79) from the influence of time, and for no other reason, perfection disappeared from among the creatures who survived at the commencement of the Tretā age which ensued at the beginning of the Kalpa. 80. When that perfection had perished, another perfection arose. The subtle form of water having returned in the form of cloud (to the sky),\textsuperscript{178} (81) rain began to be discharged from the thundering clouds. The earth having once received that rain, (82) trees resembling houses\textsuperscript{179} were provided for these creatures. From them all means of enjoyment were produced. 83. Men derived their subsistence from them at the beginning of the Tretā. Subsequently, after a great length of time, owing to their ill fortune, (84) the passions of desire and covetousness arose in their hearts uncaused. The monthly discharge, which occurred at the end of women’s lives, (85) did not then take place: but as it commenced again, owing to the force of the age (yuga), (86) and as the couples, in consequence of it, began to cohabit, and approached each other monthly, from necessity occasioned by the time,—(87) an unseasonable\textsuperscript{179a} production of the monthly discharge, and of pregnancy ensued. Then through their misfortune, and owing to that fated time, (88) all those house-like trees perished. When these had been destroyed, men disturbed and agitated, (89) but genuine in their desire, longed after that perfection (which they had lost). Then those house-like trees appeared to them; (90) and among their fruits yielded clothes and jewels. On these trees too, in the hollow of every leaf, there was produced, (91) without the aid of bees, honey of great potency, having scent, colour, and flavour. By this means they subsisted at the beginning of the Tretā, (92) delighted with this per-

\textsuperscript{177} Such is the only sense I can extract from these rather obscure lines.

\textsuperscript{178} Such is the only sense of the words here rendered which occurs to me.

\textsuperscript{179} Gṛhi-saṁsthitaḥ. Professor Wilson, in his Dictionary, gives “like, resembling,” among the meanings of saṁsthita.

\textsuperscript{179a} Instead of ṛkōle, “out of season,” Professor Aufrecht suggests ṛkōle, “in season,” as the proper reading.
fection and free from trouble. Again, through the lapse of time, becoming greedy, (93) they seized by force those trees, and that honey produced without bees. And then, owing to that misconduct of theirs, occasioned by cupidity, (94) the Kalpa trees, together with their honey, were in some places destroyed. As but little of it remained, owing to the effects of the period of twilight, (95) the pairs (of opposites, as pleasure and pain, etc.) arose in men when existing (in this state); and they became greatly distressed by sharp cold winds, and heats. 96. Being thus afflicted by these opposites, they adopted means of shelter: and to counteract the opposites they resorted to houses. 97. Formerly they had moved about at their will, and had not dwelt at all in houses: but subsequently they abode in dwellings, as they found suitable and pleasant, (98) in barren deserts, in valleys, on mountains, in caves; and took refuge in fortresses,—(in a) desert with perpetual water. 99. As a protection against cold and heat they began to construct houses on even and uneven places, according to opportunity and at their pleasure. 100. They then measured out towns, cities, villages, and private apartments, according to the distribution of each.” [The following verses 101-107 give an account of the different measures of length and breadth, which is followed, in verses 108-122, by a description of the various kinds of fortresses, towns, and villages, their shapes and sizes, and of roads. The author then proceeds in verse 123:]

“These places having been made, they next constructed houses; and as formerly trees existed, formed like houses, (124) so did they (now) begin to erect them, after repeated consideration. (Some) boughs are spread out, others are bent down, (125) others rise upwards, while others again stretch horizontally. After examining thus by reflection how the different boughs of trees branch out, (126) they constructed in like manner the apartments (śākhāḥ) (of their houses); hence they

180 “Perfection” seems to be here intended. If so, it would seem as if this line had been separated from its proper context.

181 Dhaneinam sūsvedatadakam. Perhaps we should read here with the Mārk. P. xlix. 35, vārkṣyam pūrveṣṭ vandakam “(fortresses) protected by trees, built on mountains, or surrounded by water.”

182 Whatever may be thought of this rendering of the phrase, vrikṣāḥ grihasaṁ-sthitāḥ, the Mārk. P. (xlix. 52), at least, is quite clear: grihākāra yathā pūreṣṭ teshām iśan mahārūhāḥ | tathā saṁsīrītya tat sarvāṇi chokṣvē vēnuṇi tāḥ prajāḥ | “As they had formerly had trees with the shape of houses, so recalling all that to mind, these people built their dwellings.”
are called rooms (śalāḥ). In this way rooms and houses derive their appellation from branches. Hence rooms are called śalā, and in that their character as rooms (śalātecam) consists. And inasmuch as the mind takes pleasure in them, and as they have gladdened (prāśādayan), the mind, houses, rooms, and palaces are termed respectively griha, śalā, and prāśāda. Having adopted these means of defence against the 'opposites,' they devised methods of subsistence. The kalpa-trees having been destroyed along with their honey, those creatures, afflicted with thirst and hunger, became disquieted by dejection. Then again another perfection arose for them in the Tretā age,—which fulfilled the purpose of subsistence,—viz., rain at their pleasure. The rain-water, which flowed into the hollows, burst out in the form of springs, water-courses, and rivers, through the rain. Thus at the second fall of rain rivers began to flow. When the drops of water first reached the ground, then (133) from the conjunction of the waters and the earth plants sprang up among them, which bore both flowers, roots, and fruits. Fourteen kinds of plants, cultivated and wild, were produced without ploughing or sowing, as well as trees and shrubs which bore flowers and fruit at the proper season. This was the first appearance of plants in the Tretā age, and by them men subsisted at that period. Then there again arose among them, universally, desire and cupidity, through a necessary process, and as a result of the Tretā age. They then appropriated to themselves, by force and violence, rivers, fields, hills, trees, shrubs, and plants. Those perfect beings, who were described by me as existing formerly in the Kṛita,—the mind-born children of Brahmā, who had been produced in this world when they came from the Janaloka,—who were (some) tranquil, (some) fiery, (some) active, and (others) distressed,—were again born in the Tretā, as Brāhmans, Kṣattriyas, Vaiśyas, Südras, and injurious men, governed by the good and bad actions (performed) in former births. Then those who were weaker than they, being truthful and innocent, dwelt among them, free from cupidity, and self-restrained; whilst

183 The reasoning here does not seem very cogent, as the two words śukhā and śalā do not appear to have any close connection. But such unsuccessful attempts at etymology are frequent in Sanskrit works.

184 The text here does not seem to be in a satisfactory state. The Calc. edition of the Mārk. P. reads viṣhṭyāvaruddhāḥ ābhavat, etc.
MYTHICAL ACCOUNTS OF THE CREATION OF MAN,

others, less glorious than they, took and did. When they had thus become opposed to each other,—(143) through their misconduct, while they struggled together, the plants were destroyed, being seized with their fists like gravel. 144. Then the earth swallowed up the fourteen kinds of cultivated and wild plants, in consequence of the influence exerted by the Yuga: for men had seized again and again the fruit, together with the flowers and leaves. 145. After the plants had perished, the famished people, becoming bewildered, repaired to Svayambhū the lord of creatures, (146) in the beginning of the Tretā age, seeking the means of subsistence. Learning what they desired, (147) and determining by intuition what was proper to be done, the Lord Brah- mā Svayambhū, knowing that the plants had been swallowed up by the earth, milked them back. 148. Taking Sumera as a calf, he milked this earth. When this earth (or cow) was milked by him, roots were

185 It is difficult to extract any satisfactory sense out of this line.

186 The S. P. Br. ii. 4, 2, 1, also speaks of different classes of creatures applying to the creator for food: Prājapatiṅ vais bhūtāny upāśitā | prajāḥ vais bhūtāyi | “vi no dhehi yathā jīvamā” iti | tato devā yajnopaveśīni bhūtāv dakshinām jāne ācchya upāśitān | tān abravid “yajno vo ‘namam amritatvam va ṛg vaḥ sūryo vo jyotir” iti | 2. Atha enam pitarāḥ prāchīnāvītinaḥ sasyāṁ jāne ācchya upāśitān | tān abravid “mūsī mūsī vo ‘sanāṁ svadhā vo manojavo vo chandrama vā vo jyotir” iti | 3. Atha enam manushyaṁ prāveṛtāṁ upasthaṁ kriyā upāśitān | tān abravid “sāyam prātar vo ‘sanam prajāḥ vo mṛtyur vo ‘gnir vo jyotir” iti | 4. Atha enam pusvāḥ upāśitān | tebhyaḥ svayam eva chakāra “yadā eva yugam kādivesaḥ labhadhāvaḥ yadi kule yady anākūle atha eva aśītah” iti | tasmād ete yadda kāvides labhante yadi kule yady anākūle atha eva aśīntaḥ | 5. Athā ha enam sarvad apy asurāḥ upasuddh ity āthah | tebhyaḥ tamaḥ cha māyāḥ cha pradaḍān | aṣṭy aha eva asursa-māyāḥ iti ēva | parābhūtā ha te eva tāṁ prajāḥ | tāṁ ināṁ prajāḥ tathaiva upayāyataḥ yathāiva abhyāṁ Prājāpatir adādi | “All beings resorted to Prājapati,—(creatures are beings), —(saying) ‘provide for us that we may live.’ Then the gods, wearing the sacrificial cord, and bending the right knee, approached him. To them he said, ‘let sacrifice be your food, your immortality your strength, the sun your light.’ 2. Then the Fathers, wearing the sacrificial cord on their right shoulders, and bending the left knee, approached him. To them he said, ‘you shall eat monthly, your oblation (svadhā) shall be your rapidity of thought, the moon your light.’ 3. Then men, clothed, and inclining their bodies, approached him. To them he said, ‘ye shall eat morning and evening, your offspring shall be your death, Agni your light.’ 4. Then cattle repaired to him. To them he accorded their desire, (saying), ‘Whenssoever ye find anything, whether at the proper season or not, eat it.’ Hence whenever they find anything, whether at the proper season or not, they eat it. 5. Then they say that the Asuras again and again resorted to him. To them he gave darkness (tamas) and illusion. There is, indeed, such a thing as the illusion, as it were, of the Asuras. But those creatures succumbed. These creatures subsist in the very manner which Prājapati allotted to them.”

187 Gauḥ means both.
produced again in the ground.—(149) those plants, whereof hemp is the seventeenth, which end with the ripening of fruits." [The plants fit for domestic use, and for sacrifice are then enumerated in verses 150–155.] "155. All these plants, domestic and wild, were for the first time produced at the beginning of the Tretā age, (156) without cultivation, trees, shrubs, and the various sorts of creepers and grasses, both those which produce roots as their fruits, and those which bear fruit after flowering. The seeds for which the earth was formerly milked by Svayambhū (158) now became plants bearing flowers and fruits in their season. When these plants, though created, did not afterwards grow, (159) the divine Brahmā Svayambhū devised for the people means of subsistence depending on labour effected by their hands. 160. From that time forward the plants were produced and ripened through cultivation. The means of subsistence having been provided, Svayambhū (161) established divisions among them according to their tendencies. 162 Those of them who were rapacious, and destructive, (162) he ordained to be Kshattriyas, protectors of the others. 163 As many men as attended on these, fearless, (163) speaking truth and propounding sacred knowledge (brahma) with exactness, (were made) Brāhmans. Those others of them who had previously been feeble, engaged in the work of slaughter, 164 who, as cultivators (kīnāsāh), had been destructive, and were active in connection with the ground, were called Vaiśyas, husbandmen (kīnāsān), providers of subsistence. 165. And he designated as Sudras those who grieved (ṣocharatah), and ran (dravantaḥ), who were addicted to menial tasks, inglorious and feeble.

158 See the note on verse 55, above.
159 Yathāraṇabhū. The Mārk. P. has yathā-nyāyaṁ yathā-guṇam, "according to fitness and their qualities."
160 Itareśāṁ kṛita-trayōn. The M. Bh. xii. 2247, thus explains the word Kshattriya: brāhmānyānāṁ kṣhata-trayāt tataḥ kṣhattriya uchyate | "(a king) is called Kshattriya because he protects Brāhmans from injuries."
161 Vaiśasaṁ karma. The former word has the senses of (1) "hinderance, impediment," and (2) "slaughter," assigned to it in Wilson's Dictionary.
162 The reader who is familiar with the etymologies given in Yāska's Nirukta, or in Professor Wilson's Dictionary on Indian authority, will not be surprised at the absurdity of the attempts made here by the Purāṇa-writer to explain the origin of the words Kshattriya, Vaiśya and Śūdra. To account for the last of these names he combines the roots sīuḥ, "to grieve," and dṛu, "to run," dropping, however, of necessity the last letter (ch) of the former. The word kṣhattriya is really derived from kṣhattrā, "royal power;" and vaiśya comes from vīś, "people," and means "a man of the people."
166. Brahmā determined the respective functions and duties of all these persons. But after the system of the four castes had been in all respects established, (167) those men from infatuation did not fulfil their several duties. Not living conformably to those class-duties, they came into mutual conflict. 168. Having become aware of this fact, precisely as it stood, the Lord Brahmā prescribed force, criminal justice, and war, as the profession of the Kshattriyas. 169. He then appointed these, viz., the duty of officiating at sacrifices, sacred study, and the receipt of presents, to be the functions of Brāhmans. 170. The care of cattle, traffic, and agriculture, he allotted as the work of the Vaiśyas; and the practice of the mechanical arts, and service, he assigned as that of the Südras. 171. The duties common to Brāhmans, Kshattriyas, and Vaiśyas were the offering of sacrifice, study, and liberality. 172. Having distributed to the classes their respective functions and occupations, the Lord then allotted to them abodes in other worlds for their perfection. 173. The world of Prajāpati is declared to be the (destined) abode of Brāhmans practising rites; Indra's world that of Kshattriyas who do not flee in battle; (174) the world of the Maruts that of Vaiśyas who fulfil their proper duty; the world of the Gandharvas that of men of Südra birth who abide in the work of service. 175. Having allotted these as the future abodes of (the men of the different) classes, who should be correct in their conduct, he ordained orders (āśramas) in the classes which had been established. 176. The Lord formerly instituted the four orders of householder, religious student, dweller in the woods, and mendicant. 177. To those of them who do not in this world perform the duties of their castes, the men who dwell in hermitages apply the appellation of 'destroyer of works.' 178. Brahmā established these orders by name, and in explanation of them he declared their duties, (179) their methods of procedure, and their various rites. First of all there is the order of householder, which belongs to all the four classes, (180) and is the foundation and source of the other three orders. I shall declare them in order with their several observances.” [The following verses 181–189, which detail these duties, need not be cited here. I shall, however, quote verses 190 ff. for their excellent moral tone.] “190. The Vedas, with their appendages, sacrifices, fasts, and ceremonies, (191) avail not to a depraved man, when his disposition has become corrupted. All external rites are
fruitless (192) to one who is inwardly debased, however energetically he may perform them. A man who bestows even the whole of his substance with a defiled heart will thereby acquire no merit—of which a good disposition is the only cause.” [After giving some further particulars about the celestial abodes of the righteous, verses 194–198, the writer proceeds:] “199. When—after the division into castes and orders had thus been made—(200) the people living under that system did not multiply, Brahmā formed other mind-born creatures in the middle of the Tretā (201) from his own body and resembling himself. When the Tretā age had arrived, and had gradually reached its middle, (202) the Lord then began to form other mind-born creatures. He next formed creatures in whom goodness (sattva) and passion (rajas) predominated, (203) and who were capable of attaining (the four objects of human pursuit) righteousness, wealth, love, and final liberation, together with the means of subsistence. Gods, too, and Fathers, and Rishis, and Manus (were formed), (204) by whom these creatures were classified (?) according to their natures in conformity with the Yuga. When this character(?) of his offspring had been attained, Brahmā (205) longed after mental offspring of all kinds and of various forms. Those creatures, whom I described to you as having taken refuge in Janaloka, (206) at the end of the Kalpa, all these arrived here, when he thought upon them, in order to be reproduced in the form of gods and other beings. 207. According to the course of the Manvantaras the least were esteemed the first (?), being swayed by destiny, and by connections and circumstances of every description. 208. These creatures were always born, under the controlling influence of, and as a recompence for their good or bad deeds. 209. He by himself formed those creatures which arrived in their several characters of gods, asuras, fathers, cattle, birds, reptiles, trees, and insects, in order that they might be subjected (anew) to the condition of creatures.”

The substance of the curious speculations on the origin and primeval condition of mankind contained in the preceding passage may be stated as follows: In verses 22–34 we are told that the creatures, who at the close of the preceding Kalpa had been driven by the mundane conflag-ration to Janaloka, now formed the seed of the new creation, which took place in the Kṛita Yuga, at the commencement of the present 183 I confess that I have had great difficulty in attaching any sense to the last words.
Kalpa. These were mind-born sons of Brahmā, perfect in nature, and they peopled the world. As a rule, we are informed, those beings who have formerly been elevated from the earth to higher regions, return again and again to this world, and, as a result of their previous works, are born in every age, in every possible variety of condition, exhibiting the same dispositions and fulfilling the same functions as in their former states of existence. It is next stated, verses 35–40, that when creation had, in some way not explained, come to a stand-still, four classes of human beings, consisting each of a thousand pairs of males and females, characterized respectively by different qualities, physical and moral, were produced from different members of the Creator’s body. These creatures sought to propagate the race, but abortively, for the reason specified (48). Children however were produced by mental effort (45 and 59), and in considerable numbers (52). The state of physical happiness, absolute and universal equality, moral perfection, and complete dispassion, in which mankind then existed, is depicted (48–65). The means of subsistence and enjoyment, which they are said to have drawn from the earth (48 and 57), were not, of the ordinary kind, as we are informed (55 f.) that neither animals nor plants, which are the products of unrighteousness, existed at that period. No division into castes or orders prevailed during that age of perfection (62). A gradual declension, however, had been going on, and at the end of the Kṛta Yuga, the perfection peculiar to it had altogether disappeared (70–79). Another kind of perfection, peculiar to the Tretā, however, subsequently arose (73 and 80), and in the different Yugas there has existed a perfection springing from the performance of the duties belonging to each caste and order (75). The perfection described as prevailing in the Tretā was of a physical kind, consisting in the production of rain and the growth of trees, shaped like houses, which at the same time yielded the materials of all sorts of enjoyments (80–82). Passion, however, in its various forms began to take the place of the previous dispassion (84). The constitution of women, which had formerly incapacitated them for effective impregnation, became ultimately so modified as to ensure the successful propagation of the species, which

104 This statement agrees with that in the Mārk. P. xlix. 3 ff. but differs from that already given from the Vishnu P. in so far as the latter does not specify the numbers created, or say anything about pairs being formed.
accordingly proceeded (84–87). We have then the destruction, and subsequent reproduction of the trees, formed like houses, described (88–91). These trees now produced clothes and jewels, as well as honey without bees, and enabled mankind to live in happiness and enjoyment. Again, however, the trees disappeared in consequence of the cupidity which led to their misuse (92–94). The absence of perfection occasioned suffering of various kinds, from moral as well as physical causes, and men were now driven to construct houses, which they had hitherto found unnecessary (96–99 and 123), and to congregate in towns and cities (100). Their houses were built after the model furnished by trees (123–128). The hunger and thirst which men endured from the loss of the trees which had formerly yielded all the means of subsistence and enjoyment, were relieved by means of a new perfection which appeared in the shape of rain, and the streams thereby generated, and by the growth of plants, which now sprang up for the first time as a result of the conjunction of water and earth (130–135 and 155). Desire and cupidity, however, now again arose and led to acts of violent appropriation (136 f.). At this juncture the perfect mind-born sons of Brahmā, of different dispositions, who had formerly existed in the Kṛita age, were reproduced in the Tretā as Brāhmans, Kṣatrīyas, Vaiśyas, Śūdras, and destructive men, as a result of their actions in their former existence (138–140). But in consequence of their dissensions and rapacity, the earth swallowed up all the existing plants (142–144). Under the pressure of the distress thus occasioned the inhabitants of the earth resorted to Brahmā, who milked the earth, through the medium of mount Sumera acting as a calf, and recovered the plants which had disappeared (145–149). As, however, these plants did not propagate themselves spontaneously, Brahmā introduced agriculture (158–160). Having thus provided the means of subsistence, he divided the people into classes according to their characteristics (160–165). But as these classes did not perform their several duties, and came into mutual conflict, Brahmā prescribed their respective functions with greater precision (166–171); and assigned the future celestial abodes which the members of each class might attain by their fulfilment (172–174). He then ordained the four orders of householder, religious

195 It is not quite clear, however, what is intended by the word akūla, "out of season," in verse 87. See the emendation proposed above in the note on that verse.
student, etc. (175–190). After a few verses in praise of moral purity (190–193), the abodes and destinies of the eminently righteous are set forth (194–199). Just when we had arrived at a point in the narrative, from which we might have imagined that it had only to be carried on further to afford us a sufficient explanation of the state of things existing up to the present age, we are suddenly arrested (199–202) by being informed that the people distributed according to the system of castes and orders did not multiply, and are introduced to a new mind-born creation, which took place in the Tretā age, to remedy this failure. We are next told (203) of what appears to be another creation of beings endowed with goodness and passion. And, finally, a yet further re-incorporation of previously existing souls is described as having taken place (205–209). It would thus seem that after all we are left without any account of the origin of the system of castes which prevailed when the Purāṇa was compiled. The only suppositions on which this conclusion can be avoided are either (1) that the cessation in the increase of the generation alluded to in verse 200, which led to the new creation, was not universal, that the race than existing did not entirely die out, but that the old blood was re-invigorated by that of the newly created beings; or (2) that the other set of creatures, mentioned in verse 203, as characterized by goodness and passion, were the progenitors of the present race of men. On these points, however, the text throws no light.

The preceding account of the creation of mankind and of the vicissitudes and deterioration of society, is in some places obscure and confused, and its several parts do not appear to be consistent with each other. At the outset the writer describes the creation of four thousand pairs of human beings, of whom each separate set of one thousand is distinguished by widely different innate characters, the first class having the quality of goodness, the second that of passion, the third those of passion and darkness, and the fourth that of darkness. Nevertheless (as in the parallel passage of the Vishnu Purāṇa) we cannot find in the narrative the least trace of those inherent differences of character having for a long time manifested themselves by producing dissimilarity either of moral conduct or of physical condition; for the perfection, which is described as existing in the Kṛita age, is spoken of as if it was universal; and not only is no distinction alluded to as prevailing at this period between
the component parts of society, but we are expressly told that no castes or orders then existed. The deterioration also, which ensued towards the end of the Kṛita age, is described as general, and not peculiar to any class. How is this complete uniformity, first of perfection, and afterwards of declension, which, for anything that appears to the contrary, is predicated of the descendants of the whole of the four thousand pairs, to be reconciled with the assertion that each thousand of those pairs was characterized by different innate qualities? The difficulty is not removed by saying that the writer supposed that these inherent varieties of character existed in a latent or dormant state in the different classes, and were afterwards developed in their descendants; for he distinctly declares (verse 54) in general terms that mankind were at that period sattva-bahulaḥ, i.e. “possessed the quality of goodness in abundance;” and in the earlier part of the subsequent narrative no allusion is made to the different qualities at first ascribed to the four sets of a thousand pairs being separately developed in the members of the four classes respectively. In verse 74, indeed, it appears to be assumed that the division into castes had existed from the creation; for we there find an assertion that in “all the Manvantaras, according to the division of the four yugas,” (including apparently the Kṛita) “there is declared to have existed a perfection effected by the observances of the castes and orders, and arising from the fulfilment of works;” but how is this to be reconciled with the express statement of verses 60 and 61, that “in the Kṛita age no works were performed which were either virtuous or sinful,” and that “there then existed neither distinctions of caste or order, nor any mixture of castes?” In the Tretā age the state of deterioration continued, but no reference is made of any separation of classes till we come to verse 138, where it is said that the beings who in the Kṛita age had existed as the perfect mind-born sons of Brahmā, were now, as a consequence of their former actions, recalled into human existence, and in conformity with their previous characters as calm, fiery, laborious, or depressed, became Brāhmans, Kṣatvatriyas, Vaiśyas, Śudras, and men of violence. These creatures, after they had been furnished with the means of subsistence, were eventually divided into classes, according to their varieties of disposition, character, and occupation; and as at first they did not fulfil their proper duties, but encroached upon each others’
provinces, their functions were afterwards more stringently defined and the means of enforcing obedience were provided. Here it is intimated that different sets of beings were born as Brāhmans, Kshatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras, on account of the different qualities which they had manifested in a previous existence, and that in conformity with those same characteristics they were afterwards formally distributed into castes. This description is therefore so far consistent with itself. The difference of caste is made to depend upon the dispositions of the soul. But how are we to reconcile this postulation of different characters formerly exhibited with the description given in the previous part of the narrative, where we are informed that, in the earlier parts, at least, of the Kṛta age, all men were alike perfect, and that no actions were performed which were either virtuous or vicious? If such was the case at that period, how could the beings who then existed have manifested those differences of disposition and character which are asserted to have been the causes of their being subsequently reborn as Brāhmans, Kshatriyas, Śūdras, and Vaiśyas? It may be admitted that the differences of character, which are attributed in the Purāṇa to the four primeval sets of a thousand pairs of human beings, correspond to those qualities which are described as having subsequently given rise to the division into castes; but the assertion of such a state of uniform and universal perfection, as is said to have intervened between the creation of mankind and the realization of caste, seems incompatible with the existence of any such original distinctions of a moral character.

As regards this entire account when compared with the other two descriptions of the creation given in the previous part of this section, the same remarks are applicable as have been made in the last section, p. 65 f., on the corresponding passages from the Vishnū Purāṇa.

The chapter which I have just translated and examined, is followed immediately by the one of which I have already in a preceding page quoted the commencement, descriptive of the creation of Asuras, Gods, Fathers, etc., from the different bodies assumed and cast off successively by Brahmā.

I shall now give an extract from the following, or tenth chapter, in which the the legend of Satarūpā is related.

Sūta uvācha | I. Evambhūteshu lokeshu Brahmanā loka-karttrinā

This form karttrinā (one which, as is well known, may be optionally employed in
yadā tāḥ na pravarttante prajāḥ kenāpi hetunā | 2. Tamo-mātrāvrite
Brahmā tādā-prabhrīti duṣkhitāḥ | tataḥ sa vidudhe buddhim artha-
nischara-gāminīm | 3. Athātmanī samasrākṣhit tamo-mātrāṁ nijāt-
mikām | rajāḥ-sattvam parājitya varttramānaṁ sa dharmataḥ | 4.
Tapeyate tena duṣkkhena ṣokāṁ chakre jagat-patiḥ | tamas tu vyavudat
tasmād rajas taḥ cha samārṇinot | 5. Tat tamaḥ pratinuttamaḥ vai mi-
thunaṁ samvyajāyata | adharmaṁ charaṇāj jajne hīṁsā ṣokād ajāyata |
6. Tatas tasmin samudbhūte mithune charaṇātmanī | tataḥ cha bhagavān
āsīt pritiśchainam asīśriyat | 7. Svāṁ tanum sa tato Brahmā tāṁ
apohad abhāsāram | deīḍhā ‘karot sa taṁ deham ardhaṇa puruṣo
 bhavat | 8. Ardheṇa nārī sā tasya Satarūpā vyajayata | prākritāṁ
bhuta-dhātrīm tāṁ kāmād vai srishṭavaṁ vibhūḥ | 9. Sa divam prithi-
vīṁ chaiva mahimnā vyāpya dhīśhṭitaḥ | Brahmaṇaḥ sā tanaḥ pūrva
divam āvṛitya tishṭhāti | 10. Yā te ardhāt srijate nārī Satarūpā vyajā-
yata | sā devi niyatam taptaṁ tapaḥ paraṁ-duścharam | bhattāram
diplayaśvam Purusham pratyapadyata | 11. Sa vai Svāyambhuvaḥ
pūrvam Purusho Manur uchyate | tasyaikasaptati-yugam Manvantar-
ram ihchoyate | 12. Labdheṇa tu puruṣaḥ patniṁ Satarūpam ayoṇijām |
taṇa sā ramate sārddham tasmāt sā Ratir uchyate | 13. Pratamaḥ
samprayogaḥ sa kalpādau samavarttata | Virājam asrijad Brahmā so
bhavat Purusho Virāṭ | 14. Sa samrāṭ māsarūpāt tu vairājas tu Manuḥ
smṛitaḥ | sa vairājaḥ prajā-sargah sa sarge purusho Manuḥ | 15. Vai-
rājat puruṣād virāch chhatarūpā vyajāyata | Priyavratoṭṭānapādau
putrāu putravatāṁ varau |

“1. When the worlds had thus been formed by Brahmā their creator,
but the creatures, for some reason did not engage in action,197 (2) Brahmā,
enveloped in gloom, and thenconfused dejected, formed a resolution
tending to ascertain the fact. 3. He then created in himself (a body)
of his own, formed of pure gloom (tamas), having overpowered the
passion (rajas) and goodness (sattva) which existed (in him) naturally.
4. The Lord of the world was afflicted with that suffering, and la-

the neuter, but not in the masculine) is here used for metrical reasons. Such irregu-
larities are, as we have seen, designated by the Commentators as ārsha. It is unlikely
that Brahma should be here used in a neuter sense.

197 The true reading here may be pravartdhanē, in which case the sense will be
“did not multiply.” Compare the parallel passage in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, i. 7, 4,
p. 64.
mented. He then dispelled the gloom, and covered over the passion. 5. The gloom, when scattered, was formed into a pair. Unrighteousness arose from activity (?), and mischief sprang from sorrow. 6. That active (?) pair having been produced, he became glorious (?) and pleasure took possession of him. 7. Brahmā after that cast off that body of his, which was devoid of lustre, and divided his person into two parts; with the half he became a male (purusha) (8) and with the half a female: it was Satarūpā who was so produced to him. Under the impulse of lust he created her a material supporter of beings. 9. By her magnitude she pervaded both heaven and earth. That former body of Brahmā invests the sky. 10. This divine female Satarūpā, who was born to him from his half, as he was creating, by incessantly practising austere fervour of a highly arduous description, acquired for herself as a husband a Male (purusha) of glorious renown. He is called of old the Male, Manu Svāyambhuva; and his period (manvantara) is declared to extend to seventy-one Yugas. 12. This Male, having obtained for his wife, Satarūpā, not sprung from any womb, lived in dalliance with her (ramate); and from this she is called Rati (the female personification of sexual love). 13. This was the first cohabitation practised in the beginning of the Kalpa. Brahmā created Virāj; he was the Male, Virāj. 14. He is the sovereign (samarāj), from his having the form of a month; and Manu is known as the son of Virāj. 200 This creation of living beings is called that of Virāj. In this creation Manu is the male. 15. Satarūpā bore to the heroic Purusha, son of Virāj, two sons, Priyavrata and Uttānapāda, the most eminent of those who have sons." This is followed by a further genealogy, into which I will not enter.

By comparing this account with the one extracted above, p. 64 ff., from the Vishnū Purāṇa, i. 7, 1 ff., it will be seen that while it makes no allusion to the production of Rudra, as related in the Vishnū Purāṇa (which, as well as the birth of the mental sons of Brahmā, the Vāyu Purāṇa had described in the preceding chapter, verses 67–83), it is somewhat fuller in regard to the legend of Satarūpā; and although it

199 With this account of Brahmā’s dejection and grief the accounts quoted above pp. 68 ff. from the Brāhmaṇas may be compared.
199 Compare the narrative of the Vishnū Purāṇa i. 7, 9 ff. quoted in p. 64 f.
200 Compare the account given in Manu’s Institutes, above, p. 36.
does not allow that Brahmā cohabited with his daughter, and assigns to her another husband, Manu Svāyambhūva, it describes the creator as having been actuated by carnal desire in generating her. I shall give further illustrations of this story in the next section.

Sect. IX.—Legend of Brahmā and his daughter, according to the Aitareya Brähmana, and of Satarūpa, according to the Matsya Purāṇa.

The story which forms the subject of the present section is noticed at some length in the fourth volume of this work, pp. 38–46, where one of the oldest passages in which it is related, is quoted from the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, i. 7, 4, 1 ff., together with one of a comparatively late age from the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, iii. 12, 28 ff. As however the legend, though repulsive in its character, is not without interest as illustrating the opinions which Indian mythologists have entertained regarding their deities, I shall quote two other texts in which it is narrated.

The first, from the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, iii. 33, has, no doubt (along with the passage of the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa just referred to, and another from the same work, xiv. 4, 2, 1 ff., quoted above, in p. 24 ff.), furnished the ideas which are expanded in the later versions of the story. It is as follows:

Praṇāpatir vai svāṃ duhitaram abhyādhyāyat | Divam ity ange āhur
Ushasam ity anye | tām riṣyo bhūtvā rohitām bhūtām abhyait | tam
devā apasayān | “akṛitāṃ vai Praṇāpatiḥ karoti” iti | te tam asichha
yaḥ enam ārishyati | etam anyonyasmin na avindan | teshām yā eva
ghoratamās tanvaḥ āsaṁs tāḥ ekadhā samabharaṇ | tāḥ sambhrītāḥ esha
devōbhavat | tad asya etad bhūtavan-nāma | bhavati vai sa yo’sya etad
evaṃ nāma veda | tam devā abruvam “ayam vai Praṇāpatir akṛtām
akūr imam vidhīya” iti | sa “tātāḥ” ity abraevit | “sa vai vo varam
vṛṇiṣ” iti | “vṛnīṣkva” iti | sa etam eva varam avrīṇita paśūnām
ādhipatyam | tad asya etat paśuṇam-nāma | paśuṇān bhavati yo ’syā
etad evaṃ nāma veda | tam abhyāyatya avidhyat | sa viddhaḥ urddhve
udaprāpatad ityādī"^201 |
"Prajāpati lusted after his own daughter. Some call her the Sky, others Ushas. Becoming a buck, he approached her after she had become a doe. The gods saw him; (and said) Prajāpati does a deed which was never done (before). They sought some one who should take vengeance on him. Such a person they did not find among themselves. They then gathered together their most dreadful bodies. These when combined formed this god (Rudra). Hence (arises) his name connected with Bhūta (Bhūtapati). That man flourishes who thus knows this name of his. The gods said to him, 'This Prajāpati has done a deed which was never done before: pierce him.' He replied, 'so be it,' (adding), 'let me ask a boon of you.' They rejoined, 'ask.' He asked for this boon, viz., lordship over cattle. Hence arises his name connected with Paśu (Pāsupati). He who thus knows his name, becomes the owner of cattle. He then attacked (Prajāpati) and pierced him. He, when pierced, soared upwards," etc. etc.


202 This seems to be imitated in the line of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa iii. 12, 30, quoted in vol. iv. of this work, p. 40: nañat pūrvaih kriyā tuvad ye na karishyanti chāpere | "This was never done by those before thee, nor will those after thee do it."

203 Bhavati. In the Brāhmaṇas this verb has frequently the sense of prospering, as opposed to parībhavati, "he perishes." See Böthingk and Roth's Lexicon, s. v., and the passages there referred to.
AND OF THE ORIGIN OF THE FOUR CASTES.

vismaya-sphurād-ōṣṭhaṁ cha pāschātyam udagāt tataḥ | 41. Chatur

tham abhavat pāschād vāmaṁ kāma-śaruturam | tato 'nyad abhavat
tasya kāmāturataya tathā | 42. Utpatantyās tadā 'kāśe ālokena kutā

halat | sṛṣṭya-arthaṁ yat kriyam tena tapaḥ paramadārunan | 43. Tat

sarvam nāsām agamat sva-sutopaga-mehchayā | tenāśu vaktram abhavat

panchamāṁ tasya dhimataḥ | 44. Āvirbhavaj jātābhīscha tad vaktranchā

vrīnot prabhuh | tatas tān abhavaḥ Brāhmaṁ putrān ātma-samudbhavān |

45. "Prajāḥ srijadhavam abhiitaḥ sa-devāsura-mānushāḥ" | evam uktās

tataḥ sarve sārvijur vividhāḥ prajāḥ | 46. Gateshu teshu sṛṣṭyartham

prayaṁvananātāṁ imāṁ | upayene sa visvātāṁ S'atarapāṁ aninditām |

47. Sambabhuca tayā sārdham atikāmātur vībhuh | salajjāṁ chakame
devah kamalodara-mandire | 48. Yāved abda-sataṁ divyāṁ yathā 'nyah

prākrito janaḥ | tataḥ kālēna mahata tasyāḥ putro 'bhavado Manuḥ | 49. Sevān

ambhuca iti khyātāṁ sa Virād iti nāḥ śrutam | tad-rūpa-gūna-sāṁ-

nyād adhipurusha uchyate | 50. Vairājā yatra te jātāḥ bhavaḥ saṁśita-

vrataḥ | Sevāmbhucā mahābhāgaḥ sapta sapta tathā 'pare | 51. Sevā-

rochishāyāḥ sarve te Brahma-tulya-svarūpīnaḥ | Auttami-pramukhaṁ
tadved yeshām tevaṁ saptaṁ 'dhunā | (Adhyāya. 4.) Manur urācha |

1. Aho kashṭataraṁ chaitad angajāgamanāṁ vībhoh | Kathāṁ na dosham

agamat karmanāṁ tena Padmājaḥ | 2. Parasparāṁcha sambandhāṁ sago-

trāṇāṁ abhūt katham | vaivāhikas tat-sutānāṁ chhindī me saṁśayaṁ

vībhō | Matsya urācha | 3. Divyeyam adi-sṛṣṭis tu rajo-gūna-saṁ-

uddhavā | atindriyendriya tadeva atindriya-saririkā | 4. Divya-tejomayi

bhūpa divyā-jānā-saṁuddhāva | na chānyaṁ abhitaḥ sākyā jñāte vāi

māṁsa-chakshushāḥ | 5. Yathā bhujangāḥ sarpāgam ākāse sarva-pakshi-

nāṁ | vidanti mārgām divyānāṁ divyaṁ eva na mānaṁḥ | 6. Kāryā

kāryena devaṁca sūhaṁ-sūhaṁ-pradāḥ | yasmāt tasmād na rājendra

tad-vichāro nṛṣīṁ mahāṁ | 7. Anyachecha sarva-devānāṁ adhīśthāta

chaturmukhaḥ | gāyatrī Brahmānās tadeva anga-bhūtā nigadyate | 8. Amurtta-murttimād vāpi mithunancha prachakshate | Viranchir yatra

bhagavāna tatra devi Sarasvatī | 9. Bharaṭī yatra yatraiva tatra tatra

Prajāpatīḥ | yathātapaṇa rahitāḥ chhāyā vai (? na) drisyate krachita |

10. Gāyatrī Brahmāgaḥ pārśvam tathaiva na vimunchanti | vedarāśīṁ

smṛto Brāhma Sāvitrī tad-adhīśhitā | 11. Tasmād na kāśchid doshaṁ

syāt Sāvitrī-gamanā vībhoh | tathāpī lajjavananāḥ Prajāpatī abhūt pūrā |

12. Sva-sutopagamād Brāhmaṁ sāsāpa Kusumāyudham | yasmād mamāpi

204 Instead of tenāśu the Gaikowar MS. reads tenordvēa.
bhavatā manah samkhobhitam saraiḥ | 13. Tasmāt tvad-deham aahirād
Rudro bhasmikarishyati | tataḥ prasādayāmāsa Kāmadevas Chaturmu-
kham | 14. “Na mām akāraṇaṁ śaptuṁ tvam thārhasi mām ava | aham evaṁ-vidhāḥ srishtas tvayaica chaturānana | 15. Indriya-kshobha-janakaḥ
sareshām eva dehinām | uti-puṁsor avichārenā mayā sarvatra sarvadā | 16. Kshobhyam manah prajatnena tvayaieoktam purā vibho | tasmād
anaparādhena tvayā saptas tathā vibho | 17. Kuru prasādam bhagavan
sva-śarirāptyaye punah | Brahmā uvācha | 18. Vaivasvate 'ntare prāpte
Yādavānena-sambhavaḥ | Rāmo nāma yadā martyo mat-satteva-balam
āśritaḥ | 19. Avarīyāsura-dhvāmaṇī Dvārakām adhivatsyati | taddhātus tat-samaścha 295 tvam tadā putravat eshyasi ityādi |

“32. Having thus formed the universe, consisting of the principles,
he generated a twofold creation, (33) having, with a view to the
completion of the world, placed and kept Śāvitrī in his heart. Then
as he was muttering prayers, he divided his spotless body (34) and
gave to the half the form of a woman, and to the half that of a male.
(This female) is called Satarūpa, Śāvitrī, (35) Sarasvati, Gāyatī, and
Brahmāṇī. Brahmā then took her for his daughter. 36. Beholding
her, the imperishable deity, distressed, tortured with the arrows of
love, exclaimed, ‘o what beauty! o what beauty!’ 37. Then (his
sons) headed by Vasiṣṭha, cried aloud, ‘(our) sister.’ Brahmā saw
nothing else, looking only at her face; (38) and exclaimed again and
again, ‘o what beauty! o what beauty!’ He then again gazed upon
her, as she bend forward in obeisance. 39. The fair woman then made
a circuit round her father. As on account of his sons he felt ashamed;
from his desire of gazing on her beauty (40) there appeared (on his
head) a southern face with pale cheeks; and there was afterwards
manifested a western face with lips quivering with astonishment. 41. A
fourth was subsequently formed, beautiful, disquited by the arrows of
love. Then another was produced from the disturbing influence of the
same passion, (42) and from eagerness in gazing after her as she rose
upwards in the sky. That austere fervour, extremely dreadful, which
Brahmā had practised with a view to creation, (43) was entirely lost
through his desire to approach his daughter (carnally). Through this
was produced speedily the fifth face (or, according to one MS., the upper,

295 Such appears to be the reading of the Guikowar MS. The original reading of
the Taylor MS. has been erased, and another substituted, tatas tat-samaśca tvam cha.
the fifth face) of the wise deity, (44) which appeared with matted hair, and which he covered up. Brahmā then said to the sons who had sprung from him, (45) 'create living beings everywhere, gods, asuras, and men.' They, being thus addressed, created beings of various kinds. 46. When they had gone away for the purpose of creating, he, who is the universe, took for his wife the unblamed Satarūpā. 47. Sickened with love, he cohabited with her: like any ordinary being, he loved her,—though she was full of shame—embowered in the hollow of a lotus, (48) for a hundred years of the gods. A long time after, a son was born to her, Manu (49) called Svāyambhūva, who, as we have heard, is Virāj. From their community of form and qualities he is called Adhipūrusha. 50. From him were sprung those numerous Vairājas, steadfast in religious observances, those seven glorious sons of Svayambhū, and those other seven Manus, (51) beginning with Svārochisha and Auttami, in form equal to Brahmā, of whom thou art now the seventh. (4th chapter) 1. Manu says: 'Ah! this is most afflicting, this entrance of love into the god.' How was it that the lotus-born did not incur guilt by that act? 2. And how did a matrimonial connection take place between persons of the same family who were sprung from him? Solve this doubt of mine, O Lord. The Fish replied: 3. This primeval creation was celestial, produced from the quality of passion (rajas); it had senses removed beyond the cognizance of sense, and bodies of the same description, (4) was possessed of celestial energy, derived from celestial knowledge, and cannot be perfectly perceived by others with the eye of flesh. 5. Just as serpents know the path of serpents, and (beings living) in the sky know the path of all sorts of birds, so too the celestials alone, and not men, know the way of celestials. 6. And since it is the gods who award the recompence, favourable or unfavourable, according as good or bad deeds have been done,—it is not good for men to examine this (question). 7. Furthermore, the four-faced (Brahmā) is the ruler of all the gods, and in like manner the Gāyatrī is declared to be a member of Brahmā. 8. And, as

206 Compare the Purusha Sukta, above p. 8, in the fifth verse of which the words Virājo adhi pūrushah occur. If the last two words are combined they give the name in the text.

207 This account is given by the deity represented as incarnate in a Fish, to Manu Vaivasvata.
they say, there is a pair consisting of the formless, and of that which has form. Wherever the divine Viranchi (Brahmā) is, there is also the goddess Sarasvatī. 9. Wherever Bhāratī (a name of Sarasvatī) is, there is also Prajāpati. Just as shadow is nowhere seen without sunshine, (10) so Gāyatrī never forsakes the side of Brahmā. He is called the collected Veda, and Sāvitṛ rests upon him; (11) there can therefore be no fault in his approaching her. Nevertheless, Brahmā, the lord of creatures, was bowed down with shame, (12) because he had approached his own daughter, and cursed Kusumāyudha (Kāma), (in these words) ‘As, even my mind has been agitated by thy arrows, Rudra shall speedily reduce thy body to ashes.’ Kāmadeva then propitiated the four-faced deity, saying, (14) ‘Thou oughtest not to curse me without cause: preserve me. It is by thee thyself that I have been created with such a character, (15) an agitator of the organs of sense of all embodied creatures. The minds both of men and women must always and everywhere (16) be energetically stirred up by me with out hesitation: this thou thyself hast formerly declared. It is therefore without any fault of mine that I have been thus cursed by thee. 17. Be gracious, lord, that I may recover my body.’ Brahmā answered: 18. ‘When the Vaivasvata Manvantara shall have arrived, a mortal, named Rāma, sprung from the Yādava race, deriving force from my essence, (19) and, becoming incarnate as a destroyer of Asuras, shall inhabit Dvārakā. Thou shalt then become a son of his substance and like to him,’ etc.

The narrator of this legend does not hesitate to depict in the strongest colours (though without the least approach to grossness) the helpless subjection of Brahmā to the influence of sexual desire. This illicit indulgence was regarded by the authors of the Satapatha and Aitareya Brāhmaṇas as in the highest degree scandalous, and they do not attempt to palliate its enormity by any mystical explanation, such as that which we find in the Matsya Purāṇa. Whether this apology proceeded from the original narrator, or from a later writer of a more sensitive disposition, who perceived its inconsistency with any elevated idea of the superior powers, is difficult to say. It is quite possible that the same writer who gave his fancy scope in describing the unbecoming scene, of which the substance had been handed down in works regarded

208 The word means "He whose weapons are flowers."
as authoritative, may also have thought it necessary to discover some device for counteracting the scandal. On the other hand, the original writer seems to cut himself off from the privilege of resorting to any mystical refinements to explain away the offence, by having in the first instance represented Brahmā's indulgence as on a level with that of ordinary beings. And even after the apology has been concluded, we are still told that Brahmā could not help feeling ashamed of what he had done. The writer of the explanation ought to have perceived that if his defence was of any value, the deity for whom he was apologizing had no ground for humiliation. But he did not venture to expunge the popular features of the story. The grounds on which the apology proceeds are partly of the same character as those which the writer of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa assumes in the passage (x. 33, 27 ff.) which is given in the fourth volume of this work, pp. 42 f., viz., that the gods are not to be judged on the same principles as men,—that "the celestials have laws of their own" (sunt superis sua jura). The Bhāgavata Purāṇa has, however, different measures for Brahmā and for Krishṇa; for whilst the adultery of the latter is defended in the verses just referred to, no desire is shown to vindicate the former in the other passage, iii. 12, 28 ff., adduced in the same volume, page 40.

As regards the details of the story according to the different Purāṇas, I may observe that while the Vishṇu, the Vāyu (see above, pp. 65, and 106), and the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇas, xl. 13 f., represent Satarūpā as the wife of Manu Svāyambhuva, the Matsya Purāṇa, as we have just seen, declares her to have been the spouse of Brahmā himself, and the mother of Manu Svāyambhuva. This is repeated in the twenty-sixth verse of the fourth chapter:


210 Compare the account given in Manu's Institutes (above, p. 36), which does not coincide in all particulars with any of the Purāṇas here quoted.

210 In this line the original readings are in several places erased in the Taylor MS. I have endeavoured to restore it with the help of the Gaikowar MS.
MYTHICAL ACCOUNTS OF THE CREATION OF MAN,

Vāmadevaś tu bhagavān asrijad mukhato devijān | rājanyān asrijad bāhvor
Vit-sūdrav āru-pādayoh | . . . 35. Svāyambhuvo Manuṛ dhīmāṁs
tapas tapteś suduścharam | patnāṁ avāpa rūpaḥvyām Anantāṁ nāma
nāmataḥ | Priyavratottānapādau Manus tasyāṁ ajijanat |

"She who was produced from the half of his body, Gāyatrī the declarer of sacred science, she who was the mother of Manu, the goddess Satarūpā (i.e. having a hundred forms), Satendriyā (i.e. having a hundred senses), (27) (was also) Rati, Mind, Austere Fervour, Intellect, sprung from Mahat and the other principles. He then begot upon Satarūpā seven sons. 28. This world, composed of all knowledge, sprang from Marīchi, and the others who were the mind-born sons of that wise Being. He next created Vāmadeva (Mahādeva), the wielder of the excellent trident, and the lord Sanatkumāra, born before the earliest. 30. Then the divine Vāmadeva created Brāhmans from his mouth, Rājanyas from his breast, the Viś and the Sudra from his thighs and feet." [After describing in the following verses some other creations of Vāmadeva, the writer proceeds in verse 35:] "The wise Manu Svāyambhuva, having practised austere fervour of the most arduous kind, obtained a beautiful wife named Anantā. On her he begot Priyavrata and Uttānapāda."

Having made Manu the son of Satarūpā, the writer was obliged to give him another female for a wife, as we see he has here done.

It will be observed that in this passage Vāmadeva—and not Brahmā, as in the other Purāṇas—is described as the creator of the four castes.

SECT. X.—Quotations from the Rāmāyaṇa on the Creation, and on the Origin of Castes.

The substance of the first of the following passages has already been stated above in a note on page 36. Part of it is also quoted in p. 54, and it is more fully cited in the fourth volume of this work, p. 29, but for facility of reference I repeat it here.

Rāmāyaṇa (Bombay edition) ii. 110, 1. Krūḍḍham ājnāya Rāmaṁ tu
Vasishṭhaḥ pratyuvācha ha | Jābalir api jānite lokasyāya gatāgatim |
2. Nivartta-yitū-kāmas tu tvām etad vākyam abravit | imāṁ loka-samut-
AND OF THE ORIGIN OF THE FOUR CASTES.


"1. Perceiving Rāma to be incensed" Vasishṭha replied: 'Jābāli also knows the destruction and renovation of this world. 2. But he spoke as he did from a desire to induce you to return. Learn from me, lord of the earth, this (account of) the origin of the world. 3. The universe was nothing but water. In it the earth was fashioned. Then Brahmd Śvayambhu came into existence, with the deities. He next, becoming a boar, raised up the earth, and created the entire world, with the saints his sons. 5. Brahmd, the eternal, unchanging, and undecaying, was produced from the aether (ākāśa). From him sprang Marīchi, of whom Kaśyapa was the son. 6. From Kaśyapa sprang Vivasvat: and from him was descended Manu, who was formerly the lord of creatures (prajāpati). Ikshvāku was the son of Manu (7) and to him this prosperous earth was formerly given by his father. Know that this Ikshvāku was the former king in Ayodhyā.'

The account which I next quote does not agree with the last in its details, as, besides representing the Prajāpati or sons of Brahmd to be seventeen in number, it places Marīchi, Kaśyapa, and Vivasvat in the same rank as contemporaries, while the former narrative declares them to have been respectively father, son, and grandson.


211 On account of a materialistic and immoral argument which had been addressed to him by Jābāli to induce him to disregard his deceased father's arrangements regarding the succession to the throne. See Journ. Roy. As. Soc. vol. xix. pp. 303 ff.
212 The name Ikshvāku occurs in B. V. x. 60, 4. See Professor Max Müller's article in Journ. Roy. As. Soc. for 1866, pp. 451 and 462.
MYTHICAL ACCOUNTS OF THE CREATION OF MAN,

Stāṇuṅ Marichir Atriś cha Kratuś chaiva mahābalaḥ | Pulastyaś chāṇ- 
girāś chaiva Prachetāḥ Pulahas tathā | 9. Daksha Vivasvān aparō 'rish- 
ṭanemiś cha Rāghava | Kaśyapaś cha mahatejas teshām āśīch cha paśchī- 
mah | 10. Prājāpates tu Dakshasya bābhūvār iti viśrutāḥ | shashṭir 
duhitaro Rāma yaśasvīryo mahāyasāḥ | 11. Kaśyapaḥ pratijāgrāho 
tāsām ashtau samadhyamāḥ | Aditiśa cha Ditiśa chaiva Danūm api cha 
Kālakām | 12. Tāmrāṃ Krodhavasāṃ chaiva Manuśaḥ 215 chāpy Analā 
api | tās tu kanyās tataḥ prītaḥ Kaśyapaḥ punar abrahit | 13. Putrāṃs 
trailokya-bhārtrīn vai janayishyatha mat-samān | Aditiśa 
tan-mānāḥ 
Rāma Ditiśa Cha Danūr eva cha | 14. Kālakā cha mahābāho šeshās te 
amanasi 214 bhavan | Adityāṃ jajnire devās trayastriṃśad arindama | 15. Ādityā Vasavo Rudrā Aśvinau cha parantapa | . . . . 29. Manur 
manushyān janayat Kaśyapasya mahātmanāḥ | brahmaṇān kshattriyān 
vaiśyān śūdrāṇāḥ cha manuṣjarahabha | 30. Mukhato brahmaṇā jatāh 
ura- 
śaḥ kshattriyaṃ tathā | urubhyāṃ jajnire vaiśyaḥ padbhayaḥ śūrā iti 
śrutīḥ | 31. Sarvāṃ punya-phalāṃ vrikshān Analā 'pi vyajāyata |

"5. Having heard the words of Rāma, the bird (Jaṭāyuś) made known 
to him his own race, and himself, and the origin of all beings. 6. 
′Listen while I declare to you from the commencement all the Prājā- 
patis (lords of creatures) who came into existence in the earliest time.
7. Kardama was the first, then Vikṛita, Sesha, Saṁśraya, the energetic 
Bahuputra, (8) Stāṇuṅ, Marīchi, Atri, the strong Kratu, Pulastya, 
Angiras, Prachetas, Pulaha, (9) Daksha, then Vivasvat, Arisṭanemi, 
and the glorious Kaśyapa, who was the last. 10. The Prājāpati Dak- 
sha is famed to have had sixty daughters. 11. Of these Kaśyapa took 
in marriage eight elegant maidens, Aditi, Diti, Danū, Kālakā, (12) 
Tāmrā, Krodhavasā, Manu," 215 and Analā. Kaśyapa, pleased, then said


215 I should have doubted whether Manu could have been the right reading here, 
but that it occurs again in verse 29, where it is in like manner followed in verse 31 
by Analā, so that it would certainly seem that the name Manu is intended to stand 
for a female, the daughter of Daksha. The Gauda recension, followed by Signor Gor- 
resio (iii. 20, 12), adopts an entirely different reading at the end of the line, viz. 
Balām Atibalām api, " Balā and Atibalā," instead of Manu and Analā. I see that 
Professor Roth s.v. adduces the authority of the Amara Kosha and of the Commen- 
tator on Pāṇini for stating that the word sometimes means "the wife of Manu." 
In the following text of the Mahābhārata i. 2553, also, Manu appears to be the 
name of a female: Ana vakshyam Manuḥ Vaiśāṃ Amurām Mūrgaṇapriyāṃ | Ana- 
pushāṃ Bhāṣāṃ iti Prādhā vyajāyata | " Prādhā (daughter of Daksha) bore Ana- 
vadyā, Manu, Varsā, Asurā, Mūrgaṇapriyā, Anaṭa, Subhagā, and Bhāṣi."
to these maids, (13) ‘ye shall bring forth sons like to me, preservers of the three worlds.’ Aditi, Diti, Danū, (14) and Kālakā assented; but the others did not agree. Thirty-three gods were borne by Aditi, the Ādityas, Vasus, Rudras, and the two Āśvins.’ [The following verses 15–28 detail the offspring of Diti, Danū, Kālakā, Tāmṛa, Krodhavaśā, as well as of Kraunchī, Bhāsī, Syēnī, Dhṛitarāśhṭrī, and Sukī the daughters of Kālakā, and of the daughters of Krodhavaśā. (Compare the Mahābhārata, i. 2620–2635; and Wilson’s Vishṇu Purāṇa, vol. ii. pp. 72 f.) After this we come upon Manu and the creation of mankind.] “29. Manu, (wife) of Kaśyapa,” 216 produced men, Brāhmans, Kshattriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras. 30. ‘Brāhmans were born from the mouth, Kshattriyas from the breast, Vaiśyas from the thighs, and Śūdras from the feet,’ so says the Veda. 31. Analā gave birth to all trees with pure fruits.”

It is singular to observe that in this passage, after having represented men of all castes as sprung from Manu, the writer next adds a verse to state, on the authority of the Veda, that the different castes were produced from the different parts of the body out of which they issued. Unless Manu’s body be here meant, there is a contradiction between the two statements. If Manu’s body is meant, the assertion conflicts with the common account. And if the Manu here mentioned is, as appears from the context, a woman, we should naturally conclude that her offspring was born in the ordinary way; especially as she is said to have been one of the wives of Kaśyapa.

The next passage from the Uttara Kāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa, 74, 8 f., describes the condition of men in the Kṛita age, and the subsequent introduction of the caste system in the Tretā. The description purports to have been occasioned by an incident which had occurred just before. A Brāhman had come to the door of Rāma’s palace in Ayodhyā, carrying the body of his dead son, 217 and bewailing his loss, the blame

216 The text reads Kaśyapa, “a descendant of Kaśyapa,” who, according to Rām. ii. 110, 6, ought to be Vivasvat. But as it is stated in the preceding part of this passage iii. 14, 11 f. that Manu was one of Kaśyapa’s eight wives, we must here read Kaśyapa. The Gauda recension reads (iii. 20, 30) Manur manushyān us tathā janayūmna Rāghava, instead of the corresponding line in the Bombay edition.

217 The boy is said, in 73, 5, to have been aprūpta-puṇvanam bōlam panche-vrsha-sahasram | “a boy of five thousand years who had not attained to puberty!” The Commentator says that vrsha here means not a year, but a day (vrsha-enbe 'tra
of which (as he was himself unconscious of any fault) he attributed to some misconduct on the part of the king. Rāma in consequence convinced his councillors, when the divine sage Nārada spoke as follows:


Nārada speaks: 8. "Hear, o king, how the boy's untimely death occurred: and having heard the truth regarding what ought to be
dinoparasya,"—just as it does in the ritual prescription that a man should perform a sacrifice lasting a thousand years ("sahāra-saṁcātasya satram upāśita" iti vata),—and that thus some interpreters made out the boy's age to be sixteen, and others under fourteen. But this would be a most unusual mode of reckoning age.
done, do it. 9. Formerly, in the Krita age, Brāhmans alone practised austere fervour (tapas). 10. None who was not a Brāhman did so in that enlightened age, instinct with divine knowledge (or, with Brahma), unclouded (by darkness). 11. At that period all were born immortal, and far-sighted. Then (came) the Tretā age, the era of embodied men, (12) in which the Kshattriyas were born, distinguished still by their former austere fervour; although those men who were great in the Tretā age had been greater, both in energy and austere fervour, in the former birth. 13. All the Brāhmans and Kshattriyas, both the former and the later, were of equal energy in both Yugas. 14. But not perceiving any more distinction (between the then existing men) they all next established the approved system of the four castes. 15. Yet in that enlightened age, instinct with righteousness, unclouded (by darkness), unrighteousness planted one foot upon the earth.” [After some other remarks (verses 16–18), which are in parts obscure, the writer proceeds:] 19. “But, although this falsehood had been planted upon the earth by unrighteousness, the people, devoted to true righteousness, practised salutary observances. 20. Those Brāhmans and Kshattriyas who lived in the Tretā practised austere fervour, and the rest of mankind obedience. 21. (The principle that) their own duty was the chief thing pervaded the Vaiśyas and Śūdras among them: and the Śūdras especially paid honour to all the (other) classes. . . . 23. Next the second foot of unrighteousness was planted on the earth, and the number of the Dvāpara (the third yuga) was produced. 24. When this deterioration of the age numbered as the Dvāpara, had come into existence,

218 The Commentator says, this means that in the Krita age the Brāhmans were superior, and the Kshattriyas inferior (as the latter had not then the prerogative of practising tapas), but that in the Tretā both classes were equal (ubhayor yugayor madhye kṛta-yuga brahma-pūreṇa tapo-viryābhyaṁ utkṛṣṭham kshattrāṁ cāvārān ca tābhyaṁ tapo-viryābhyaṁ nyūnam āśiṭ | tat sāreṇa brahma-kshattrā-rūpaṁ ubhayām tretāyāṁ sama-virya-samaneśvitaṁ āśiṭ | kṛte kshattrīyāṁ tapasy anadhit-kārūt tadyugiyēbhyo brāhmateṣhām nyūnatā tretāyāṁ tu ubhayo rapi tapo-‘dhikarūd ubhāv api tapo-viryābhyaṁ sāman | But in the previous verse (12) it is said that the Kshattriyas were born in the Tretā distinguished by their former tapas. But perhaps they were formerly Brahmans, according to verses 9, 10, and 12.

219 Manu and other legislators of that age, according to the Commentator (Mane-adayah sarve tātkālikāḥ dharma-pravarttanādhikritāḥ). He adds that in the Krita age all the castes were spontaneously devoted to their several duties, although no fixed system had been prescribed (kṛte tu vinaiśva sthāpanam sāyam eva sarve varṇāḥ svaa-dharma-ratāḥ).
unrighteousness and falsehood increased. 25. In this age, numbered as the Dvāpara, austere fervour entered into the Vaiśyas. Thus in the course of three ages it entered into three castes; (26) and in the three ages righteousness (dharma) was established in three castes. But the Śūdra does not attain to righteousness through the (lapse of these three) ages. 27. A man of low caste performs a great act of austere fervour. Such observance will belong to the future race of Śūdras in the Kali age, (28) but is unrighteous in the extreme if practised by that caste in the Dvāpara. On the outskirts of thy territory such a foolish person, of intense fervour, is practising austerity. Hence this slaughter of the boy."

Here then was a clue to the mystery of the young Brāhman's death. A presumptuous Śūdra, paying no regard to the fact that in the age in which he lived the prerogative of practising self-mortification had not yet descended to the humble class to which he belonged, had been guilty of seeking to secure a store of religious merit by its exercise. Rāma mounts his car Pushpaka, makes search in different regions, and at length comes upon a person who was engaged in the manner alleged. The Śūdra, on being questioned, avows his caste, and his desire to conquer for himself the rank of a god by the self-mortification he was undergoing. Rāma instantly cuts off the offender's head. The gods applaud the deed, and a shower of flowers descends from the sky upon the vindicator of righteousness. Having been invited to solicit a boon from the gods, he asks that the Brāhman boy may be resuscitated, and is informed that he was restored to life at the same moment when the Śūdra was slain. (Sections 75 and 76.)

The following curious account of the creation of mankind, among whom it states that no distinction of class (or colour) originally existed, is given in the Uttarā Kānda, xxx. 19 ff., where Brahmā says to Indra:

Amarendra mayā buddhyā praṇaḥ srishtā tathā prabhō | eka-varṇāḥ sāma-bhāṣā eka-rūpāḥ cha sarvaśaḥ | 20. Tūsāṁ nāsti viśeṣho hi darśane lakshane 'pi vā | tato 'ham ekāgramanās tāḥ praṇaḥ samachintayaḥ |

So 'ham tūsāṁ viśeṣhārtham striyām ekām vinirmame | yad yat praṇānām pratyānagam viśiṣṭāṁ tat tad uddhīritam | 22. Tato mayā

220 The Tretā, according to the Commentator.
221 See the Rev. Professor Banerjea's Dialogues on the Hindu philosophy, pp. 44 ff., where attention had previously been drawn to the story.
AND OF THE ORIGIN OF THE FOUR CASTES.

rupa-gunair ahalyā stri vinirmitā | halam nāmeha vairūpyaṁ halyaṁ
tat-prabhavam bhavet | 23. Tasya na vidyate halyam tenahalayeti viśrūtā |
Ahaḷyey eva cha mayā tasyā nāma prakṛttitam | 24. Nirmitāyāṁ cha
devendra tasyāṁ nāryāṁ survarshaḥa | bhavishyatītī kasyaisha mama
chintā tato bhave | 25. Tvāṁ tu S'akra tadā nāriṁ jānishe manasaṁ prabho
sthānādhikatayā patnī māmaisheti purandara | 26. Sa mayā
nyāśa-bhūtā tu Gautamasya mahātmanaḥ | nyastā bahūni varshāni tena
nirvātītā cha ha | 27. Tutas tasya pariṇāya mahāsthairyaṁ mahāmu-
nēḥ | jnātva tapasi siddhiṁ cha patny-arthaṁ sparśitā tadā | 28. Sa
tayā saha dharmātmā ramate sma mahāmuniḥ | āsām nirāśā devās tu
Gautame dattayā tayā | 29. Tvāṁ kruddhas te iha kāmātmā gatva
tasyāśramam muneḥ | drishtvācāśa cha tadā tāṁ strīṁ deśām agni-
sikhāṁ iva | 30. Śa tvayā dharṣhitā S'akra kāmārttena samanyunā,
ādriṣṭas tvāṁ cha tādā tena āśrame paramārthiṅaḥ | 31. Tataḥ kruddhena
tenāśi saptah paramatejasā | gato 'si yena devendra dasā-bhūga-vipa-
yayam |

19. O chief of the immortals (Indra) all creatures were formed by
my will of one class (or colour), with the same speech, and uniform in
every respect. 20. There was no distinction between them in ap-
pearance, or in characteristic marks. I then intently reflected on these
creatures. 21. To distinguish between them I fashioned one woman.
Whatever was most excellent in the several members of different crea-
tures was taken from them, (22) and with this (aggregate) I formed a
female, faultless in beauty and in all her qualities. Hala means ‘ugli-
neness,’ and halya, ‘what is produced from ugliness.’ 23. The woman in
whom there is no halya, is called Ahalyā. And this was her name to
which I gave currency. 24. When this female had been fashioned, I
anxiously considered to whom she should belong. 25. Thou, Indra,
didst, from the eminence of thy rank, determine in thy mind, ‘She
must be my spouse.’ 26. I, however, gave her in trust to the great
Gautama; and after having retained her in charge for many years, he
restored her. 27. Knowing then the great steadfastness of that distin-
guished Muni, and the perfection of his austere fervour, I, in due form,
gave her to him for his wife. 28. The holy sage lived with her in the
enjoyment of connubial love. But the gods were filled with despair
when she had been given away to Gautama. 29. And thou, Indra,
angry, as well as inflamed with lust, wentest to the Muni’s hermitage,
and didst behold that female brilliant as the flame of fire. She was then corrupted by thee who wert tormented by lust, as well as heated by anger. But thou wert then seen by the eminent rishi in the hermitage, cursed by that glorious being in his indignation. Thou didst in consequence fall into a reverse of condition and fortune," etc., etc.

Sect. XI.—Extracts from the Mahābhārata on the same subjects.

The first passage which I shall adduce is from the Ādi Parvan, or first book, verses 2517 ff.:

Vaiśampāyana uvāca | hanta te kathayishyāmi namaskṛtya Svayambhuce | surādinām ahaṃ samyak lokānām prabhavāpyayam | Brahmaṇa mānasāḥ putrāḥ viditāḥ shak-mahāshrayāḥ | Marichir Atry-angirasau Pulastyāḥ Pulahāḥ Kratuḥ | Maricheḥ Kaśyapaḥ putrāḥ Kaśyopat tu prajā imāḥ | prajājñire mahābhāgā Daksha-kanyās trayodasa | 2520. Adītītī Dītīr Danuḥ Kālā Danauḥ Śāṁkīra tathā | Krodhā Pradhā ca Viśvā ca Vīnata Kapila Muniḥ | Kadrās ca manujayāghra Daksha-kanyāvah Bhārata | etasāṃ virya-sampannam putra-pautram anantakam |

"Vaiśampayana said: I shall, after making obeisance to Svayambhū, relate to thee exactly the production and destruction of the gods and other beings. Six great rishis are known as the mind-born sons

In regard to this story of Indra and Ahalyā, as well as to that of Brahmā and his daughter, above referred to, see the explanation given by Kumārila Bhatta, as quoted by Professor Max Müller in his Hist. of Anc. Sansk. Lit. p. 329 ff. The name of Ahalyā is there allegorically interpreted of the night, to which this name is said to have been given because it is absorbed in the day (ahāni tiyānātayā). Indra is the sun.

Another passage (Sānti-p. 7569 ff.) raises the number of Brahmā's sons to seven by adding Vasishṭha: Ekaḥ Svayambhūr bhagavān aydo Brahmā sanātanaḥ | Brahmaṇaḥ svapta vai putrā mahātmānaḥ Svayambhūvaḥ | Maricir Atry-Angirasau Pulastyāḥ Pulahāḥ Kratuḥ | Vasishṭhasaḥca mahābhāghah sarvātva vai Svayambhūvaḥ | svapta Brahmāna ity ete puruṣe niśchayaḥ gataḥ | "There is one primeval eternal lord, Brahma Svayambhū; who had seven great sons, Marichi, Atri, Angiras, Pulasta, Pulaha, Kratu, and Vasishtha, who was like Svayambhū. These are the seven Brahmās who have been ascertained in the Puranic records." In another part of the same Sāntiparvan, verses 12685 ff., however, the Prajāpatis are increased to twenty-one: Brahmā Śthānur Manuḥ Daksha Bhṛguḥ Dharmas tathā Yamaḥ | Maricir Aṅgirā 'trisṛcchā Pulastyaḥ Pulahāḥ Kratuḥ | Vasishṭḥaḥ Paramesāh śča Vivasvat Soma eva eča | Kardanaḥ chāpi yaḥ prakrtah Krodhā Viśvāma eca eca | ekaviṇāsaṁ utpannas te prajāpatayān smṛitāḥ | "There are reputed to have been twenty-one Prajāpatis produced, viz. Brahmā, Śthānu, Manu, Daksha, Bhrigu, Dharma, Yama, Marichi,
of Brahma, viz., Marichi, Atri, Angiras, Pulastya, Pulaha, and Kratu. Kaśyapa was the son of Marichi; and from Kaśyapa sprang these creatures. There were born to Daksha thirteen daughters of eminent rank, (2520) Aditi, Diti, Danu, Kālā, Danāyu, Śūnhikā, Krodhā, Pradhā, Visvā, Vīnatā, Kapilā, and Muni. Kādrā also was of the number. These daughters had valorous sons and grandsons innumerable."

Daksha, however, had other daughters, as we learn further on in verses 2574 ff., where the manner of his own birth also is related:

Dakshas te ajāyatāngushtḥād dakśiṇād bhagavān rishiḥ | Brahmānaḥ prithivīpāla śantāmā sumahātāpāḥ | vāmād ajāyatāngushtḥād bhāryā tasya mahātmanāḥ | tasyām panchāṣṭam kanyāḥ sa eva jānayād muniḥ |

. . . . 2577. Dadau cha dasā Dharmāya saptaviṃśatim Indave | divyena vidhina rājan Kaśyapāya trayodasaḥ | . . . . 2581. Paitāmahāḥ Manur devas tasyā putrāḥ praṇāpatiḥ | tasyāśthau Vasasvāh putrāḥ tēshām vakhśāmi visāram | . . . . 2595. Stanaiḥ tu dakśiṇām bhitevā Brahmano nara-vigrāhāḥ | nissritō bhagavān Dharmāḥ sarva-loka-suḫāvāhāḥ | trayas tasya varāḥ putrāḥ sarvābhūta-manoharāḥ | Samaḥ Kāmaḥ cha Harśaḥ cha tejasā loka-dhārīṇāḥ |

. . . . 2610. Ārūshi to Manoh kanyā tasya patnī manishīṇāḥ | . . . . 2614. Deau putrāv Brahmanoḥ te anyau yavo tiṣṭhathī lokaḥ saṃgam | loke Dhātā Vidhātā cha yau sīhīva Manunā saha | tayor eva vasā devī Lakṣmī padma-grīhā śubhā | tasyās tu mānaśāḥ putrās turagāḥ vyoma-chārināḥ |

. . . . 2617. Prajnām annakāmānām anyonya-parībhakshaṇāt | Adharmas tatra saṁjñātaḥ sarva-bhūta-vināśakaḥ | tasyāpi Nīrītīr bhāryā nīrīrīta yena Rakṣasaḥ | ghoraḥ tasyās trayāḥ putrāḥ pāpa-karma-ratāḥ sadā | Bhayo Mahā-bhavaya chaiva Mrityur bhūtāntakas tathā | na tasya bhāryā putro vā kaścid asty antako hi saḥ |

Angiras, Atri, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu, Vasishtha, Paramesṭhin, Vivasvat, Soma, the person called Kurdam, Krodha, and Vikrītā." (Here, however, only twenty names are specified including Brahma himself.) Compare this list with those quoted above, p. 116, from the Rāmāyana, iii. 14, 7 ff., from Manu in p. 36, and from the Vishnu P. in p. 65.

That Munī is a name, and not an epithet, is shown (1) by the fact that we have otherwise only twelve names; and (2) by her descendants, both gods and gandharvas, being afterwards enumerated in verses 2550 ff. (ity ete deva-gandharvo Manunyāḥ pariśrītāḥ). Kapilā, another of the thirteen daughters of Daksha is said to have been the mother of Ambrosia, Brāhmans, kine, Gandharvas and Apsarasas (amritam brahmaṇā gāvo gandharvōpsarasas tathā | apatyaṃ kapilāyās tu purāṇe pariṣrītām | ).
“2574. Daksha, the glorious rishi, tranquil in spirit, and great in austere fervour, sprang from the right thumb of Brahmā. From the left thumb sprang that great Muni’s wife, on whom he begot fifty daughters. Of these he gave ten to Dharma, twenty-seven to Indu (Soma), and according to the celestial system, thirteen to Kaśyapa.” I proceed with some other details given in the verses I have extracted: 2581. “Pitāmaha’s descendant, Manu, the god and the lord of creatures, was his (it does not clearly appear whose) son. The eight Vasus, whom I shall detail, were his sons. . . . . 2595. Dividing the right breast of Brahmā, the glorious Dharma (Righteousness), issued in a human form, bringing happiness to all people. He had three eminent sons, Sama, Kāma, and Harsha (Tranquillity, Love, and Joy), who are the delight of all creatures, and by their might support the world. . . . . 2610. Arushī, the daughter of Manu, was the wife of that sage (Chyavana, son of Bhrigu). . . . . 2614. There are two other sons of Brahmā, whose mark remains in the world, Dhātrī, and Vidhātrī, who remained with Manu. Their sister was the beautiful goddess Lakshmi, whose home is in the lotus. Her mind-born sons are the steeds who move in the sky. . . . . 2617. When the creatures who were desirous of food, had devoured one another, Adharma (Unrighteousness) was produced, the destroyer of all beings. His wife was Nirṛiti, and hence the Rākshasas are called Nirṛitas, or the offspring of Nirṛiti. She had three dreadful sons, continually addicted to evil deeds, Bhaya Mahābhaya (Fear and Terror) and Mṛityu (Death) the ender of beings. He has neither wife, nor any son, for he is the ender.”

The next passage gives a different account of the origin of Daksha; and describes the descent of mankind from Manu:

Adip. 3128. *Tevohir uditaḥ sarve maharshi-sama-tejasah | daśa Pra-

225 See above, p. 72 f. The Matsya P. also states that Daksha sprang from Brahmā’s right thumb, Dharma from his nipple, Kāma from his heart, etc.


227 The Taitt. Sanhitā, ii. 3, 5, 1, says Prajāpati had thirty-three daughters, whom he gave to King Soma (Prajāpates trayastrimāsad dukitara āsan | tāḥ Somāya rūjne ‘dayitī).

228 Dhātrī had been previously mentioned, in verse 2523, as one of the sons of Aditi. See also Wilson’s Vishn̄u P. ii. 152.

229 See Wilson’s Vishn̄u P. i. pp. 109, 118 ff., 144 ff. and 152.

230 The Vishn̄u P. (Wilson, i. 112) says he had five children.
chetasah putraḥ santah punya-janah smritah | mukhajenagninā yais te
purvam dagdha mahayujasah | tebbyah Prāchetaso jajne Daksho Dakshad
imah praJay | sambhutāh purusha-vyāghra sa hi loka-pitamahah |
Virīnyā saha sangamya Dakshah Prāchetaso munih | ātma-tulyan ajay
nayat sahasraṁ saṁsita-vaṛatan | sahasra-saṁkhyān sambhūtān Daksha-
putramś cha Naradaḥ | moksham adhyāpayāmśa saṁkhyā-jnānām anuttamam |
tataḥ pancaḥaśataṁ kanyāḥ putrikāḥ abhisandadhah | Prajayāpatiḥ
praJay Dakshah sriṅkshur Janamejaya | dadau cha daśa Dharmāya
Kasyapāya trayodaśa | kālaśya nayane yuktah saptaviśātam Indave |
3135. Trayodaśānam patīnām yā tu Dakshāyaṇi varā | Mārichaḥ
Kasyapas tasyām Adityān samajjanat | Indrādīn viryā-sampannān
Vivasvantam athāpi cha | Vivasvataḥ suto jajne Yamo Vaivavataḥ prabhuh |
Mārtandaśya Manur dhīmaṇ ajaṭaya sutaḥ prabhuh | Yamaś
chāpi suto jajne khyātas tasyānuyah prabhuh | dharmātmā sa Manur
dhīmaṇ yatra vaisaḥ pratisāhitaḥ | Manor vaṁśo mānaṁvām tato 'yam
prathito 'bhavat | brahma-kshatrādayas tasmad Manor jātus tu mānaēah |
tato 'bhaved mahārāja brahma kshatrāṇa sangatam | 3140. Brāhmaṇa
mānaṁ teshāṁ sāngam vedam adhārayan | Venam Dṛṣṭhūṁ Narish-
yantam Nābhyāgkeśvākum eva, cha | Kāruśah atha Sāryatiṁ tathā
chaivaśāṃtanim Ilām | Prishadheram naacaman prabhuh kshatrā-dharmā-
parāyaṇam | Nābhyāgariṣṭa-dāsāmān Manoh putrān prachakshate | pan-
chāṣat tu Manoh putrās tathaivāṇyo 'bhavān kṣitau | anyonya-bhedat te
sarve vineṣur iti naḥ śrutam | Purūravas tato vidvān Ilāyoṁ samapad-
yata | sā vai tasyābhadvā mātaḥ pitaḥ chaiveti naḥ śrutam |

"3128. Born all with splendour, like that of great rishis, the ten sons
of Prachetas are reputed to have been virtuous and holy; and by them
the glorious beings were formerly burnt up by fire springing from their
mouths. From them was born Daksha Prāchetasā; and from Daksha,
the Parent of the world (were produced), these creatures. Cohabiting
with Virīṇi, the Muni Daksha begot a thousand sons like himself, famous

321 "Trees and plants," according to the Commentator (mahāprabhāvā vriśikha-
322 The same account of Daksha's birth is given in the S-antic, 7573: Dasāṁnāṁ
tanayās te eva Daksha nāma praṣyapatiḥ | tasya deve nāманi loko Dakshah Ka iti che-
chyate | "These ten Prachetases had one son called Daksha, the lord of creatures. He
is commonly called by two names, Daksha and Ka." (Compare vol. iv. of this work,
p. 13, note 30, and p. 24; and the S'atapatha Brāhmaṇa, vii. 4, 1, 19, and ii. 4, 4, 1,
there quoted.) The following verse 7574 tells us that Kasyapa also had two names,
the other being Arishṭanemi. See Rām. iii. 14, 9, quoted above.
for their religious observances, to whom Nārada taught the doctrine of final liberation, the unequalled knowledge of the Sānkhya. Desirous of creating offspring, the Prajāpati Daksha next formed fifty daughters, of whom he gave ten to Dharma, thirteen to Kaśyapa, and twenty-seven, devoted to the regulation of time,233 to Indu (Soma). ... 3135. On Dākshāyani,234 the most excellent of his thirteen wives, Kaśyapa, the son of Marichi, begot the Ādityas, headed by Indra and distinguished by their energy, and also Vivasvat.235 To Vivasvat was born a son, the mighty Yama Vaivasvata. To Mārtanda (i.e. Vivasvat, the Sun) was born the wise and mighty Manu, and also the renowned Yama, his (Manu's) younger brother. Righteous was this wise Manu, on whom a race was founded. Hence this (family) of men became known as the race of Manu. Brāhmans, Kshatriyas, and other men sprang from this Manu. From him, o king, came the Brāhman conjoined with the Kshatriya. 3140. Among them the Brāhmans, children of Manu, held the Veda with the Vedāṅgas. The children of Manu are said to have been Vena, Dhṛṣṭhūṛṇ, Narishyanta, Nābhāga, Ikshvāku, Kārūsha, Saryāti, Ilā the eight, Prishadra the ninth, who was addicted to the duties of a Kshatriya, and Nābhāgārīṣṭa the tenth. Manu had also fifty other sons; but they all, as we have heard, perished in consequence of mutual dissensions. Subsequently the wise Purūravas was born of Ilā, who, we heard, was both his mother and his father."

The tradition, followed in this passage, which assigns to all the castes one common ancestor, removed by several stages from the creator, is, of course, in conflict with the account which assigns to them a fourfold descent from the body of Brahmā himself.

The Śāntiparvāṇ, verses 2749 ff., contains an account of the origin of castes which has evidently proceeded from an extreme assessor of the dignity of the Brahmanical order. The description given of the prerogatives of the priestly class is precisely in the style, and partly in almost the identical words, of the most extravagant declarations of

233 This phrase kālasya nayana yuktāḥ had previously occurred in verse 2580, where it is followed by the words sarvā nakshatra-yogino loka-yātrā-viśākhaṁ | "all identified with the lunar asterisms, and appointed to regulate the life of men."

See also Vishnu P. i. 15, 56, and Professor Wilson's translation ii. p. 10, note 1, and p. 28, note 1.

234 i.e. Aditi. See verses 2520, 2522, and 2800 of this same book.

235 The account in the Rāmāyana, ii. 110, 5 ff., agrees with this in making Kaśyapa son of Marichi, and father of Vivasvat.
Manu (i. 99 f.) on the same subject. In other places, however, the Mahâbhârata contains explanations of a very different character regarding the origin of the distinctions, social and professional, which prevailed at the period of its composition. A comparison of these various passages will afford an illustration of the fact already intimated in p. 6, 236 that this gigantic poem is made up of heterogeneous elements, the products of different ages, and representing widely different dogmatical tendencies, the later portions having been introduced by successive editors of the work to support their own particular views, without any regard to their inconsistency with its earlier contents. In fact, a work so vast, the unaided compilation of which would have taxed all the powers of a Didymus Chalkenterus, could scarcely have been created in any other way than that of gradual accretion. And some supposition of this kind is certainly necessary in order to explain such discrepancies as will be found between the passages I have to quote, of which the three first are the productions of believers (real or pretended) in the existence of a natural distinction between their own Brahmanical order and the other classes of the community, while the two by which these three are followed have emanated from fair and moderate writers who had rational views of the essential unity of mankind, and of the superiority of moral and religious character to any factitious divisions of a social description.

In the first passage, Bhishma, the great uncle of the Pândus, when describing to Yudhishthira the duties of kings, introduces one of those ancient stories which are so frequently appealed to in the Mahâbhârata. Without a minute study of the poem it would be difficult to say whether these are ever based on old traditions, or are anything more than mere vehicles invented to convey the individual views of the writers who narrate them. Bhishma says, Sântiparvan, 2749:

Ya eva tu sato rukhased asataś cha nivarttayet | sa eva rājān karttavyo rājan rāja-purohitah | 2750. Atrāpy udhârantiṃam itihāsam purātanam | Purâravasa Aîlaya saśvādam Mātariśvanaḥ | Purâravā vedaḥ | Kutaḥ svid brâhmano jāta varnāś chāpi kutas trayah | kasmāchchā bhavati śreshthas tan me vyākhyātum arhasi | Mātariśvechāḥ | Brâhmano mukhataḥ śrīhato brâhmano rāja-sattama | bāhubhyām kshatvriyāḥ srishta urubhyāṃ vaisya eva cha | varganām paricharyyyartham trayānām Bhā-

236 See also the fourth volume of this work, pp. 141 ff. and 152.
ratarshabha | varna ṣhaturthaḥ sambhūtāḥ padbhīyām śādṛu vinirmitāḥ | brāhmaṇo jāyamāno hi prithivyām anujāyate227 | iśvarāḥ sārva-bhūtānām dharmā-kosāhyānām guptaye | 2755. Ataḥ prithivyā yantāram kshattriyam danda-dhārane | deśīyam Dandam akarot praṇām anunātīpyate | vaiśyas tu dhana-dhāṇyena trīn vargān nibhriyād īmān | śādṛu hy etān parichared iti Brahmanuṣāsanam | Aīlā uvācha | deśīyaḥ kshattrabandhār vā kasyeyam prithiviḥ bhavet | dharmataḥ saha vittena samyag Vāyo prachakṣheva me | Vāyur uvācha | viprasya sarvam evaitad yat kinchīj jagatigatam | jyeshtenābhijanena tad dharmā-kuṣalā viduḥ | svam eva brāhmaṇo bhuktā svam vaste svamā dādāti cha | gurur hi sarva-vargānām jyeshtāḥ īśreṣṭhaḥ cha vai devaḥ | 2760. Pāty-ābhāve yathāeva stri devaram kurute patim | eṣa te prathamaḥ k芦paḥ āpady ānya bhaved ataḥ |

"2749. The king should appoint to be his royal priest228 a man who will protect the good, and restrain the wicked. 2750. On this subject they relate this following ancient story of a conversation between Purūravas the son of Ilā, and Mātariśvan (Vāyu, the Wind-god). Purūravas said: You must explain to me whence the Brāhmaṇa, and whence the (other) three castes were produced, and whence the superiority (of the first) arises. Mātariśvan answered: The Brāhmaṇa was created from Brahmat's mouth, the Kshatriya from his arms, the Vaiśya from his thighs, while for the purpose of serving these three

227 Manu, i. 99, has adhi jāyate.
228 Rūja-purohitāḥ. The king's priest (rūja-purohitāḥ) is here represented as one who should be a confidential and virtuous minister of state. Such is not, however, the character always assigned to this class of persons. In Manu xii. 46, quoted above (p. 41f.), the purohita is placed in a lower class than other Brāhmaṇas. And in the following verse (4527) of the Anuśāsanaparvan, taken from a story in which the Rishi utters maledictions against anyone who should have stolen certain lotus roots, part of the curse spoken by Visvāmitra is as follows: varvācayo'rstu bhṛtako rūjnaḥ cāstukāḥ purohitāḥ | ayājyasya bhavate riteiv vis-scāmīna karoti yah | "Let the man who steals lotus roots be a hirpling trafficker in rain incantations (?) and the domestic priest of a king, and the priest of one for whom no Brāhmaṇ should officiate." Again, in verse 4579, the same person says: karoto bhṛtako varvācayo rūjnas cāstukāḥ purohitāḥ | ritev astu hy agyājyasya yas te harati puskaram | "Let him who steals thy lotus perform as a hirirling incantations to cause drought, and be a king's domestic priest, and the priest of one for whom no Brāhmaṇ should officiate." I have had partly to guess at the sense of the words varvācayaraḥ and avarsām. The Commentator does not explain the former; and interprets the latter (for which the Edinburgh MS. reads aver-shāḥ) by eṛṣṭhi-nilbandham, "causing drought." He adds, papisāḥ eva avarsāḥ, "those who cause drought are most wicked."
castes was produced the fourth class, the Śūdra, fashioned from his feet. The Brāhmaṇ, as soon as born, becomes the lord of all beings upon the earth, for the purpose of protecting the treasure of righteousness. 2755. Then (the creator) constituted the Kṣatriya the controller of the earth, a second Yama to bear the rod, for the satisfaction of the people. And it was Brahmā's ordinance that the Vaiśya should sustain these three classes with money and grain, and that the Śūdra should serve them. The son of Ilā then enquired: Tell me, Vāyu, to whom the earth, with its wealth, rightfully belongs, to the Brāhmaṇ or the Kṣatriya? Vāyu replied: All this, whatever exists in the world, is the Brāhmaṇ's property by right of primogeniture: this is known to those who are skilled in the laws of duty. It is his own which the Brāhmaṇ eats, puts on, and bestows. He is the chief of all the castes, the first-born and the most excellent. Just as a woman when she has lost her (first) husband, takes her brother in law for a second; so the Brāhmaṇ is thy first resource in calamity; afterwards another may arise.'

A great deal is shortly afterwards added about the advantages of concord between Brāhmaṇs and Kṣatriyas. Such verses as the following (2802): "From the dissensions of Brāhmaṇs and Kṣatriyas the people incur intolerable suffering" (mitho bhedaḥ brāhmaṇa-kṣatriya-ānām praajā duḥkhaṁ dussahāṁ chāviśanti) afford tolerably clear evidence that the interests of these two classes must frequently have clashed.

In the same strain as the preceding passage is the following:

Vanaparvan, 13436. Nādhyāpanād yājanād vā anyasmād vā pratigrahaḥ | dosho bhavati viprānāṁ jvalitāgni-samā devijāḥ | dурvedā vā suvedā vā prakṛtāḥ saṁskritās tathā | brāhmaṇā nācamaṁatavā bhasmacchannā ivagnayaḥ | yathā śmaśāne dīptaujāḥ pāvaka naiva dushyati | evan videvān avidēvān brāhmaṇa daivatam mahat | prākāraiṣ cha puradevaiḥ praśādaiṣ cha prithag-vidhāḥ | nāgarāṇi na sobhante hīnāni brāhmaṇottamaḥ | vedādhyā vṛttā-sampāṇnā jnānavantas tapasvinaḥ | yattra tishthanti vai viprās tan-nāma nagaraṁ nripa | vṛaje vā py athava

239 Kullāka, the Commentator on Manu (i. 100), is obliged to admit that this is only spoken in a panegyrical or hyperbolical way, and that property is here used in a figurative sense, since theft is afterwards predicated by Manu of Brāhmaṇs as well as others ("śvam" iti stutya ucchaye | śvam īva śvam na tu śvam eva | brāhmaṇasyaśāpi Manunā steyasya vakṣyamōgatevā).
"No blame accrues to Brāhmans from teaching or sacrificing, or from receiving money in any other way: Brāhmans are like flaming fire. Whether ill or well versed in the Veda, whether untrained or accomplished, Brāhmans must never be despised, like fires covered by ashes. Just as fire does not lose its purity by blazing even in a cemetery, so too, whether learned or unlearned, a Brāhman is a great deity. Cities are not rendered magnificent by ramparts, gates, or palaces of various kinds, if they are destitute of excellent Brāhmans. 13440. The place where Brāhmans, rich in the Veda, perfect in their conduct, and austere ly fervid, reside, is (really) a city (nagara). Wherever there are men abounding in Vedic lore, whether it be a cattle- pen, or a forest, that is called a city, and that will be a sacred locality."

The following verses from the Anuśāsanap. 2160 ff. are even more extreme in their character, and are, in fact, perfectly sublime in their insolence:

Brāhmaṇānām paribhavād asurāḥ salile śayāḥ | brāhmaṇānām prasādācha cha devāḥ svarga-nivāsāḥ | aśakyaṁ srasṭuṁ ākāsām ačālyo himavān giriḥ | adhārayya setunā Gangā ādurjayā brāhmaṇā bhuvi | na brāhmaṇa-virodhena sakyā śāstuṁ vasundhara | brāhmaṇā hi mahātmāno devānām api devatāḥ | tān pūjayasca satataṁ dānena paricharyyaḥ | yad ēkhasi mahāṁ bhoktum imāṁ sāgara-mekhalāṁ |

"Through the prowess of the Brāhmans the Asuras were prostrated on the waters; by the favour of the Brāhmans the gods inhabit heaven. The ether cannot be created; the mountain Himavat cannot be shaken; the Gangā cannot be stemmed by a dam; the Brāhmans cannot be conquered by any one upon earth. The world cannot be ruled in opposition to the Brāhmans; for the mighty Brāhmans are the deities even of the gods. If thou desire to possess the sea-girt earth, honour them continually with gifts and with service."

The next passage seems to be self-contradictory, as it appears to set out with the supposition that the distinction of castes arose after the creation; while it goes on to assert the separate origin of the four classes:

Sāntiparvan, 10861. Janaka uccaḥ | varṇo viśeṣa-varṇānām ma- 
harshe kena jāyate | etat ēkhaṁ ahaṁ jnātum tad brāhi vadataṁ vara | yad etaj jāyate 'patyaṁ sa evāyaṁ iti śrutih | katham brāhmaṇato jāto
vişeṣe grahaṇaṁ gataḥ | Parāṣara uvāca | Evam etad mahārāja yena jātāḥ sa eva saḥ | tapasas te apakarsheṇa jātigrahaṇatāṁ gataḥ | sukhaḥ-trāchcha svajāḥ cha punyo bhavati sambhavaḥ | ato 'nyatarato hīnād avara namā jáyate | 10865. Vakrād bhujaḥ-bhyām ārūbhāyaṁ padbhyaṁ chaivaṁtha jajnire | srijataḥ Prajāpater lokān iti dharmavidvō viduḥ | mu-khaḥ brāhmaṇaś tata bahujāḥ kṣattriyāḥ smṛtāḥ | ārujaḥ dhanino rājan pādajāḥ parichārakāḥ | caturṇām eva varṇānām āgamaḥ puru-sharshabhaḥ | ato 'nyo vyatīrikta ye to vai sankara-jāḥ smṛtāḥ | . . . . 10870. Janaka uvāca | Brahmaṇaikena jātānām nānātvāṁ gotrātāḥ katham | bahūnīha hi loke vai gotrāṇi muni sattama | yatra tatra katham jātāḥ svayonim (śuyonim) munayo gataḥ | sūdha-yonau samutpanna viyonaḥ ca tathaḥ pare | Parāṣara uvāca | rājan naitad bhave grāhyam āpakriṣṭena jannanam | matātmanāṁ samutpattis tapasā bhāvitamanam | utpādaya purān munayo nripate yatra tatra ha | svēnaiva tapasā teshāṁ rishitvam pradadhūḥ punaḥ | . . . 10876. Ete svām prakṛitim prāptā Vaideha tapasōṣrayāt | pratishṭhitā veda-vido damena tapasaiva hi |

"Janaka asks: 10861. How, o great rishi, does the caste of the separate classes arise? Tell me, as I desire to know. According to the Veda, the offspring which is born (to any one) is the very man himself. How does offspring born of a Brāhmaṇ fall into distinct classes? Parāṣara replied: It is just as you say, o great king. A son is the very same as he by whom he was begotten; but from decline of austere fervour, (men) have become included under different classes. And from good soil and good seed a pure production arises, whilst from those which are different and faulty springs an inferior production. Those acquainted with duty know that men were born from the mouth, arms, thighs, and feet of Prajāpati when he was creating the worlds. The Brāhmaṇs sprang from his mouth, the Kṣattriyas from his arms, the merchants from his thighs, and the servants from his feet. The scriptural tradition speaks only of four classes. The men not included in these are declared to have sprung from a mixture (of the four) . . . . 10870. Janaka asked: How is there a difference in race between men sprung from one and the same Brahma? for there are now many races in the world. How have Munis born anywhere (indiscriminately) entered into a good family; some of them having sprung from a pure source and others from an inferior stock? Parāṣara replied: It would not be credible that noble-minded men, whose souls
had been perfected by austere fervour, should have been the offspring of a degraded birth. Munis who had begotten sons in an indiscriminate way conferred on them the position of rishis by their own austere fervour.” The speaker then names a number of sages (10876) “famed for their acquaintance with the Veda, and for their self-command and austere fervour,” as “having all attained to their respective conditions by practising the latter observance.”

In the latter verses the speaker appears to admit, at the very moment that he denies, the degraded origin of some of the renowned saints of Indian antiquity. What else is the meaning of the verse, “Munis who had begotten sons in an indiscriminate way conferred on them the position of rishis by their own austere fervour?” No doubt it is intended to represent those as exceptional times: but while we refuse to admit this assumption, we may find some reason to suppose that the irregularities, as they were afterwards considered to be, which this assumption was intended to explain away, were really samples of the state of things which commonly prevailed in earlier ages.

The next extract declares that there is a natural distinction between the Brāhmans and the other castes; and appears to intimate that the barrier so constituted can only be overpassed when the soul re-appears in another body in another birth:


Mahādeva says: 6570. “Brāhmaṇhood, o fair goddess, is difficult to
be attained. A man, whether he be a Brāhman, Kshatriya, Vaiśya, or Śūdra, is such by nature; this is my opinion. By evil deeds a twice-born man falls from his position. Then let a twice-born man who has attained to the highest caste, keep it. The Kshatriya, or Vaiśya, who lives in the condition of a Brāhman, by practising the duties of one, attains to Brāhmanhood. But he who abandons the state of a Brāhman and practises the duty of a Kshatriya, falls from Brāhmanhood and is born in a Kshatriya womb. And the foolish Brāhman, who, having attained that Brāhmanhood which is so hard to get, follows the profession of a Vaiśya, under the influence of cupidity and delusion, falls into the condition of a Vaiśya. (In like manner) a Vaiśya may sink into the state of a Śūdra. A Brāhman who falls away from his own duty becomes afterwards a Śūdra. . . . 6590. But by practising the following good works, o goddess, a Śūdra becomes a Brāhman, and a Vaiśya becomes a Kshatriya: Let him actively perform all the functions of a Śūdra according to propriety and rule, i.e. obedience and service to the highest caste,” etc.

The next passage is the first of those which I have already noted, as in spirit and tenor very different from the preceding. The conversation which it records arose as follows: Yudhishtihira found his brother Bhīmasena caught in the coils of a serpent, which, it turned out, was no other than the famous king Nahusha, who by his sacrifices, austerities, etc., had formerly raised himself to the sovereignty of the three worlds; but had been reduced to the condition in which he was now seen, as a punishment for his pride and contempt of the Brāhmans. He promises to let Bhīmasena go, if Yudhishtihira will answer certain questions. Yudhishtihira agrees, and remarks that the serpent was acquainted with whatever a Brāhman ought to know. Whereupon the Serpent proceeds:

Vana-parva, verses 12469 ff: Sarpa uvācha | brāhmaṇaḥ ko bhaved rājan vedyāṁ kīṁ cha Yudhishtihira | 12470. Bravīhy atimātin tvāṁ hi vākyair anumīṁmaḥ | Yudhishtihira uvācha | satyaṁ dānam kṣamā śīlam anuśīṣyaṁ tapo ghrinā | dṛisyante yatra nāgendra sa brāhmaṇaḥ iti smṛtiḥ | vedyāṁ sarpa param Brahma nirdūṣkham asukham cha yat | yatra gataṁ na sochanti bhavataṁ kiṁ civaṁśhitam | Sarpa uvācha | chāturvarṇam pramāṇam cha satyaṁ cha brahma chaiva hi | Śudreshe api cha satyaṁ cha dānām akrodha eca cha | anuśīṣyaṁ ahiṁsa cha ghrinā chaiva Yudhishtihira | vedyāṁ yath chaṭra nirdūṣkham asukham cha na-
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rādhīpa | tābhyaṁ hīnām padaṁ chānyad na tad astīti lakṣhayye | Yu-

ḍhīṣṭhīra uvācha | 12475. Sudre tu yad bhavel lakṣhma dvīje tach cha

na vidyate | na vai śudro bhavech chhūdro brāhmaṇa na cha brāhmaṇaḥ |
yatatāl lakṣhayate sarpa evrītaṃ sa brāhmaṇaḥ smṛitaḥ | yatraitad na

bhavet sarpa tam śūḍram iti nṛddiṣet | yat punar bhavatā praktam

na vedyāṁ vidyātīti cha | tābhyaṁ hīnām ato 'nyatra padaṁ nāsti

ti ched api | evam etad matam sarpa tābhyaṁ hīnāṁ na vedyate | yathā

śītoshnayor madhye bhaved noshgaṁ na śītāti | evam vai sukha-duḥ-

khābhyaṁ hīnāṁ nāsti padaṁ kvechit | ehā mama matiḥ sarpa yathā

vā manyate bhavān | Sarpa uvācha | 12480. Yadi te evītta tūjan

brāhmaṇaḥ prasāmakṣɦitaḥ | vṛthā jātis tadā 'yushman kriṭir yāvad

na vedyate | Yudhisṭhīra uvācha | jātir atra mahāsarpa manushyaṁ
takāṁ | sankarāt sarva-vargāṁ uṣṇa-duḥparikṣhyaṁ iti matiḥ | sarve

sarvaśv apatyāṁ janayanti saḍā naraḥ | vān maithunam ato janma

mahāṁ cha samam nṛṇāṁ | idam ārshaḥ pramāṇaḥ cha 'ya ya-

jāmahe" ity api | tasmāḥ chhiḷam pradhāneshṭaṁ vidyut ye tattvade-

rāṁśaḥ | "prāṇ nābhi-varḍddhanāt puṁso jāta-karma vidhiyate" |

tadā 'syā matā sāvitrī pitā te āchāryya ucyate" | 12485. "Tāvach

chhūdra-samo hy esha yāvad vede na jāyate" | tasmāṁ evam mati-devadhe

Manuḥ Svāyambhuvo 'brahita | kṛita-kṛtiyāḥ punar vārya yadi vṛttāṁ na

vidyate | sankarasa tatra nāgendra balavān prasāmakṣitaḥ | yatredāṁ

mahāsarpa samskritāṁ vṛttam ishyate | tam brāhmaṇam aham pūrvaṁ

uktavān bhujagottama | "12469. The Serpent said: Who may be a Brāhmaṇ, and what is

the thing to be known, o Yudhisṭhīra;—tell me, since by thy words

I infer thee to be a person of extreme intelligence. Yudhisṭhīra

replied: 12470. The Smṛti declares, o chief of Serpents, that he is a

Brāhmaṇ, in whom truth, liberality, patience, virtue, innocence, austere

cavour, and compassion are seen. And the thing to be known is the

supreme Brahma, free from pain, as well as from pleasure,—to whom,

when men have attained, they no longer sorrow. What is your

opinion? The Serpent replied: The Veda (brahma) is beneficial to

to all the four castes and is authoritative and true.290 And so we find in

290 Such is the sense assigned by the Commentator to this line, the drift of which

is not very clear. The comment runs thus: Sarparas tu brāhmaṇa-padana jāti-mātrām

evākhiṛīva śūḍre tul lakṣhaṇaṁ vyaḥbhiḥkārayati "chātury ṣyaṁ" iti sūṛddhena

chaturyāṁ vargāṁ hitam | satyaṁ pramāṇaṁ cha dharma-vaipasthāpakam brahma

vedaḥ | śūḍra-cuḍra-smṛter api veda-mula-katvāt sarvo 'py ācārōdiḥ śrutimulakah
Sudras also truth, liberality, calmness, innocence, harmlessness, and compassion. And as for the thing to be known, which is free from pain and pleasure, I perceive that there is no other thing free from these two influences. Yudhishtithra rejoined: 12475. The qualities characteristic of a Sudra do not exist in a Brahman (nor vice versa). (Were it otherwise) the Sudra would not be a Sudra, nor the Brahman a Brahman. The person in whom this regulated practice is perceived is declared to be a Brahman; and the man, in whom it is absent, should be designated as a Sudra. And as to what you say further, that there is nothing other than this (Brahma) to be known, which is free from the susceptibilities in question; this is also (my own) opinion, that there is nothing free from them. Just as between cold and heat can be neither heat nor cold, so there is nothing free from the feeling of pleasure and pain. Such is my view; or how do you consider? The Serpent remarked: 12480. If a man is regarded by you as being a Brahman only in consequence of his conduct, then birth is vain until action is shown. Yudhishtithra replied: O most sapient Serpent, birth is difficult to be discriminated in the present condition

*Ity arthah | evam cha satyadikam yadi sudre 'pyasti tarhi so 'pi bruhmana eva vyad iti aha "sudreshev api" iti | "The serpent, however, understanding by the term Brahman mere birth, shows in a sloka and a half that Yudhishtithra's definition fails by being applicable also to a Soudra. Chatuvarnya means 'beneficial to the four castes.' (Such is the Veda), which is also 'true' and 'authoritative,' as establishing what is duty. Inasmuch as the Smriti which prescribes a Soudra's conduct is itself founded on the Veda; all conduct, etc., is based on the Veda. And so if (the characters of) truth, etc., are found also in a Soudra, he too must be a Brahman—such is his argument in the words 'In Soudras also.'" According to this explanation the connection between the first line and the second and third may be as follows: The Veda is beneficial to all the castes, and therefore Soudras also, having the advantage of its guidance, although at second hand, may practise all the virtues you enumerate; but would you therefore call them Brahmans?*

341 This verse is not very lucid; but the sense may be that which I have assigned. The Commentator says: *Itaras tu bruhmana-padena brahma-vida'm vivakshite'suddruder api bruhmanateem abhyapagamyam pariharati "Sudre te" iti | Soudre-lakshya-kamadikam na bruhmana'asti na bruhmana-lakshya-samadikam sudre 'asti ity arthah | Soudre 'pi samudya-upeta bruhmana'h | bruhmano 'pi kamudy-upetata sudre eva ity arthah | "The other (Yudhishtithra), however, understanding by the word Brahmano one who knows the Veda (or, Brahman), and conceding the fact of a Soudra's Brahmanhood, obviates by the words 'but in a Soudra,' etc. (the objection thence drawn). The qualities, lust, etc., distinctive of a Soudra, do not exist in a Brahman, nor do the qualities tranquillity, etc., characteristic of a Brahman exist in a Soudra. A Soudra distinguished by the latter is a Brahman; while a Brahman characterized by lust, etc., is a Soudra."
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of humanity, on account of the confusion of all castes. All (sorts of)

243 In the tenth vol. of his Indische Studien, p. 83, Professor Weber adduces some
curious evidence of the little confidence entertained in ancient times by the Indians in the
chastity of their women. He refers to the following passages: (1) Nidāna Sutra, iii.
Vechchāveka-charāṇīḥ striyo bhavantī | saha deva-sūkṣhya cha manunyaya-sūk-
ṣhya cha yeshām putro vākṣhya teṣām putro bhavishyamī | yāmāscha putrān vākṣhya
te me putrāḥ bhavishyantī | Women are irregular in their conduct. Of whatsoever
men, I, taking gods and men to witness, shall declare myself to be the son, I shall be
their son; and they whom I shall name as my sons shall be so.” (2) S’atapatha
Brūhmaṇa, ii. 2, 1, 40. Atha yad “brūhmaṇaḥ” ātyaḥ | anadāhā iev vai asya atāḥ
purā jānam bhavati | idāṃ hy āhuh “rakṣhāmi yositham amuschante tad uta rak-
ṣhāmi eva reta ādhati iti | atha atra adhāḥ jāyate yo brūhmano yo yajnāy jāyate |
*tasmād api rājanyān vā saṅcāryān vā “brūhmaṇaḥ” ity eva bhāyit | brūhmano ki jāyate yo yajnāj āyate | tasmād āhuh “na savāna-kritān kanyād evaśi eva
garva-kritā” iti | “Now as regards what he says ‘this’ (this) Brūhman (has been con-
cerated):’ before this his birth is uncertain. For they say this that ‘Rakshasas follow
after women, and therefore that it is Rakshases who inject seed into them.’” (Compare
for 1865, p. 301.) So then he is certainly born who is born from sacred science
(brūhma) and from sacrifice. Wherefore also let him address a Rājanya or a Vaiśya
as “Brūhman,” for he is born from sacred science (brūhma), and consequently a Brūh-
man who is born from sacrifice. Hence they say “let no one slay an offerer of a
libation, for he incurs (the) sin (of Brahmanicide?) by so doing.” (3) On the next
passage of the S’ P. Br, ii. 5, 2, 20, Professor Weber remarks that it is assumed that
the wife of the person offering the Varuṇa praghāsa must have one or more para-
mours: Atha pratipras’hōtaṇa pratiparaṇi | sa patuṇām udāneṣhyan prichhati ‘kena
(jāreṇa Comm.) charati’ iti | Varuṇyaṇā vai etat stri koroti yad anyasya saty anyena
charati | atha “na id me ‘ntah-śūlpā juhved’ iti tasmāt prichhati | nīrūktaṃ vai
enah kanyā bhavati | satyaṃ hi bhavati | tasmād vai eva prichhati | sā yad na prati-
janāta nātībhya ha asya tad ohitāṃ syut | “The pratipratsthātṛ (one of the priest)
returns. Being about to bring forward the wife, he asks her, ‘with what (paramour)
dost thou keep company?’ For it is an offence incurring punishment from Varuṇa
that being the wife of one man she keeps company with another. He enquires ‘in
order that she may not sacrifice with me while she feels an inward pang.’ For a sin
when declared becomes less: for it is not ill for her relations.” (This passage is
explained in Kātyāyanā’s S’rāuta Sūtras, v. 5, 6-11.) (4) S’ P. Br. i. 3, 2, 21. Tum
u ha uvāca Yājvanavka “yathādās’tam patuṇāh astu | kas tad ādiyeta yat para-
patunāṃ vā patuṇ syut” | “Yājvanavka said this (in opposition to the doctrine of some
other teachers): ‘let the prescribed rule be followed regarding a wife. Who would
mind his wife consorting with other men?’ The last clause has reference to the
consequence which the other teachers said would follow from adopting the course they
approved, viz., that the wife of the man who did so would become an adulteress.
(5) Taitt. S. v. 6, 8, 3. Na agraṁ chiteva rūmām upeyaḥ “ayam eva reto dhanvāmi” iti |
na devitaḥ chiteva ‘nyasya striyam upeyaḥ | na trītiyaḥ chiteva kāṅchana upeyat | reto
vai etad nidhatte yad agraṁ chinute | yad upeyaḥ retasā vyādyeta | “Let not a man,
after preparing the altar for the sacred fire, approach a woman (a S’ōdra-woman,
according to the Commentator), (considering) that in doing so, he would be discharging
seed into an improper place. Let no man, after a second time preparing the fire-
men are continually begetting children on all (sorts of) women. The speech, the mode of propagation, the birth, the death of all mankind are alike. The text which follows is Vedic and authoritative: 'We who (are called upon) we recite the text.' Hence those men who have an insight into truth know that virtuous character is the thing chiefly to be desired. 'The natal rites of a male are enjoined to be performed before the section of the umbilical cord (Manu, ii. 29). Then Sāvitrī (the Gāyatrī, Manu ii. 77) becomes his mother and his altar, approach another man’s wife. Let no man, after a third time preparing the fire-altar, approach any woman: for in preparing the fire-altar he is discharging seed. Should he approach (a woman in these forbidden cases) he will miscarry with his seed.” This prohibition of adultery in a certain case, seems to prove that it was no uncommon occurrence, and is calculated, as Professor Weber remarks, to throw great doubt on the purity of blood in the old Indian families.

To explain the last elliptical expression I will quote part of the Commentator’s remarks on the beginning of Yudhishthira’s reply: Vāgūḍīnēm eva maithunasyoḥpī sūdhārayoḥ ātīt dūrñeyāḥ | tathā cha ārthāḥ “na cha itād vidmaḥ brāhmaṇāḥ svu vayam abhrāmaṇā vā” iti brāhmaṇāya-samādayam upanyasyati | manu jāty-anischeye kathām “brāhmaṇo ’ham” ityūdy abhināna-purassaram vāgūḍau pravarteta ity āṣānyaḥ “idad ārtham” iti | ātma “ye yājaṁaḥ” ity anena cha ye vayam svu brāhmaṇāḥ anye vā te vayam yājaṁaḥ iti brāhmaṇya ‘nawahāraṇaṁ dārītam | mantra-lingam api “ya evaṁ sa sān yājye” iti | . . . . Tasmād ākāra eva brāhmaṇya-niśchayahetur veda-prāṇāyām ity upasāñcharati | “As the mode of propagation is common to all the castes, just as speech, etc. are, birth is difficult to be determined. And accordingly, by the words: ‘We know not this, whether we are Brāhmaṇs or no Brāhmaṇs,’ the Veda signifies a doubt as to Brāhmaṇhood. Then, having raised the difficulty ‘how, if birth is undetermined, can a man engage in sacrifice, etc., with the previous consciousness that he is a Brāhmaṇ, etc.?’ the author answers in the words ‘this text is Vedic, etc.’ It is both shown by the words ‘we who . . . recite,’ (which mean) ‘we, whoever we are,—Brāhmaṇs or others,—we recite,’ that the fact of Brāhmaṇhood is unascertained; and this is also a characteristic of the formula, ‘whosoever I am, being he who I am, 1 recite.’” The comment concludes: “Hence he briefly infers from the authoritative character of the Veda, that conduct is the cause of certainty in regard to Brāhmaṇhood.” Prof. Aufrecht has pointed out to me that the words ye yājaṁaḥ occur in S. P. Br. i. 5, 2, 16, and in Taitt. S. i. 16, 11, 1. The Commentator on the last-named passage refers in explanation of them to Asvalayana’s S’rauta Sūtras, i. 5, 4 f., where it is said that these two words constitute the formula called āgūḥ, which comes in at the beginning of all the yājya which are unaccompanied by any anuṣṭāṇa. The Commentator interprets the two words thus: sāvah “ye” vayam hotāro dhevar yāṇu “yāja” iti preśīās te vayam “yājaṁaḥ” yājyaṁ pāṭhāmaḥ | “All we hotri priests who are called upon by the adhvarya by the word ‘recite,’ we recite, i.e. repeat the yājya.” (See Haug’s Ait. Br. ii. p. 133, and note 11.) Prof. Aufrecht thinks the words in the Commentator’s note ya evaṁ sa san yājye may be a free adaptation of Atharva V. vi. 123, 3, 4. It does not appear from what source the words na cha itād vidmaḥ etc. are derived.
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religious teacher his father (Manu, ii. 170, 225). 12485. Until he is born in the Veda, he is on a level with a Sūdra’ (Manu, ii. 172);—so, in this diversity of opinions did Manu Svāyambhuva declare. The castes (though they have done nothing) will have done all they need do,"244 if no fixed rules of conduct are observed. In such a case there is considered to be a gross confusion of castes. I have already declared that he is a Brāhman in whom purity of conduct is recognized."

The next passage from the Sāntiparvan, verses 6930 ff., is even more explicit than the last in denying any natural distinction between the people of the different castes:

_Bhrigur uvācha | Aṣrija ṛ brāhmaṇān evam pāreṇa Brahmat prajāpatiḥ | ātmā-tejo bhūni pröttan bhāskarāgni-sama-prabhūn | lataḥ satyam cha dharmam cha tapo brahma cha śāṣe tam | āchāram chaiva saucham cha svargāya vidaḍhe prabhuḥ | deva-dānava-gandharvā daityāsura maḥoragāḥ | yaksha-rākṣasa-nāgaḥ cha piśāchā manuṣyās tathā | brāhmaṇāḥ kshattriya vaiśyāḥ śūdrās cha dvija-sattama | ye chanye bhūta-sanghanām varṇāī āchāpi nirmane | brāhmaṇānāṁ sita varṇāḥ kshattriyāṇāṁ | cha lohitāḥ vaiśyāṇāṁ pitaḥ varṇāḥ śūdrāṇāṁ asitaḥ tatha | 6935.

_Bharadeva uvācha | Chāturvarnāisyā varṇena yadi varṇo vibhiyāte | svarṣeṣhāḥ khalu varṇāṇāṁ dṛiṣyate varṇa-sankaraḥ | kāmaḥ krodho bhayaḥ lobhaḥ śokaḥ chintā kshudhaḥ śramaḥ | svarṣeṣhāḥ naḥ245 prabhavati kasmād varṇo vibhiyāte | sveda-mātra-purishāṇi śleśmāḥ pīthānaḥ sa-ṣoṣi- | tam | tānuḥ ksharati svarṣeṣhāḥ kasmād varṇo vibhajyate | jangamānāṁ | asāṃkhyaḥ śāvāraṇāṁ cha jātayaḥ | teshāṁ vibhiḍha-varṇāṇāṁ kuto varṇa-viniścayaḥ | Bhrigur uvācha | Na viśeṣo 'sti varṇānāṁ sarvam brāhmaṇaṁ idānā jāgat | Brahmat pāreṇa śrīhitaṁ ki karmabhīk varṇataṁ | gataṁ | 6940.

Kāma-bhoga-priyās tikṣṇāḥ krodhanāḥ priya-sāhasāḥ |

244 The Commentator thus explains the word kṛita-kṛitya: _Kṛita-kṛityāḥ śūdra-stulyāḥ | tathā cha smṛtiḥ "na śūdre pātakaṁ kinchid na cha saṁskāram arhati" iti teshāṁ saṁskārarhateva-nischopatevaḥ bhidāṇat kṛita-kṛityenaṃ darśayati | tadeva trivarpinkā epi syur ity arthāḥ | "Kṛita kṛityāḥ (lit. having done what was to be done) means, like Sūdras; so the Smṛti (when it says), 'No sin exists in a Sūdra, nor is he fit for purificatory rites,' shews, by declaring the unfitness of this class for such rites, and its freedom from sin, that it has the character of kṛita-kṛityatvam, i.e. of having done all it had to do. And such (in the event supposed) would be the case with men of the three (upper) classes also."

245 The Calcutta edition reads na, "not," which cannot be right. The MS. in the Library of the Edinburgh University has naḥ, "of us."
tyakta-svadharmā raktāṅgūs te dvijāh kshattratāṁ gatāh | gobhoy eṛttīṁsamāsthāya pitāh krishya-upajīvināh | svā-dharmān nānutishthantī te
dvijā vaiṣyatam gatāh | hiṁsānrita-priyā lubdhāḥ sarva-karmopajīvināh
krishnāḥ saucha-parībhṛṣṭas te dvijāh śūdratāṁ gatāh | ity etāṁ kar-
mabhir evastā dvijā varṇāntaraṁ gatāh | dharmo yajna-krīyā teshāṁ
nityāṁ na pratishidhyate | ity ete chaturo varṇā yeshām brāhmaś saras-
evati | vihitā Brahmāṇā pūrein lohhāt te ajnānātaṁ gatāh | 6945.
Brahmaṇaḥ brahma-tantra-sthāna246 tapas teshāṁ na naiyāti | brahma dvā-
rayatāṁ nityāṁ vratāṁni uyaṁāṁs tathā | brahma chaiva paraṁ srishtauṁ
ye na jānanti te dvijāh | teshāṁ bahuvidhāś tv anyās tatra tatra hi
jātayaḥ | pīśāchā rākṣasāḥ preta vīvīdā mlechha-jātayaḥ | prayashta-
jāna-vidyāṅṇāṁ svacchhandāchāra-ceshṣṭitāḥ | prajā brāhmaṇa-saṁskāraḥ
sva-karma-krita-nīchayāḥ | rishiḥbhīḥ sevā tapasā śrijyante chāpāre
paraiḥ | adī-deva-samudbhūta brahma-mūla ’kṣhayā ’cayāḥ | sā srishtīr
mānāṁ nāma dharmā-tantra-parāyaṇā | 6950. Bharadeśa vaśāḥ |
Brahmāṇaḥ kena bhavaṭi kshattriyo vā dvijottama | vaiśyāḥ śūdraś cha
viprarshe tad brāhi vadaṭāṁ vara | Bṛhīgūr vaśāḥ | Jata-karmādibhir
yas tu saṁskāraḥ saṁskṛītaḥ śuchī | vedādhyayana-sampannāḥ shatṣu
karmav aevasthitāḥ | śaučāhāra-sthitāḥ sanyog vighasāśi guru-priyāḥ
nitya-eratī satyaparaṁ sa vai brāhmaṇa ucyate | satyaṁ dānam athā-
droha ānṛśāṁṣyāṁ trapā ghrīṇā | tapaḥ cha druśyate yatra sa brāhmaṇa
iti smṛītaḥ | kṣattṛa-jaṁ sevate karma vedādhyayana-sangatāḥ | dāna-
dāna-ratīr yas tu sa vai kṣattṛiṣya ucyate | 6955. Viśāṭy āśu paśubhyāś
cha krishya-adāna-raṭiḥ śuchī | vedādhyayana-sampannāḥ sa vaiśyāḥ iti
sanjītāḥ | sarca-bhaṅghya-ratīr nityāṁ sarca-karma-karo ’śuchīḥ
| tyaktā-vedas tu anāchāraḥ sa vai śūdraḥ iti smṛītaḥ | śādre chaitad
bhavel lakṣyāṁ dvije tach cha na vidyate | sa vai śūdro bhavech cẖūdro
brāhmaṇo brahmaṇo na cha |

"Bṛhīgu replied: 6930. 'Bṛhmaṁ thus formerly created the Prajā-
patis, Brahmamic,247 penetrated by his own energy, and in splendour
equalling the sun and fire. The lord then formed truth, righteousness,
austere fervour, and the eternal veda (or sacred science), virtuous
practice, and purity for (the attainment of) heaven. He also formed
the gods, Dānavas, Gandharvas, Daityas, Asuras, Mahoragas, Yakshas,

246 Brahma-tantra = vedoktīnāshkāhām | Comm.
247 Brahmāṇā, "Bṛhman," is the word employed. It may mean here "sons of
Bṛhmaṁ."
Rākshasas, Nāgas, Piśāchas, and men, Brāhmans, Kshatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras, as well as all other classes (vāṇāḥ) of beings. The colour (vāraṇa) of the Brāhmans was white; that of the Kshatriyas red; that of the Vaiśyas yellow, and that of the Śūdras black.' 248 6935. Bharadvāja here rejoins: 'If the caste (vāraṇa) of the four classes is distinguished by their colour (vāraṇa), then a confusion of all the castes is observable. Desire, anger, fear, cupidity, grief, apprehension, hunger, fatigue, prevail over us all: by what, then, is caste discriminated? Sweat, urine, excrement, phlegm, bile, and blood (are common to all); the bodies of all decay: by what then is caste discriminated? There are innumerable kinds of things moving and stationary: how is the class (vāraṇa) of these various objects to be determined?' Bhrigu replies: 'There is no difference of castes: 249 this world, having been at first created by Brahmā entirely Brahmanic, 250

248 It is somewhat strange, as Professor Weber remarks in a note to p. 215 of his German translation of the Vajra Sūtra, that in the passage of the Kāṭhaka Brāhmaṇa xi. 6, which he there quotes, a white colour is ascribed to the Vaiśya and a dark hue to the Rājanya. The words are these: Yath chhukāyāḥ (brīhīnām) adityēbhya nir-vapati tasmāḥ chhukā leva vaiśyā jāyate [yat kriṣṭahyām cēryām tasmād dhūmāna iva rājānyāḥ] "Since the Vaiśya offers an oblation of white (rice) to the Adityas, he is born as it were white; and as the Vāruṇa oblation is of black (rice) the Rājanya is as it were dusky."

249 Compare with this the words attributed in S'antiparvan, verses 2819 ff., to King Muchukunda, who had been reproached by the god Kuvera with trusting for victory to the aid of his domestic priest instead of to his own prowess: Muchukundas tataḥ krudhah pratyavēcha Dhanēvarvanam [vyāya-pūrṇam asamārabddam asambhūtam ideā vachāḥ] brahma kṣatram ideā śīrṣām ekā-yoni svayambhūrā [prīthag-bala-vadānān taṁ tattam paripālayat | tapa-mantra-balam nityam brahmaṇaśeṣu pratishṭhātam | astra-bāhu-balam nityaṁ kṣatritoṣṣhu pratishṭhātam | tāḥṣeyam sambhūya kartakaṁ prajānīṁ paripālanam | "Muchukunda then, incensed, addressed to the Lord of riches these reasonable words, which did not partake of his anger or excitement: 'Brāhmans and Kshatriyas were created by Brahmā from the same womb (or source) with different forces appointed to them: this cannot (neither of these separate forces can?) protect the world. The force of austere fervour and of sacred texts abides constantly in the Brahmins; and that of weapons and their own arms in the Kshatriyas. By these two forces combined the people must be protected.'"

250 Brāhmaṇam is the word employed. That it is to be understood in the sense of "Brahmanical" appears from the following lines in which the word devāḥ must be taken in the special signification of Brāhmans and not of "twice-born men" (who may be either Brāhmans, Kshatriyas, or Vaiśyas) in general. The Brāhmaṇ is considered to have been formed of the essence of Brahmā, and to represent the original type of perfect humanity as it existed at the creation. The Commentator takes the word brāhmaṇam as = brāhmaṇa-jātimat, "having the caste of Brāhmans;" and he explains the different colours mentioned in the next verses as follows: red (rakta)
became (afterwards) separated into castes in consequence of works. 6940. Those Brāhmans (lit. twice-born men), who were fond of sensual pleasure, fiery, irascible, prone to violence, who had forsaken their duty, and were red-limbed, fell into the condition of Kshattriyas. Those Brāhmans, who derived their livelihood from kine, who were yellow, who subsisted by agriculture, and who neglected to practise their duties, entered into the state of Vaiśyas. Those Brāhmans, who were addicted to mischief and falsehood, who were covetous, who lived by all kinds of work, who were black and had fallen from purity, sank into the condition of Sūdras. Being separated from each other by these works, the Brāhmans became divided into different castes. Duty and the rites of sacrifice have not been always forbidden to (any of) them. Such are the four classes for whom the Brahmanic Sarasvati was at first designed by Brahmā, but who through their cupidity fell into ignorance. 6945. Brāhmans live agreeably to the prescriptions of the Veda; while they continually hold fast the Veda, and observances, and ceremonies, their austere fervour (tapas) does not perish. And sacred science was created the highest thing: they who are ignorant of it are no twice-born men. Of these there are various other classes in different places, Piśāchas, Rākshasas, Pretas, various tribes of Mlechhas, who have lost all knowledge sacred and profane, and practise whatever observances they please. And different sorts of creatures with the purificatory rites of Brāhmans, and discerning their own duties, are created by different rishis through their own austere fervour. This creation, sprung from the primal god, having its root in Brahma, undecaying, imperishable, is called the mind-born creation, and is devoted to the prescriptions of duty.’ 6950. Bharadvāya again enquires: ‘What is that in virtue of which a man is a Brāhman, a Kshattriya, means “formed of the quality of passion” (rajo-guṇa-maya); yellow (piṭa) “formed of the qualities of passion and darkness” (rajas-tamo-maya), and black (krishṇa or asita) “formed of darkness only” (kevala-tamomaya).

Brāhmī. This word is thus interpreted by the Commentator: vedamayī | chatur-gūm api vargānām Brahmāḥ pūram ehitā | lobhā-dosheṇa tu ajñānatām tamo-bhāvām gatāḥ sūdrāḥ anadhitkāriyo vede jātīḥ | “Sarasvati, consisting of the Veda, was formerly designed by Brahmā for all the four castes: but the Sūdras having through cupidity fallen into ‘ignorance,’ i.e. a condition of darkness, lost their right to the Veda.” See Indische Studien, ii. 194, note, where Professor Weber understands this passage to import that in ancient times the Sūdras spoke the language of the Áryas.
a Vaiśya, or a Śūdra; tell me, o most eloquent Brahman rishi.'
Bhrigu replies: 'He who is pure, consecrated by the natal and other ceremonies, who has completely studied the Veda, lives in the practice of the six ceremonies, performs perfectly the rites of purification, who eats the remains of oblations, is attached to his religious teacher, is constant in religious observances, and devoted to truth,—is called a Brāhmaṇ. 6953. He in whom are seen truth, liberality, inoffensiveness, harmlessness, modesty, compassion, and austere fervour,—is declared to be a Brāhmaṇ. He who practises the duty arising out of the kingly office, who is addicted to the study of the Veda, and whose delights in giving and receiving,—is called a Kṣatriya. 6955. He who readily occupies himself with cattle, who is devoted to agriculture and acquisition, who is pure, and is perfect in the study of the Veda,—is denominated a Vaiśya. 6956. He who is habitually addicted to all kinds of food, performs all kinds of work, who is unclean, who has abandoned the Veda, and does not practise pure observances,—is traditionally called a Śūdra. And this (which I have stated) is the mark of a Śūdra, and it is not found in a Brāhmaṇ: (such) a Śūdra will remain a Śūdra, while the Brāhmaṇ (who so acts) will be no Brāhmaṇ.'

The passage next to be quoted recognizes, indeed, the existence of castes in the Kṛita age, but represents the members of them all as having been perfect in their character and condition, and as not differing from one another in any essential respects.

It is related in the Vanapravasana that Bhīmasena, one of the Pândus,

252 Dānam viprebhyaḥ | ādānam prajabhyāḥ, "Giving to Brāhmaṇs, receiving from his subjects."—Comm.
253 Pāsūn vāyujyāya upayoginoḥ upalabdhvā viśiti pratisṭhāhām labhate | "Who perceiving cattle to be useful for trade, 'enters,' obtains a basis (for his operations)."
—Comm. As we have seen above p. 97, these etymologies are frequently far-fetched and absurd.
254 On this verse the Commentator annotates as follows: etat satyādi–saśātanam devit vīravānīke | dharma eva varya–vibhāga kāryaḥ na jātir ity arthah | "These seven virtues, beginning with truth (mentioned in verse 6953), exist in the twice-born man of the first three classes. The sense is that righteousness, and not birth, is the cause of the division into classes." This explanation is not very lucid. But the sense seems to be that the seven good qualities referred to are the proper characteristics of the three upper castes, while the defects specified in verse 6956 are the proper distinctive marks of the Śūdras. Thus the Śūdra who has the four defects will remain a Śūdra, but a Brāhmaṇ who has them will be no Brāhmaṇ.
in the course of a conversation with his brother. Hanumāt the monkey chief, had requested information on the subject of the Yugas and their characteristics. Hanumāt’s reply is given in verses 11234 ff.:

Kriṭaṁ nāma yugaṁ tāta yatra dharmāḥ sanātanaḥ | kriṭam eva na karttavyaṁ tasmin kāle yugottame | na tatra dharmāḥ śiddanti kṣihiyante na cha vai praśaṁ | tataḥ kriṭa-yugam nāma kālena guṇatāṁ gatam | deva-dānava-gandharva-yaksha-rākṣasa-pannagaḥ | nāsan kriṭa-yuge tāta tadā na kraya-vikrayaḥ |

na śama-rig-yajur-varṇaḥ kriyaṁ nāśich cha mānavi | abhidyayam phalasṁ tatra dharmaṁ sannyāsa eva cha | na tasmin yuga-saṁsarge vyādhayo nendriya-kṣayaḥ | nāsyaṁ nāpi ruditaṁ na darpo nāpi vaikriṭaṁ |

na vigrahaṁ kutas tandri na decesho na cha pāśaṇam | 11240. Na bhayaṁ nāpi santāpo na chershyaṁ na cha matsaraḥ | tataḥ paramakam Brahma śa gatir yoginām parā | ātmā cha savra-bhū-tānaṁ śuklo Nārāyaṇas tadā | brāhmaṇaṁ kṣatāriyaṁ vaiśyaṁ śūdraṁ kṣaṁ kriṭa-lakṣaṇaṁ |

kriṭe yuge samabhavan sa-karma-niratāṁ praśaṁ | saṁśravyam saṁcāraṇāṁ sama-jnānaṁ cha kevalam | tadā hi sāmakarmāno varṇa dharme avāpnuvam | eka-deva-sadā-yuktāṁ eka-mantra-viśti-kriyāṁ |

prthigdharmas āt eka-veda dharmam ekam anuvratāṁ | cāturāśrayam-yuktena karaṇāṁ kāla-yoginā | 11245. Akāma-phala-saṁyogāḥ prāṇapunvanti parāṁ gatim | ātmā-yoga-saṁyuktāḥ dharmo 'yaṁ kriṭa-lakṣaṇaṁ |

kriṭe yuge chatushpādaś cāturcaryanāya śāśvataṁ | etat kriṭa-yugāṁ nāma traigunya-parivarjitaṁ | tretām api nibodha tvāṁ tasmin saltram pravarttate | pādaṁ krasate dharmo rakṣatām yāti cāchyutayā |

satya-pravrīttās cha narāḥ kriya-ṛahaṁ-pārayaṁ | tato yajnaḥ pravarttante dharmāscha vividhāṁ kriyaṁ |


225 Both were sons of Vāyu. See verses 11134, 11169 f. and 11176 f. of this same book. The Rāmāyaṇa is mentioned in verse 11177.

226 The MS. in the Edinburgh University Library reads as the last pāda: dāna-dhyayanā-vīrāmaḥ.

227 The Edinburgh MS. reads vedaṁ instead vṛgaṁ.

228 Kūpātām—Comm.

229 Vairam—Comm.
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kṛitāḥ | satteṣaṇa chehā vibhrāṃśat satye kaścid avasthitāḥ | sattvaḥ prachyavamānānāṁ vyadhayo bahavo bhavan | 11255. Kāmās chopardravāschaiva tadā vai daiva-kāritāḥ | yair ardyamānāḥ subhṛṣam tapas tapyanti mānaḥvā | kāma-kāmāḥ svarga-kāma yajñāṁs tanvanti chāpāre | evaḥ dvāparam āsādyā prajāḥ kṣhiyanty adharmataḥ | pādenaikunā Kauṇteya dharme kali-yuge sthitāḥ | tāmasyām yugam āsādyā kriyāno bhavati Kesavāḥ | vedāchārāḥ prasāmyanti dharma-yajna-kriyās tathāḥ | itayo vyādhayaḥ trandri doṣāḥ krodhādayās tathāḥ | upadraucāḥ cha varttante ādhayaḥ kshud bhayam tathāḥ | yugese āvarttamāneshu dharma vyāvarttate punah | dharme vyāvarttamāne tu loko vyāvarttate punah | loka kṣhinge kshaṇam yānti bhācā loka-praavarttakah | yuga-kshaya-kritā dharmaḥ prārthanānī vikurvate | etat kalyugam nāma achariṇā yat pravarttate | yugānuvarttanaṁ te etat kurvanti chitrajevināḥ |

“11234. The Krita is that age in which righteousness is eternal. In the time of that most excellent of Yogas (everything) had been done (kṛita), and nothing (remained) to be done. Duties did not then languish, nor did the people decline. Afterwards, through (the influence of) time, this yuga fell into a state of inferiority. In that age there were neither Gods, Dānavas, Gandharvas, Yakshas, Rākshasas, nor Pannagas; no buying or selling went on; the Vedas were not classed as Sāman, Rich, and Yajush; no efforts were made by men: the fruit (of the earth was obtained) by their mere wish: righteousness and abandonment of the world (prevailed).

250 The Edinburgh MS. reads satteśa instead of satye.
251 In thus rendering, I follow the Commentator, whose gloss is this: Mukhyam apy anukhyatam gatam | “although the chief, it fell into inferiority.” In Bōhtlingk and Roth’s Lexicon this line is quoted under the word gugata, to which the sense of “superiority, excellence,” is assigned.
252 Compare with this the verses of the Vāyu Purāṇa quoted in p. 90, which state that in the Krita age there were neither plants nor animals; which are the products of unrighteousness.
253 I do not venture to translate “there was then no [division of the Veda into] Sāman, Rich, and Yajush, nor any castes,” (1) because the Edinburgh MS. reads vedāḥ instead of vārgāh, and the Commentator does not allude to the word vārgāh; and (2) castes (vārgāh) are referred to below (verses 11242 f.) as existing, though without much distinction of character. The Commentator explains: trayi-dharmasya chittaśuddhy-arthatē tasyāḥ cha tadānūṁ savbhāvateit na śiṃādiny āsan | “As the object of the triple veda is purity of heart, and as that existed naturally at that period, there were no (divisions of) Sāman, etc.”
254 I follow the Commentator whose gloss is: “Mānavē kriyā” krishy-ūdy-ārambhā bhūta | kintu “abhidhāyā phalam,” sankalpōd eva sarvam sampadyate |
AND OF THE ORIGIN OF THE FOUR CASTES.

No disease or decline of the organs of sense arose through the influence of the age; there was no malice, weeping, pride, or deceit; no contention, and how could there be any lassitude? no hatred, cruelty, (1240) fear, affliction, jealousy, or envy. Hence the supreme Brahma was the transcendent resort of those Yogins. Then Nārāyaṇa, the soul of all beings, was white. Brāhmans, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras possessed the characteristics of the Kṛta. In that age were born creatures devoted to their duties. They were alike in the object of their trust, in observances and in their knowledge. At that period the castes, alike in their functions, fulfilled their duties, were unceasingly devoted to one deity, and used one formula (mantra), one rule, and one rite. Though they had separate duties, they had but one Veda, and practised one duty. By works connected with the four orders, and dependent on conjunctions of time, (11245) but unaffected by desire, or (hope of) reward, they attained to supreme felicity. This complete and eternal righteousness of the four castes during the Kṛta was marked by the character of that age and sought after union with the supreme soul. The Kṛta age was free from the three qualities. Understand now the Tretā, in which sacrifice commenced, righteousness decreased by a fourth, Vishnu became red;

In verse 12981 of this same Vanaprśa the god says of himself: svetah kṛtyasvarṇah pītas tretāyugamama | raktō deśāparam āśūtya kṛishṇah kali-yugoyathā | “My colour in the Kṛta age is white, in the Tretā yellow, when I reach the Dvāpara it is red, and in the Kali black.”

The Commentator’s gloss is: kṛitinā svataḥ siddhiḥ laukṣaṇaṁ ārdo damas tapa ityādini yeshāṁ te | “They were men whose characteristics, tranquillity, etc., were effected, spontaneously accomplished.” On verse 11245 he explains the same term kṛita-lakṣaṇaḥ by kṛita-yuga-sūchakaḥ, “indicative of the Kṛta age.”

The different clauses of this line can only be reconciled on the supposition that the general principle of duty, and the details of the duties are distinguished. Dharma is the word used in both parts of the verse for “duty.”

Kūla-yojinā. The Commentator explains: kūla darsādih | tad-yuktena | “connected with time, i.e. the appearance of the new moon, etc.”

And yet we are told in the Vāyu P. that the creation itself proceeded from the influence of the quality of passion (see above, p. 75), and that the four castes when originally produced were characterized in different ways by the three qualities, pp. 62 and 89.

Compare Sānti-parva, 13088. Idam kṛita-yugam nāma kūlaḥ ivres-thāḥ pravartitaḥ | ahūkṣaḥ yajna-pāsavo yugamāmin na tad anyathā | chatusshpati sakalo dharmo bhavishyatyaatra vaivāṣūḥ | tatas tretā-yugam nāma trayi yatva bhavishyatā | prokshtā yatva pāsavo badham prāpyanti vai makhe | “This Kṛta age is the most excellent of periods: then victims are not allowed to be slaughtered; complete and
and men adhered to truth, and were devoted to a righteousness dependent on ceremonies. Then sacrifices prevailed, with holy acts and a variety of rites. In the Treta men acted with an object in view, seeking after reward for their rites and their gifts, and no longer disposed to austerities and to liberality from (a simple feeling of) duty. 11250. In this age, however, they were devoted to their own duties, and to religious ceremonies. In the Dvapara age righteousness was diminished by two quarters, Vishnu became yellow, and the Veda fourfold. Some studied four Vedas, others three, others two, others one, and some none at all. 271 The scriptures being thus divided, ceremonies were celebrated in a great variety of ways; and the people being occupied with austerity and the bestowal of gifts, became full of passion (rājasa). Owing to ignorance of the one Veda, Vedas were multiplied. And now from the decline of goodness (sattva) few only adhered to truth. When men had fallen away from goodness, many diseases, (11255) desires and calamities, caused by destiny, assailed them, by which they were severely afflicted, and driven to practice austerities. Others desiring enjoyments and heavenly bliss, offered sacrifices. Thus, when they had reached the Dvapara, men declined through unrighteousness. In the Kali righteousness remained to the extent of one-fourth only. Arrived in that age of darkness, Vishnu became black: practices enjoined by the Vedas, works of righteousness, and rites of sacrifice, ceased. Calamities, diseases, fatigue, faults, such as anger, etc., distresses, anxiety, hunger, fear, prevailed. As the ages revolve, righteousness again declines. When this takes place, the people also decline. When they decay, the impulses which actuate them also decay. The practices generated by this declension of the Yugas frustrate men's aims. Such is the Kali Yuga which has existed for a short time. Those who are long-lived act in conformity with the character of the age."

The next passage from the same book (the Vana-parvan) does not make any allusion to the Yugas, but depicts the primeval perfection of mankind with some traits peculiar to itself, and then goes on to describe their decline. Markandeya is the speaker.

perfect righteousness will prevail. Next is the Treta in which the triple Veda will come into existence; and animals will be slain in sacrifice.” See note 65, page 39, above.

271 The Commentator explains anirahas ("without the Rig-veda") by krita-kṛityōḥ. On the sense of the latter word see above.

"The first-born Prajāpati formed the bodies of corporeal creatures pure, spotless, and obedient to duty. The holy men of old were not frustrated in the results at which they aimed; they were religious, truth-speaking, and partook of Brahma’s nature. Being all like gods they ascended to the sky and returned at will. They died too when they desired, suffered few annoyances, were free from disease, accomplished all their objects, and endured no oppression. Self-subdued and free from envy, they beheld the gods and the mighty rishis, and had an intuitive perception of all duties. They lived for a thousand years, and had each a thousand sons. Then at a later period of time, the in-

727 See the passage from S'ankara’s Commentary on the Brahma Sūtras i. 3, 32, in the 3rd vol. of this work, pp. 49 f., and note 49 in p. 95 ; and S'atapatha Brāhmaṇa, ii. 3, 4, 4, ubhaye ha vai idam agre saha 'śur devaiḥ cha manushyās cha' | tad yad ha sma manushyaṁ na bhavati tad ha devaṁ yāchante "idāṁ vai no nāsti idāṁ no ste" iti | te tasyai eva yāchaṁyai deshena devaiḥ tirobhaṁta "na id hināsanī na id deşhaya 'śūni'" iti | "Gods and men, together, were both originally (component parts of) this world. Whatever men had not they asked from the gods, saying, ‘We have not this; let us have it.’ From dislike of this solicitation the gods disappeared, (saying each of them) ‘let me not hurt (them), let me not be hateful.’"

Compare also the passage of the S’ P. Br. iii. 6, 2, 26, referred to by Professor Weber in Indische Studien, x. 158: Te ha dēva manuṣhāyā pitarāh sāmpibante | uśaśa sāmpī | te ha dēva dṛṣṭiyāmānā eva purā sāmpibante uta etarhy adṛṣṭiyāmānāḥ | "Both gods, men, and fathers drink together. This is their symposium. Formerly they drank together visibly: now they do so unseen." Compare also Plato, Philebus, 18: Kai dè mēn palaioi, kriptontes ἡμῶν καὶ ἐγγυνέω θεῶν ἀκοῦσας, tauton φιλομ βασιλέων, "And the ancients who were better than ourselves, and dwelt nearer to the gods, have handed down this tradition."
habitants of the earth became subject to desire and anger, and subsisted by deceit and fraud. Governed by cupidity and delusion, devoted to carnal pursuits, sinful men by their evil deeds walked in crooked paths leading to hell,” etc., etc.

At the end of the chapter of the Bhāshmaparvan, entitled Jambū-khaṇḍa-nirmanā, there is a paragraph in which Sanjaya gives an account of the four yugas in Bhāratavarsha (Hindustan), and of the condition of mankind during each of those periods. After stating the names and order of the yugas, the speaker proceeds:

389. Chatārī tu sahasrāṇī varshānāṁ Kuru-sattama | āyuḥ-sankhyā krita-yuge sankhyātā rāja-sattama | tathā trīṇi sahasrāṇī tretāyāṁ ma-nujādhīpa | dve sahastra devāpare cha bhūvi tishtantī sāmpratam | na pramāṇa-sthītir hy asti tishye 'smin Bharatarṣabha | garbha-sthāś cha mriyante cha tathā jātā mriyanti cha | mahābalā mahāsatvāḥ prajnā-guṇa-samanvaitāḥ | prajāyante cha jātās cha sataśo 'tha sahasrāsah | jātāḥ krita-yuge rājan dhanināḥ priya-darśināḥ | prajāyante cha jātās cha maunayo vai tapodhanāḥ | mahotsāhāḥ maḥātmāno dharmikāh satya-vādīnāḥ | priyadarśanā vaipushmanto mahāvīryā dhanurdharaḥ | varārāḥ yudhi jāyante kṣhattriyāḥ śūra-sattamāḥ | tretāyāṁ kṣhattriyā rājan surve vai chakravarttināḥ | āyuḥmanto mahāvīrā dhanurdhara-sarā yudhi | jāyante kṣhattriyā virās tretāyāṁ vāsa-varttināḥ | sace varṇā mahārāja jāyante devāpore sati | mahotsāhā viryavantāḥ paraspara-jayaśiṣṭaḥ | tejasā 'lpena samyuktāḥ krodhanāṁ purusā nirpa | lubdhā anṛitakāś chaiva tishye jāyanti Bhārata | iśrā mānas tathā krodho māya 'sūyā tathāvita cha | tishye bhavati bhūtanāṁ rāgo lobhācha Bhārata | sankshepo vart-rājan devāpare 'smin narādhīpa |

“389. Four thousand years are specified as the duration of life in the Kṛta age,274 three thousand in the Tretā, and two thousand form the period at present established on earth in the Dwāpara. There is no fixed measure in the Tīshya (Kali): embryos die in the womb, as well as children after their birth. Men of great strength, goodness, wisdom, and virtue were born, and born too in hundreds and thousands. In the Kṛta age men were produced opulent and beautiful, as well as munis rich in austere fervour. Energetic, mighty, righteous, veracious, beautiful, well-formed, valorous, bow-carrying, (395) heroic Kṣhattriyas,

274 See above, p. 91, note 174.
distinguished in battle, were born. In the Tretā all sovereigns were Kahattriyas. Heroic Kshattriyas were born in the Tretā, long-lived, great warriors, carrying bows in the fight, and living subject to authority. During the Dvāpara all castes are produced, energetic, valorous, striving for victory over one another. In the Tishya age are born men of little vigour, irascible, covetous, and mendacious. During that period, envy, pride, anger, delusion, ill-will, desire, and cupidity prevail among all beings. During this Dvāpara age there is some restriction."

As it is here stated that men of all castes were born in the Dvāpara, while Brāhmaṇa and Kshattriyas only are spoken of as previously existing, it is to be presumed that the writer intends to intimate that no Vaishyas or Sudras existed during the Krita and Tretā ages. This accords with the account given in the passage quoted above from the Uttara Kanda of the Rāmāyaṇa, chapter 74, as well as with other texts which will be quoted below.

The following verses might be taken for a rationalistic explanation of the traditions regarding the yugas; but may be intended as nothing more than a hyperbolical expression of the good or bad effects of a king's more or less active discharge of his duties:


"2674. The time is either the cause of the king, or the king is the cause of the time. Do not doubt (which of these alternatives is true): the king is the cause of the time. When a king occupies himself fully in criminal justice, then the Kṛita age, brought into existence by time,

375 It does not appear clearly whether we are to suppose them to have been produced in the Kṛita, or in the Tretā, as in the passage of the Rāmāyaṇa, quoted in page 119.
prevails.” [Then follows a description of such good government: righteousness alone is practised; prosperity reigns; the seasons are pleasant and salubrious; longevity is universal; no widows are seen; and the earth yields her increase without cultivation.]

“2682. When the king practises criminal justice only to the extent of three parts, abandoning the fourth, then the Tretā prevails.” [Then evil is introduced to the extent of a fourth, and the earth has to be tilled.] “2684. When the king administers justice with the omission of a half, then the period called the Dvāpara prevails.” [Then evil is increased to a half, and the earth even when tilled yields only half her produce.] “2686. When, relinquishing criminal law altogether, the king actively oppresses his subjects, then the Kali age prevails.” [Then the state of things, which existed in the Kṛita age, is nearly reversed.] “2693. The king is the creator of the Kṛita, Tretā, and Dvāpara ages, and the cause also of the fourth yuga.”

The next extract is on the same subject of the duties of a king, and on the yugas as forms of his action (see Manu, ix. 301, quoted above, p. 49):

Sānti-parvan, 3406. Karma śūdre kṛishva vaiśya daṇḍa-nātiṣ cha rājāni | brāhmaṇaḥ yāyaṃ tapo maṇstrāḥ satyaṁ chāpi dejātishu | teshāṃ yaḥ kṣattriyo veda vastrāṇām iva ṣodhanam | śīla-doshāṃ vinirharttaṁ sa pītā sa praṇāpateḥ | kṛitaṁ tretāvīrṣaṁ cha kāliś Bharatarśabha | rāja-vṛttāṇi sarvāṇi rājāva yugam uchyate | chāturāṃgaṁ ṣodāḥ vedās chāturāśramyang eva cha | sarvāṃ pramuhyaḥ hy etad yadā rājā pramādyati |

“3406. Labour (should be found) in a Śūdra, agriculture in a Vaiśya, criminal justice in a King, continence, austere fervour, and the use of sacred texts in a Brāhmaṇa. The Kṣattra, who knows how to separate their good and bad qualities, (as (a washerman) understands the cleansing of clothes), is a father and lord of his subjects. The Kṛita, Tretā, Dvāpara, and Kali, are all modes of a King’s action. It is a King who is called by the name of Yuga. The four castes, the Vedas, and the four orders, are all thrown into disorder when the king is regardless.”

176 This comparison is more fully expressed in a preceding verse (3404): Ye na jānuṣṭi nirharttaṁ vastrāṇām rajasā malam | raktāṇāṃ va ṣodāhyutāṁ yathā nāsti tathaiva saḥ |
AND OF THE ORIGIN OF THE FOUR CASTES.

In two of the preceding passages different colours are represented as characteristic either of particular castes (Sānti-p. verses 6934 ff.), or of particular yugas (Vana-p. verses 11241 ff.). Colours (though not ranked in the same order of goodness) are similarly connected with moral and physical conditions in verses 10058 ff. of the Sāntiparvan, of which I shall offer a few specimens:

**Shāj jīva-varṇāḥ paramāṇaṁ kṛishṇo dhūmo niśam athāśya madhyam | raktaṁ punaḥ sahyataram sukham tu hāridra-varṇam susukhaṁ cha suklam | parantu śuklam vimalaṁ viśokaṁ gata-klaśaṁ siddhyati dānadvendra | gatevā tu yoni-prabhavānī daitya sahasraśaṁ siddhim upaiti jīvaḥ | 10060. . . . Gatiḥ punar varṇa-kritā praṇāmaṁ varṇas tathā kāla-kriito 'surendra | . . . . 10062. Krīṣṇasya varṇasya gatir nikriṣṭā sa sajate narakā pachyamānaḥ |**

"10058. Six colours of living creatures are of principal importance, black, dusky, and blue which lies between them; then red is more tolerable, yellow is happiness, and white is extreme happiness. White is perfect, being exempted from stain, sorrow, and exhaustion; (possessed of it) a being going through (various) births, arrives at perfection in a thousand forms. 10060. . . . Thus destination is caused by colour, and colour is caused by time. . . . 10062. The destination of the black colour is bad. When it has produced its results, it clings to hell."

The next passage, from the Harivānśa, assigns to each of the four castes a separate origin, but at the same time gives an explanation of their diversity which differs from any that we have yet encountered: unless, indeed, any one is prepared to maintain that the four principles, out of which the castes are here represented to have arisen, are respectively identical with the mouth, arms, thighs, and feet of Brahmā! This passage, however, corresponds with one of those already quoted in associating different colours with the several castes. The question with which the passage opens refers to an account which had been given in the preceding section (verses 11799 ff.) of the creation of Bhṛigu and Angiras, to both of whom the epithet "progenitor of Brāhmans" (*brahma-vāṁśa-kara*) is applied. No mention is made there of Kshattriyas or any other castes. M. Langlois, the French translator of the Harivānśa, remarks that the distinction between the age of the Brāhmans and that of the Kshattriyas is an unusual one, and receives
no explanation in the context. But in two of the passages which have been quoted above (1) from the Uttara Kānda of the Rāmāyaṇa, chapter 74 (p. 119), and (2) from the Bhisma-parva of the Mahābhārata, verses 393 ff. (p. 149), I think we find indications that the Kṛita Yuga was regarded as an age in which Brāhmans alone existed, and that Kṣattriyas only began to be born in the Tretā.


"Janamejaya says: 11808. I have heard, o Brāhmaṇ, the (description of the) Brahma Yuga, the first of the ages. I desire also to be accurately informed, both summarily and in detail, about the age of the

277 The printed text reads nāsaṁskṛitena; but na saṁskṛitena seems necessary.
Kshatriyas, with its numerous observances, illustrated as it was by sacrifices, and described as it has been by men skilled in the art of narration. Vaiśampāyana replied: 11810. I shall describe to you that age revered for its sacrifices and distinguished for its various works of liberality, as well as for its people. Those Munis of the size of a thumb had been absorbed by the sun’s rays. Following a rule of life leading to final emancipation, practising unobstructed ceremonies, both in action and in abstinence from action constantly intent upon Brahma, united to Brahma as the highest object,—Brāhmans glorious and sanctified in their conduct, leading a life of continence, disciplined by the knowledge of Brahma,—Brāhmans complete in their observances, perfect in knowledge, and contemplative,—when at the end of a thousand yugas, their majesty was full, these Munis became involved in the dissolution of the world. 11815. Then Vishṇu sprung from Brahma, removed beyond the sphere of sense, absorbed in contemplation, became the Prajāpati Daksha, and formed numerous creatures. The Brāhmans, beautiful (or, dear to Soma),728 were formed from an imperishable (akṣara), the Kshatriyas from a perishable (kshara), element, the Vaiśyas from alteration, the Śūdras from a modification of smoke. While Vishṇu was thinking upon the castes (varṇān), Brāhmans were formed with white, red, yellow, and blue colours (varṇāiḥ).729 Hence in the world men have become divided into castes, being of four descriptions, Brāhmans, Kshatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras, one in form, distinct in their duties, two-footed, very wonderful, full of energy(), skilled in expedients in all their occupations. 11820. Rites are declared to be prescribed by the Vedas for the three (highest) castes. By that contemplation practised by the being sprung from Brahma (see v. 11815) —by that practised in his character as Vishṇu,—the Lord Prāchetas (Daksha), i.e. Vishṇu the great contemplator (yogin), passed through his wisdom and energy from that state of meditation into the sphere of works.730 Next the Śūdras, produced from extinction, are destitute

728 In verse 11802, we read abhīṣhitṛṣya tu Somaḥ cha yauvarūja Pitāmahaḥ | brāhmaṇānān cha rājanānān rāvaṭaṇāṁ rajanī-charam | “Brahma also inaugurated Soma as the heir to the kingdom, as the king of the Brāhmans who walks eternally through the night.”

729 This play upon the two senses of the word varga will be noticed.

730 I do not profess to be certain that I have succeeded in discovering the proper meaning of this last sentence.
of rites. Hence they are not entitled to be admitted to the purificatory ceremonies, nor does sacred science belong to them. Just as the cloud of smoke which rises from the fire on the friction of the fuel, and is dissipated, is of no service in the sacrificial rite, so too the Śûdras wandering over the earth, are altogether (useless for purposes of sacrifice) owing to their birth, their mode of life devoid of purity and their want of the observances prescribed in the Veda.”

The next extract gives an account at variance with all that precedes, as it does not assign to all the Brāhmans themselves the same origin, but describes the various kinds of officiating priests as having been formed from different members of Vishnu’s body:

Harivaṃśa, 1135. Evam ekāraṇaeva bhūte śete loke mahādyutīḥ | prachchhādyā nalsilam sarvaṁ Hariṁ Nārāyaṇaḥ prabhuh | mahato rajasa madhye mahāraṇa-samasya vai | virajasko mahābāhur akṣharam brāhmaṇaḥ viduḥ | ātma-rūpa-prakāśena tapasā saṁveṣitaḥ prabhuh | trikam āchhādyā kālam | tu tataḥ sūheśva paras tadā | purusho yajna ity evam yat param parikṛtān | yach chānyat purushākhyāṁ tu tat sarvam purushottamaḥ | ye cha yajnopravā viprā ritvijā iti saṁjñitaḥ | ātma-dehāt purā bhūta yajnebhyāḥ śrūyatām tadā | 11360. Brahmāṇam paramaṁ vaktrod udgatārām cha sāma-gaṁ | hotāraṁ atha chādhevṛūyam bāhubhyāṁ asṛjat prabhuh | brāhmaṇo brāhmaṇatvāc cha prastotārām cha sarvasaḥ | tam maitrā- | varunam spṛṣṭvā pratishtātāram eva cha | udarāt pratiḥartāram po- | tārāṁ chaiva Bhārata | aĉhāvākam aṭhurubhyāṁ neshtāram chaiva | Bhārata | pāṇibhyām athaḥcāṅgātāram brahmaṇyaṁ chaiva yajniyam | grāvāṇam atha bāhubhyāṁ unnataṁ cha yānjikam | evam evaśa bha- | gavāṁ shoḍasāitān jagatpatiḥ | pravacanī praveya-yaññānam ātvijō ’ṣrjād | uttamām | tad esha vai yajnamāyaḥ purusko veda-jaṁjñitaḥ | vedāś cha | tanmayāḥ sarve sāṅgopanishada-kriyāḥ |

Vaisampāyana said: 1135. “Thus the glorious Lord Hari Nārāyaṇa, covering the entire waters, slept on (the world) which had become one sea, in the midst of the vast expanse of fluid 281 (rajas), resembling a mighty ocean, himself free from passion (virajaskah), with mighty arms:—Brāhmans know him as the undecaying. Invested through austere fervour with the light of his own form, and clothed with triple time (past, present, and future), the Lord then slept. Purushottama

281 Rājas is said in two places of the Nirukta, iv. 19, and x. 44, to have the sense of “water.”
(Vishnu) is whatever is declared to be the highest, Purusha the sacrifice, and everything else which is known by the name of Purusha. Hear how the Brâhmans devoted to sacrifice, and called rîtvijes, were formerly produced by him from his own body for offering sacrifices. 11360. The Lord created from his mouth the brâhman, who is the chief, and the udgâtri, who chants the Sâman; from his arms the hotri and the adhvaryu. He then ... 282 created the prastotri, the maitrâvaruna, and the pratishthâtri; from his belly the prathhartri and the potri, from his thighs the achhavaka and the neshtri, from his hands the agnîdra and the sacrificial brahmaṇya, from his arms the grâvan and the sacrificial unnetri. Thus did the divine Lord of the world create these sixteen excellent rîtvijes, the utterers of all sacrifices. Therefore this Purusha is formed of sacrifice and is called the Veda; and all the Vedas with the Vedângas, Upanishads, and ceremonies, are formed of his essence."

SECT. XII.—Extracts from the Bhâgavata Purâna on the same subject.

I will conclude my quotations from the Purânas on the subject of the origin of mankind and of castes with a few passages from the Bhâgavata Purâna. The first extract reproduces some of the ideas of the Purusha Sûkta283 more closely than any of the Puranic accounts yet given.

ii. 5, 34. Varsha-pûga-sahasrânte tad aṇḍam udake śayam | kālakarma-svabhâva-stho jīvo jîvam ajîvayat | 35. Sa eva Purushas tasmād aṇḍam nirbhedya nirgatah | sahasro-re-anghri-bâhe-akshaḥ sahasrânana-sīrshavân | 36. Yasyehâvayavair lokân kalpayanti maniśiṇah | katu-

282 I am unable to make a proper sense out of the words brahmaṇa brahmâyateuḥ ccha, which, however, as I learn from Dr. FitzEdward Hall, are found (with only a difference of long and short vowels) in the best MSS. to which he has access, as well as in the Bombay edition. One of the sixteen priests, the Brâhmanâchâhmasin, is not found in the enumeration, and his name may therefore have stood at the beginning of the line. Instead of the inept reading sarvasâḥ, at the end, the author may perhaps have written vakshasâḥ, "from his chest," as, indeed, one MS. reads in the next line. The Bombay edition reads prishthât, "from the back," instead of srishtvā.

283 M. Burnouf remarks in the Preface to the first vol. of his edition of the Bhâgavata, pp. exxii. ff., on the manner in which its author has gone back to Vedic sources for his materials. The same thing is noticed by Professor Weber, Indische Studien, i. 286, note.
"34. At the end of many thousand years the living soul which resides in time, action, and natural quality gave life to that lifeless egg floating on the water. 35. Purusha then having burst the egg, issued from it with a thousand thighs, feet, arms, eyes, faces, and heads. 36. With his members the sages fashion the worlds, the seven lower worlds with his loins, etc., and the seven upper worlds with his groin, etc. 37. The Brähman (was) the mouth of Purusha, the Kshattriya his arms, the Vaiśya was born from the thighs, the Sūdra from the feet of the divine being. The earth was formed from his feet, the air from his navel; the heaven by the heart, and the mahaarloka by the breast of the mighty one."

In the following verse the figurative character of the representation is manifest:

ii. 1, 37. Brahmānamam kshattr-bhuyo mahātmā vid-urur anghri-
śrita-krīsha-varnāḥ

"The Brähman is his mouth; he is Kshattriya-armed, that great One, Vaiśya-thighed, and has the black caste abiding in his feet."

The next passage is more in accord with the ordinary representation, though here, too, the mystical view is introduced at the close:

iii. 22, 2. Brahmā 'svijut vca-mukhato yushmān utma-paripaśyāḥ

"Brahmā, who is formed of the Veda (chhandas), with a view to the recognition of himself, created you (the Brähmans) who are characterized by austere fervour, science, devotion and chastity, from his mouth. For their protection he, the thousand-footed, created us (the Kshattriyas) from his thousand arms: for they declare the Brähman to be his heart, and the Kshattriya his body."

iii. 6, 29 ff. contains another reference to the production of the castes:

29. Mukhato 'varttata brahma Purushasya Kurudevaha | yastān- mukhatvād varnaṇām mukhya 'bhūd brāhmaṇo guruḥ | 30. Bāhubhya 'varttata kshattrāṁ kshattriyas tad-anuvrataḥ | yo jātas trāyate varnaṇ

"29. From the mouth of Purusha, o descendant of Kuru, issued divine knowledge (brahma), and the Brāhman, who through his production from the mouth became the chief of the castes and the preceptor. 30. From his arms issued kingly power (kshatra), and the Kshattriya devoted to that function, who, springing from Purusha, as soon as born defends the castes from the injury of enemies. 31. From the thighs of the Lord issued the arts, affording subsistence to the world; and from them was produced the Vaiśya who provided the maintenance of mankind. 32. From the feet of the divine Being sprang service for the fulfilment of duty. In it the Śūdra was formerly born, with whose function Hari is well satisfied. By fulfilling their own duties, with faith, for the purification of their souls, these castes worship Hari their parent, from whom they have sprung together with their functions."

In viii. 5, 41, we find the following:

Vipro mukhād brahma cha yasya guhyāmn rājanya āśid bhujayor balaṁ cha | ārvo vīḍ ojो'ṅghiv aveda-śūdrau prasidatāṁ naḥ sa mahā- vibhūtiḥ |

"May that Being of great glory be gracious to us, from whose mouth sprang the Brāhman and the mysterious Veda, from whose arms came the Rājanya and force, from whose thighs issued the Viś and energy, and whose foot is no-veda (aveda) and the Śūdra."

The same work gives the following very brief account of the Arvāk-srotas creation, which is described with somewhat more detail in the passages extracted above from the Vishnū and Vāyu Purāṇas:

iii. 20, 25. Arvāk-srotas tu navamanḥ kshattar eka-vidho nṛṇāṁ | rajo 'dhiṁkāḥ karma-parāḥ duḥkhe cha sukhā-māṁnaḥ |

The word so rendered is viśaḥ, which in the hymns of the Rig-veda has always the sense of "people." Here, however, it seems to have the sense assigned in the text, if one may judge from the analogy of the following verse, in which the Śūdra is said to be produced from his special function, śuṛuṣāḥ, "service." The Commentator explains viśaḥ = kṛishya-ūḍi-ravasāyūḥ, "the professions of agriculture," etc.
"The Arvakrsrotas creation was of one description, viz., of men, in whom the quality of passion abounded, who were addicted to works, and imagined that in pain they experienced pleasure."

In vi. 6, 40, a new account is given of the origin of mankind. We are there told:

_Aryamno Mātrikā patnī tayoḥ Charshaṇayaḥ sutah | yatra vai mānushī jātir Brahmaṇaḥ chopakalpitā |

"The wife of Aryaman (the son of Aditi) was Mātrikā. The Charshaṇis were the sons of this pair, and among them the race of men was formed by Brahmā. The word _charshani_ signifies "men," or "people" in the Veda.

In the following verse (which forms part of the legend of Purūravas, quoted in the 3rd vol. of this work, pp. 27 ff.) it is declared that in the Kṛita age there was only one caste:

_ix. 14, 48. Eka eva purā vedah praṇavaḥ sarva-vāṁmayah | devo Nārāyaṇo nānya eko 'gnir varṇa eva cha | Purūravasa evāsīt trayi tretā-mukhe nripa |

"There was formerly but one Veda, the _praṇava_ (the monosyllable _Om_), the essence of all speech; only one god, Nārāyaṇa, one Agni, and (one) caste. From Purūravas came the triple Veda, in the beginning of the Tretā."

Some of the Commentator's remarks on this text will be found in vol. iii. p. 29. He says the one caste was called "Hansa" (_varṇas cha eka eva haṁsa nāma_), and concludes his note by remarking: "The meaning is this: In the Kṛita age when the quality of goodness predominated in men, they were almost all absorbed in meditation; but in the Tretā, when passion prevailed, the method of works was manifested by the division of the Vedas, etc."

285 The Sāṅkhya Kārikā, 53, says: _aṅga-vaikalpo daivas tairagyonyayav cha panchadhā bhavati mānushyas chaika-viḍīkāh samāsato bhautikah sargah_; which is thus translated by Mr. Colebrooke (in Wilson's Sāṅkhya Kārikā, p. 164): "The divine kind is of eight sorts; the grovelling is five-fold; mankind is single in its class. This, briefly, is the world of living beings." The Commentator Gaudapāda shortly explains the words _mānushyas chaika-viḍīkāh_ by _mānushayonīr ekaiya_, "the source of production of mankind is one only." Vijñāna Bhikṣu, the Commentator on the Sāṅkhya Pravachana, iii. 46, paraphrases the same words thus, _mānushya-sargaḥ chaika-prakāraḥ_, "the human creation is of one sort."
Sect. XIII.—Results of this Chapter.

The details which I have supplied in the course of this chapter must have rendered it abundantly evident that the sacred books of the Hindus contain no uniform or consistent account of the origin of castes; but, on the contrary, present the greatest varieties of speculation on this subject. Explanations mystical, mythical, and rationalistic, are all offered in turn; and the freest scope is given by the individual writers to fanciful and arbitrary conjecture.

First: we have the set of accounts in which the four castes are said to have sprung from progenitors who were separately created; but in regard to the manner of their creation we find the greatest diversity of statement. The most common story is that the castes issued from the mouth, arms, thighs, and feet of Purusha, or Brahmā. The oldest extant passage in which this idea occurs, and from which all the later myths of a similar tenor have no doubt been borrowed, is, as we have seen, to be found in the Purusha Sūkta; but it is doubtful whether, in the form in which it is there presented, this representation is anything more than an allegory. In some of the texts which I have quoted from the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, traces of the same allegorical character may be perceived; but in Manu and the Puranas the mystical import of the Vedic text disappears, and the figurative narration is hardened into a literal statement of fact. In other passages, where a separate origin is assigned to the castes, they are variously said to have sprung from the words Bhūb, Bhuvaḥ, Svah; from different Vedas; from different sets of prayers; from the gods, and the asuras; from nonentity (pp. 17–21), and from the imperishable, the perishable, and other principles (Harivamsa, 11816). In the chapters of the Vishnu, Vāyu, and Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇas, where castes are described as coeval with the creation, and as having been naturally distinguished by different guṇas, or qualities, involving varieties of moral character, we are nevertheless allowed to infer that those qualities exerted no influence on the classes in whom they were inherent, as the condition of the whole race during the Kṛita age is described as one of uniform perfection and happiness; while the actual separation into castes did
not take place, according to the Vāyu Purāṇa, until men had become
deteriorated in the Tretā age.

Second: in various passages from the Brāhmanas, Epic poems, and
Puranas, the creation of mankind is, as we have seen, described with-
out the least allusion to any separate production of the progenitors of
the four castes (pp. 23–27, and elsewhere). And whilst in the chapters
where they relate the distinct formation of the castes, the Puranas, as
has been observed, assign different natural dispositions to each class,
they elsewhere represent all mankind as being at the creation uniformly
distinguished by the quality of passion. In one of the texts I have
quoted (p. 26 f.) men are said to be the offspring of Vivasvat; in
another his son Manu is said to be their progenitor; whilst in a third
they are said to be descended from a female of the same name. The pas-
sage which declares Manu to have been the father of the human race
explicitly affirms that men of all the four castes were descended from
him. In another remarkable text the Mahābhārata categorically asserts
that originally there was no distinction of classes, the existing distri-
bution having arisen out of differences of character and occupation.
Similarly, the Bhāgavata Purāṇa in one place informs us that in the
Kṛta age there was but one caste; and this view appears also to be
taken in some passages which I have adduced from the Epic poems.

In these circumstances we may fairly conclude that the separate
origination of the four castes was far from being an article of belief
universally received by Indian antiquity.

I shall now proceed to enquire what opinion the writers of the older
Vedic hymns appear to have entertained in regard to the origin of the
race to which they themselves belonged.
CHAPTER II.

TRADITION OF THE DESCENT OF THE INDIAN RACE FROM MANU.¹

It appears from the considerations urged in the preceding chapter that in all probability the Purusha Sūkta belongs to the most recent portion of the Rig-veda Sanhitā, and that it is at least doubtful whether the verse in which it connects the four castes with the different members of the creator's body is not allegorical. And we have seen that even if that representation is to be taken as a literal account of the creation of the different classes, it cannot, in the face of many other statements of a different tenor, and of great antiquity, be regarded as expressing the fixed belief of the writers of the period immediately succeeding the collection of the hymns in regard to the origin of the social divisions which prevailed in their own time. But the notions entertained of the origin of caste at the date of the Purusha Sūkta, whatever they may have been, will afford no criterion of the state of opinion on the same subject in an earlier age; and it therefore remains to enquire whether those hymns of the Rig-veda, which appear to be the most ancient, contain either (1) any tradition regarding the origin of mankind, or of the Indian tribes; or (2) any allusion to the existence, in the community contemporary with their composition, of separate classes corresponding to those afterwards known as Brāhmans, Kshātriyas, Vaiṣyas, and Sūdras; and if they embrace any reference of the latter kind, whether they afford any explanation of the manner in which these orders of men came to occupy their respective positions

¹ On the subjects treated in this chapter compare my article in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. xx. for 1863, pp. 406 ff., where a reference is made to the other writers who had previously treated of them, such as M. Nève, Mythe des Ribhavas, etc.
in society. We shall find on examination that the hymns supply some information on both these branches of enquiry.

Numerous references are undoubtedly to be found in all parts of the hymn-collection to a variety of ranks, classes, and professions; of which an account will be given in the next chapter; but no hint is anywhere discoverable, except in the single text of the Purusha Sūkta, of those classes being distinguished from each other by any original difference of race. If, however, the early Vedic Indians had all along believed in the quadruple production of their nation from the different members of Purusha, one might naturally have expected to find allusions to such a variety of birth running through the hymns. But nothing, I repeat, of this kind is to be traced. On the contrary it appears from a considerable number of passages that at least the superior ranks of the community were regarded as being of one stock, the Aryan, and as having one common ancestor. This chapter will therefore embrace, First, the texts which are found in the hymns regarding the origin of the Indian tribes, and the history of their progenitor, and Secondly those passages which occur in the Brāhmaṇas, and other later works in which the statements of the early Vedic poets on these subjects are re-echoed or developed.

Sect. I.—Manu as the progenitor of the Āryan Indians and the instigator of religious rites according to the Hymns of the Rig-veda.

In this section I shall first quote the texts which allude to Manu as father (which must of course be understood to designate him as the actual human progenitor of the authors of the hymns, and of the bulk of the people to whom they addressed themselves); and then adduce those which speak of him as the instigator of religious rites, or as the object of divine protection.

(1) The following texts are of the first class:

i. 80, 16. Yām Atharvā Manush pītā Dadhyān dhiyam atnata | tas-

min brahmāṇi pūrvathā Indre uktāh samagnata |

"Prayers and hymns were formerly congregated in that Indra, in the ceremony which Atharvan, father Manu, and Dadhyanch celebrated."

2 This verse is quoted in the Nirukta, xii. 34, where the words Manush pītā,
i. 114, 2. Yakṣaṁ cha yoś cha Manur ayeje pitā tad aśyāma tava Rudra praṇītishu |

"Whatever prosperity or succour father Manu obtained by sacrifice, may we gain all that under thy guidance, O Rudra."

ii. 33, 13. Ya vo bhesajā Marūṭaḥ śuchini yā santamā vṛiṣkṣaṇo yā mayobhā | yāni Manur avṛigīta pitā naḥ tā saṁ cha yoś cha Rudrasya caśmi |

"Those pure remedies of yours, O Maruts, those which are most auspicious, ye vigorous gods, those which are beneficent, those which our father Manu chose, those, and the blessing and succour of Rudra, I desire."

viii. 52, 1 (Sāma-veda, i. 355). Sa pūreyo mahānām veno kratubhir ānaje | yasya dvārā Manush pitā deveshu dhiyāḥ ānaje |

"That ancient friend hath been equipped with the powers of the mighty (gods). Father Manu has prepared hymns to him, as portals of access to the gods."

"father Manu," are explained as meaning Manuśaḥ pitā mānavānām, "Manu the father of men." Sāyana, the Commentator on the Rig-veda, interprets them as meaning sarvānām praṇānām pitṛbhūto Manuśaḥ, "Manu the father of all creatures." In R.V., x. 82, 3, the words "our father and generator" (yo naḥ pitā jaṁtā), are applied to Viśvākarma, the creator of the universe. The word "father" in the R.V. is often applied to Dyaus, the Sky, and "mother" to the Earth, as in vi. 51 5. (Compare Journ. Roy. As. Soc. for 1864, pp. 55 ff.) But in these passages it is not necessary to suppose that the words are employed in any other than a figurative sense; although in a hymn to the Earth in the Atharva-veda, xii. 1, we find the following verse (the 16th): Tvaj-yātas tvayi charanti martyāsa team bhāraviś dvipadas team chatuḥpadaḥ | tavame prthivei pancha-mānavāḥ yebhya jyotir anurāmam martyebhyaḥ udyan sūryo rāmibhir ātanoti | "Mortals born of thee live on thee: thou supportest both bipeds and quadrupeds. Thine, O Earth, are these five races of men, these mortals on whom the sun rising, sheds undying light with his rays;"—where it might almost appear as if the poet meant to represent mankind as actually generated by the earth. Brihaspati (iv. 50, 6; vi. 73, 1) and the other gods, as Indra, are called "father," or compared to fathers (vi. 52, 3); as are Rudra, vi. 49, 10; and the Rishi, R.V., x. 81, 1; x. 82, 1, 3. S. P. Br., i. 5, 3, 2, has Prajāpatau pitarī; and Taitt. Br. iii. 9, 22, 1, Prajāpatim pitarām. In both the last places Prajāpati is referred to as the father of the gods.

3 It is to be observed that while in the two preceeding passages Manu is styled merely "father Manu," he is here called "our father Manu" (Manuḥ pitā naḥ).

4 I am indebted to Professor Aufrecht for the above translation of this, to me, obscure verse. Sāyana explains it thus: Sa pūreyo mukhyo mahānām pujyānām yajamānānām krutahih karnahir nimitabhūtair venāḥ köntas teshām havih kāma-

ymānaḥ ānaje āgachhati | yasyendrasya dvārā dvāriṇī prāptipyayāni dhiyāḥ karmāṇi devesha eteshu madhye pitā sarveshām pālako Manur ānaje prāpa | ānujīḥ prūpti-
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The sense of the next text is less clear, but it appears at least to allude to the common designation of Manu as a father:

x. 100, 5. Yajno Manuḥ pramatār naḥ pitaḥ hi kam |
“Sacrifice is Manu, our protecting father.”

The following verse, according to the Commentator at least, speaks of the *paternal* or *ancestral* path of Manu. Professor Aufrecht thinks it need not mean more than the ancestral human path:

viii. 30, 3. Te naś trādhvam te avata te u no adhi vocata | mā naḥ pathaḥ pitṛyād mānavād adhi dūram naishaḥ parāvataḥ |
“Do ye (gods) deliver, protect, and intercede for us; do not lead us far away from the paternal path of Manu.”

As in the preceding passages Manu is spoken of as the progenitor of the worshippers, so in the following the same persons may perhaps be spoken of as his descendants, although it is also true that the phrases employed may be merely equivalent to “children of men.”

i. 68, 4. Hota nishatno Manor apatyae sas hi nu asam patiḥ rayinam |
“He (Agni) who abides among the offspring of Manu as the invoker (of the gods), is even the lord of these riches.”

karmā | “This chief one, in consequence of the rites of the venerable sacrificers, desiring their oblation, comes,—he (Indra) as means of attaining whom Manu the preserver of all has obtained rites among these gods.” Professor Benfey renders the verse, where it occurs in the Sāma-veda, thus: “He is the chief of the rich, through works the dear one enlightens him, whose doors father Manu has, and illuminates observances towards the gods.” From Prof. Benfey’s note to the passage (p. 230) it appears that the Commentator on the Sāma-veda explains ānaje by vyaktikaroti ātmānam, “makes himself distinct” (herein differing from Sāyana), Manu by jñātā sarvasya = Indraḥ, “the knower of all, Indra,” and ānaje, where it occurs the second time, by āgamayati, “causes to come.” Such are the differences of opinion regarding the interpretation of some parts of the hymns.

5 On this verse Sāyana comments thus: *Sarveshām Manuḥ pitaḥ tataḥ āgatāḥ | parāvataḥ | pitaḥ Manur dūram mārgam chakre | tasmāt patho mārgat no asmān mā naishaḥ mā nayata | apanayanam mā kuruta ity arthāḥ | sarvāt brahmacharyyāgni- 

hotrādi-karmāyā yena mārgeṣa bhavanti tam eva asmān nayata | kintu dūram ya etad-vyatiśkota vipra-krishno mārgo ’sti tasmād adhi adhikam ity arthāḥ asmān apānayata | “Of Manu” means, come from Manu who is the father of all. ‘Distant:’ Father Manu journeyed along a distant path. Do not lead us away from that path. Lead us along that path in which contience, the agnihotra sacrifice, and other duties have always been practised. But lead us away from the distant path which is different from that.”

6 The Commentator here explains “the offspring of Manu” as offspring or creatures in the form of worshippers (yajamāna-svarūpyām prajāyām); and adds that according to a Brāhmaṇa “creatures are sprung from Manu” (“Mānavyo hi prajāḥ,”
iii. 3, 6. Agnir devabhār manushāscha jantubhiś tavanāno yaynām puru-pesasam dhiyā |

"Agni, together with the gods, and the children (jantubhiḥ) of Manush, celebrating a multiform sacrifice with hymns," etc.

In the following texts reference is made to the people of Manu, the word for "people" being viś, from which vaiśya, "a man of the people," is derived:

iv. 37, 1. Upa no Vājaḥ adhvaram Ribhukśaḥ devāḥ yāta pathibhir devayānaḥ | yathā yaynām manusho vikshu āsu dadhidev rayvah sudineshunahnām |

"Ye gods, Vājas, and Ribhukshans, come to our sacrifice by the path travelled by the gods, that ye, pleasing deities, may institute a sacrifice among these people of Manush (Manusho viksho) on auspicious days."

vi. 14, 2. Agnim hotāram iḷate yayneshu manusho viśaḥ |

"The people of Manush praise in the sacrifices Agni the invoker."

viii. 23, 13. Yad vai ā visūpatiḥ sitah suprito manusho viśi | viśvā iḍ Agnih prati rakshānis sedhati |

"Whenever Agni, lord of the people,7 kindled, abides gratified among the people of Manush, he repels all Rakshases."

(2.) From the preceding texts it appears that the authors of the hymns regarded Manu as the progenitor of their race. But (as is clear from many other passages) they also looked upon him as the first person by whom the sacrificial fire had been kindled, and as the instigator of the ceremonial of worship; though the tradition is not always consistent on this subject. In one of the verses already quoted (i. 80, 16) Manu is mentioned in this way, along with Atharvan and iti hi brāhmaṇam). Yāska (Nir. iii. 7) gives the following derivations of the word manushya, "man.:" Manushyāḥ kasmāt | matvā karmāṇi sīvyanti | manasyāmānenā srishṭāḥ ...... | Manor apiyam Manusho vā | "From what are men (named)? Because after reflection they sew together works; (or) because they were created by one who reflected (or, according to Durga, "rejoiced") ...... (or) because they are the offspring of Manu, or Manush."

7 Visūpati. Compare vi. 48, 8, where it is said: visūṣāṁ grihapatir visūṣāṁ asi tavam Agne mānushaṁ | "Agni, thou art the master of the house of all human people (or, people sprung from Manush);" and x. 80, 6, Agnin visaḥ iḷate mānushir yāḥ Agnim Manushaḥ Nahushaḥ vi jātāḥ | "Human people (or, people descended from Manush) praise Agni: (people) sprung from Manush, from Nahush, (praise) Agni." Or if mānushaḥ be the nom. plur. the last clause will run thus: "men sprung from Nahush (praise) Agni."
Dadhyananch, as having celebrated religious rites in ancient times. The following further passages refer to him as a kindler of fire, and offerer of oblations:

i. 36, 19. *Ni tvām Agne Manur dadhe jyotir janāya śāsvate*

"Manu has placed (or ordained) thee, Agni, a light to all the people."

i. 76, 5. *Yathā vipyrasya Manusho hāvīrbhir derān ayājah kavibhiḥ kaviḥ san| eva hotaḥ satyatara tvam adya Agne mandrayā juhē ca yajasva*

"As thou, thyself a sage, didst, with the sages, worship the gods with the oblations of the wise Manush, so to-day, Agni, most true invoker, worship them with a cheerful flame."

v. 45, 6. *Ā ita dhiyam kriñacāma sakhāyah... yaya Maṇu Viśiśipram jīgāya...*

"Come, friends, let us perform the prayer... whereby Manu conquered Viśiśipra..."

viii. 10. 2. *Yad vā yajnam Maṇave sammicikshathur eva it Kāṇvasya bodhatam*

"Or if ye (Āsvins) sprinkled the sacrifice for Manu, think in like manner of the descendant of Kauṇa."

ix. 96, 11. *Tvāyā hi naḥ pitarāḥ Soma pūrve karmāṇi chakruḥ pava- māna dhirāḥ... 12. Yathā apavatḥāḥ Maṇave vayodhāḥ uṇātraḥ va- varivōd havishmān | eva pavasea...*

"For through thee, O pure Soma, our early fathers, who were wise, performed their rites... 12. As thou didst flow clear for Manu, thou upholder of life, destroyer of foes, possessor of wealth, rich in oblations, so (now) flow clear..."

x. 63, 7. *Yebhyo hotrām prathamām āyeṣe Maṇuḥ samiddhāgnir ma- nasā saptā hotrībhīḥ | tā Ādityā abhāyam śarma yachhata...*

"O ye Ādityas, to whom Manu, when he had kindled fire, presented along with seven ṛtṛ priests the first oblation with a prayer, bestow on us secure protection."

x. 69, 3. *"Yat te Maṇur yad anikam Sumitraḥ samīdhē Agne tad idam naviyāh"*

---

8 The S'atapatha Brāhmaṇa (i. 4, 2, 5) thus explains the words desvedhā Maṇvid- dhāh:— Maṇviddhāḥ iti | Maṇuḥ hy etam agre ainiddha | tasmād āha "Maṇviddhāḥ" iti | "The gods formerly kindled it (fire): hence it is called 'god-kindled.' Manu formerly kindled it: and hence it is called 'kindled by Manu.'" The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (ii. 34), however, explains the word Maṇu-iddhāḥ from the fact that "men kindle it" (imam hi maṇushyā indhate).
"That lustre of thine which Manu, which Sumitra, kindled is this same which is now renewed."

In conformity with the preceding texts, the following may be understood as declaring that the sacrificial fire had been first kindled by Manu:

i. 13, 4 (= S.V. ii. 700). Agne sukhatame rathe devāṁ ilitaḥ ā vaha | asi hotā Manurhitah |

"O Agni, lauded, bring the gods hither in a most pleasant chariot. Thou art the invoker (of the gods) placed by Manush."

i. 14, 11. Tvam hotā Manurhitā gne yajnesu sidasi | saḥ imam no adhvaram yaja |

"Thou, Agni, the invoker placed by Manush, art present at the sacrifices: do thou present this our oblation." (See also R.V. iii. 2, 15.)

vi. 16, 9. Tvam hotā Manurhitah . . . .

"Thou art the invoker placed by Manush . . . ."

viii. 19, 21. Ḫe girā Manurhitam yam devā dūtaṃ aratim ni erīre | yajishṭham havya-vāhanam |

"With a hymn I laud that adorable bearer of oblations placed by Manush, whom the gods have sent as a ministering messenger."

9 The compound word which I have here rendered "placed by Manush" is in the original Manur-hita. Professor Aufferth would render it "given to man," and quotes i. 36, 10, in support of this view. The sense I have given is supported by i. 36, 19, where the same root, dhi, from which hita (originally dhita) comes, is used, joined with the particle ni. The same participle hita is used in vi. 16, 1, where it is said: Tvam Agne yajñānām hotā sarveshām hitaḥ | deevahīr mānuske jane |

"Thou, Agni, hast been placed, or ordained, among the race of Manush by the gods as the invoker at all sacrifices." The fact that Agni is here said to have been placed by the gods among the race of Manush does not forbid us to suppose that there are other passages in which, either inconsistently, or from a different point of view, Agni may have been said to be placed by Manu. The compound manur-hita occurs also in the following texts, where, however, it has probably the sense of "good for man," viz.: i. 106, 5. Brihaspati sadam id naḥ sugaṁ kriḍhi sam yor yat te manur-hitam tad īmaha | "Brihaspati, do us always good: we desire that blessing and protection of thine which is good for man." (Sāyana says that here manur-hitam means either "placed in thee by Manu, i.e., Brahmā," or, "favourable to man." Benfey, in loco, renders "destined for man.") vi. 70, 2. Rājantī asya bhuvanasya rodasi asme retaṁ sīchataṁ yad manur-hitam | "Heaven and earth, ruling over this world, drop on us that seed which is good for man." x. 26, 5. Rishīṁ sa yo manur-hitah | "He (Pūrūṇa) who is a rishi kind to men," etc. Professor Roth s.v. gives only the latter sense.

10 Though the word manur-hita is here interpreted by Sāyana as meaning "placed by Manu Prājāpati who sacrificed," it might also signify "friendly to men," as Agni is also said to have been sent by the gods.
viii. 34, 8. Ā tvā hotā Manurhito devatrā vakshad िद्याः |
      “May the adorable invoker placed by Manu bring thee (Indra) hither among the gods,” etc.

There is also a class of passages in which the example of Manush may be referred to by the phrase manush-vat, “like Manush,” or, “as in the case of Manush.” 11 Thus in i. 44, 11, it is said:
      Ni tvā yajnasya sādhanaṁ Agne hotāram ितविजम manushvad deva dhimaḥ . . .. |
      “Divine Agni, we, like Manush, place thee, the accomplisher of the sacrifice, the invoker, the priest,” etc.

v. 21, 1. Manushvat tvā ni dhimaḥ Manushvat sam idhimaḥ | Agne Manushvad Angiro devān devayate yaja |
      “Agni, we place thee like Manush, we kindle thee like Manush. Agni, Angiras, worship the gods like Manush, for him who adores them.”

vii. 2, 3. Manushvad Agnim Manunā samiddham sam adhvarāya sadam in mahema |
      “Let us, like Manush, continually invoke to the sacrifice Agni who was kindled by Manu.”

viii. 27, 7. Suta-somatā Varunā havāmahe Manushvad iddhōgnayah |
      “We invoke thee, Varuṇa, having poured out soma, and having kindled fire, like Manush.”

viii. 43, 13. Uta tvā Bhūrguvaḥ sute Manushvad Agne ighetā | Angirasvaḥ havāmahe | . . .. 27. Yam tvā janāsa indhate Manushvad Angirastama | Agne sa bodhi me vachaḥ |
      “Like Bhūriu, like Manush, like Angiras, we invoke thee, bright Agni, who hast been invoked. . . .. 27. Agni, most like to Angiras, whom men kindle like Manush, attend to my words.”

The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, i. 5, 1, 7, explains thus the word Manushvat: 12 —Manur ha vai agrē yajnena iva | tad anukṛitya imāḥ prajāḥ ya-

11 I should observe that Prof. Aufrecht thinks the phrase—except perhaps with the single exception of viii. 43, 13—means “amongst men.” Prof. Roth gives only the sense “like men,” “as among, or for, men.”
12 The same work in the same passage thus explains the phrase Bharata-vat. “He bears (bhruti) the oblation to the gods; wherefore men say, Bharata (or ‘the bearer’) is Agni. Or, he is called Bharata (the ‘sustainer’) because, being breath, he sustains these creatures.” This phrase may, however, refer to the example of King Bharata. See S’atapatha Brāhmaṇa, xiii. 5, 4, 14.
jante tasmād āha “Manush-vad” iti “Manor yajnah” iti u vai āhuḥ tasmād vā iha aḥur “Manushvad” iti “Manu formerly sacrificed with a sacrifice. Imitating this, these creatures sacrifice. He therefore says, Manushvāt, ‘like Manu.’ Or, they say ‘like Manu,’ because men speak of the sacrifice as being Manu’s.’

It must, however, be admitted that Manu is not always spoken of in the hymns of the first, or only, kindler of fire or celebrator of religious rites. In i. 80, 16, already quoted, Atharvan and Dadhyanch are specified along with him as having offered sacrifice in early times.

In the following verses Atharvan is mentioned as having generated fire:

vi. 16, 13. Īmam tu tyam Atharva-vad Āgnim mathanti vedhasaḥ

“The wise draw forth this Agni, as Atharvan did.”

vi. 16, 13 (= S. V. i. 9; Vāj. Sañh. xi. 32). Tvām Āgna pushkarād ādhy Atharva nīr amanthata . . . . | 14. Tam u tvā Dadhyaṇān rishih putraḥ īdhe Atharvaṇāḥ |

“Agni, Atharvan drew thee forth from the lotus leaf,” etc. 14. “Thee the rishi Dadhyanch, son of Atharvan, kindled,” etc.

[In the Vājasaneyi Sañhitā, the first of these verses is immediately preceded by the following words (xi. 32): Atharva tvā prathamo nīr amanthad Āgna | “Athenavan was the first who drew thee forth, Agni.”]

Again it is said in the Rig-veda, x. 21, 5. Āgnir jāto Atharvaṇā vidad visvāni kāvyā bhuvad duṭo Vīvasvataḥ | “Agni, produced by Atharvan, knows all wisdom, and has become the messenger of Vivasvata.”

In i. 83, 5, Atharvan is mentioned as the earliest instigator of sacrifice: Yajnaṛ Atharva prathamāḥ pathas tate tataḥ sūryo vrataṇāḥ venah ājani | “Atharvan was the first who by sacrifices opened up paths; then the friendly Sun, the upholder of ordinances, was produced,” etc.: so too in x. 92, 10. Yajnaṛ Atharva prathamo vi dhārayad deva dakhair Bṛhigavaḥ sam chikitrīre | “Atharvan, the first, established (all things) with sacrifices. The divine Bṛhigus co-operated with their powers.”

These two texts might, though not very probably, be understood to mean not that Atharvan was the first to employ sacrifice, but to use it for the purpose referred to in the context.
The next texts speak of the Bhrigus as the institutes of sacrifice by fire:

i. 58, 6. Dadhus tvā Bhrigavo mānushesv ā rayim na chārum suhavam janēbhyaḥ | hotāram Agne |

"The Bhrigus have placed thee, o Agni, among men, as an invoker, like a beautiful treasure, and easily invoked for men," etc.

ii. 4, 2. Imam vidhanto apām sadasthe devī adadhur Bhrigavo vikshu Āyoh |

"Worshipping him (Agni) in the receptacle of waters, the Bhrigus placed him among the people of Ayu."

x. 46, 2. Imam vidhanto apām sadasthe paśum na nashṭam padair anu gman | guhā chahtam uṣiio namobhir ichhanto dhīrā Bhrigavo avindan |

"Worshipping him in the receptacle of waters, and desiring him with prostrations, the wise and longing Bhrigus followed him with their steps, like a beast who had been lost, and found him lurking in concealment" 14 (i. 65, 1).

In other places, the gods, as well as different sages, are mentioned as introducing or practising worship by fire, or as bringing down the sacred flame from heaven:

i. 36, 10. Yam tvā devāso manave dadhur iha yajishtham havyavāhāna | yam Kāṇva Medhyātithir dhanaspritam yam Vrīshā yam Upastutah |

"Thou, o bearer of oblations, whom the gods placed here as an object of adoration to man (or Manu); whom Kāṇva, whom Medhya-tithi, whom Vrishan, whom Upastuta (have placed) a bringer of wealth," etc. Compare vi. 16, 1, quoted above, p. 167, note 9.

iii. 5, 10. Yadi Bhrigubhyāḥ pari Mātariśvā guhā santam havyavāham samidhe |

"When Mātariśwan kindled for the Bhrigus Agni, the bearer of oblations, who was in concealment." 11

x. 46, 9. Dyāvā yam Agnim prithivī janishtām āparas Tvasṭā Bhrigavo yam sahoabhīḥ | ilenyam prathamam Mātariśvā devās tatakshur manave yajatram |

"Mātariśwan and the gods have made, as the first adorable object of worship to man (or Manu), that Agni whom heaven and earth, whom

14 In the following passages also the Bhrigus are mentioned as connected with the worship of Agni: i. 71, 4; i. 127, 7; i. 143, 4; iii. 2, 4; iv. 7, 1; vi. 15, 2; viii. 43, 13; viii. 91, 4; x. 122, 5.
the waters, whom Tvashtri, whom the Bhrigus, have generated by their powers."

In the 8th verse the Ayus, and in the 10th the gods, as well as men, are said to have placed Agni.

In i. 60, 1; i. 93, 6; i. 148, 1; iii. 2, 13; iii. 5, 10; iii. 9, 5; vi. 8, 4, Matariśvan is again spoken of as the bringer or generator of fire. (Compare note 1, in p. 416, of my article "On Manu—the progenitor of the Āryan Indians," in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. xx. for 1863.)

But to return to Manu. Although the distinction of having been the first to kindle fire is thus, in various passages, ascribed to Atharvan or the Bhrigus, this does not disprove the fact that in other places, it is, somewhat inconsistently, assigned to Manu; and none of these other personages is ever brought forward as disputing with Manu the honour of having been the progenitor of the Aryan race. In this respect the Vedic tradition exhibits no variation, except that Yama also seems in some places to be represented as the first man. (See my article in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, for 1865, pp. 287 ff., and especially the words of the Atharva-veda, xviii. 3, 14. Yo mamāra prathamo martyrānām | "Who (Yama) died first of men.")

(III.) The following passages describe Manu as being the object of special favour or intervention on the part of some of the gods:

i. 112, 16. Yabhir narā Sayave yabhir Atraye yabhiiḥ purā Manave gatum ishatuḥ | yabhiiḥ sārīr ājatam Syūmarasmaye tabhir u shu utibh bhrahir Aśvinā gatam | 18. . . . Yabhir Manum āram ishā samāvatam |

"Come, Aświns, with those succours, whereby, o heroes, ye effected deliverance for Sayu, for Atri, and formerly for Manu, whereby ye shot arrows for Syūmarasmi. 18. . . . whereby ye preserved the hero Manu with food."15

viii. 15, 5. Yena jyotisāhī Āyave Manave cha viveditha | mandāno asya bahisho vi rájasī |

"Exulting in this (exhilaration), wherewith thou didst make known the luminaries to Ayu, and to Manu, thou art lord of the sacrificial grass."

15 This passage, as far as it concerns Manu, is thus explained by Śāyaṇa: "And with those succours, whereby ye made a path, a road which was the cause of escape from poverty, by sowing barley and other kinds of grain, etc., for Manu, the royal rishi of that name; according to another text" (i. 117, 21).
When compared with the preceding verse it seems not improbable that the following text may refer to the same tradition, and that instead of Vāyave we should read Āyave:

vii. 91, 1. Kuvid anga namasā ye vriḍhāsah purā devā anavadyāsah āsan | te Vāyave (Āyave?) Manave bādhitāyā avāsayan Ushasam Sūryena |

"Certainly those gods who were magnified by worship were of old faultless. They displayed the dawn with the sun to Vāyu (Āyu?), to Manu when distressed.

There is also a reference to the sky being displayed to Manu in the following verse, unless the word (manu) is to be there taken as an epithet of Purūravas, which does not seem a probable supposition:

i. 31, 4. Tvam Agne Manave dyām avāsayaḥ Purūravase sukrite sukṛttaraḥ |

"Thou, Agni, didst display the sky to Manu, to the beneficent Purūravas, (thyself) more beneficent."

If Manu be taken for a proper name in vii. 91, 1, it may reasonably be understood in the same way in vi. 49, 13, where the person referred is similarly spoken of as distressed:

vi. 49, 13. Yo rajāṃśi vimame pārthivāni triś chid Vishnu Manave bādhitāyā |

"Vishnu who thrice measured the terrestrial regions for Manu when distressed."

And in that case the word Manu may perhaps also be taken to denote a person in vii. 100, 4, Vichakrame prithivim esha etām keśetrāya Vishnu Manave dasāyan | "This Vishnu strode over this earth, bestowing it on Manu for an abode." Although here the general sense of "man" would make an equally good sense.

I may introduce here another text in which, from its conjunction with other proper names, it must be held that the word Manu denotes a person.

i. 139, 9. Dadhyaṇaḥ ha me janusham pūrvo Angirāḥ Priyamedhāḥ Kanva Atrir Manur vidus te me pūrve Manur viduḥ |

"Dadhyanch, the ancient Angiras, Priyamedha, Kanva, Atri, Manu, know my (Paruchhepa') birth; they, my predecessors, Manu, know it."

There are, as we have seen, some passages in the hymns in which it is doubtful whether the words manu and manusha denote an
individual, or stand for man in general; and there are also texts in which the latter sense is clearly the only one that can be assigned. Such are the following:

(1.) Manu in the singular:

i. 130, 5. . . . . Dhenur iva manave viśvadhaso janaḥ viśvadhāsaḥ

"All-productive as a cow to man, all-productive to a person."

v. 2, 12. Barhishmate manave śarma yaṁsad havishmate manave śarma yaṁsat

"That he may bestow protection on the man who sacrifices, on the man who offers oblations."

viii. 47, 4. Manor viśvasya gha iḍi ime Ādityāḥ rāya iṣate . . . .

"These Ādityas are lords of every man's riches."

(2.) Manu in the plural:

vii. 18, 22. Ye chid hi nrityubandhavāḥ Ādityāḥ manavaḥ smaśi

pra su naḥ āyur jivase tīrtena

"O ye Ādityas, prolong the days of us who are men who are of kin to death, that we may live."

x. 91, 9. Yad devayanto dadhati prayāṇi te havishmanto manavo e Kıka-barhishaḥ

"When these pious men sacrificing, and spreading the sacrificial grass, offer thee oblations."

(3.) Manush in the singular:

i. 167, 7. Guhā charanti manusho na yoshā

"Like the wife of a man moving secretly."

vii. 70, 2. . . . atāpi gharṣo manusho durong

"Fire has been kindled in the man’s abode."

The same phrase manusho durong occurs also in viii. 76, 2; x. 40, 13; x. 104, 4; x. 110, 1. In x. 99, 7, we find the words druḥvane manushe, "against the injurious man."

(4.) Manush in the plural:

iv. 6, 11. Hotāram Agnim manusho nishedur namasyanta uśijaḥ sam-sam āyoh

"Men offering worship, and eager, attend upon Agni the invoker, the object of man’s (or Āyu’s) praises."

In the following passages, if the word Manu is not to be understood as denoting a person, the progenitor of men, it seems, at all events, to designate his descendants, the favoured race to which the authors of
the hymns believed themselves to belong, and appears to be in some cases at least nearly synonymous with Ārya, the name by which they called men of their own stock and religion, in contradistinction to the Dasyus, a term by which we are either to understand hostile demons, or the rude aboriginal tribes:

i. 130, 8. *Indraḥ samatsu yajamānam āryam prāvad viśeshu satamūṭir ājuśu . . . . | manave śasād avratān techam kṛṣṇām arandhayat* | 16

“Indra who bestows a hundred succours in all conflicts . . . . has preserved the Ārya in the fights. Chastising the lawless, he has subjected the black skin to the man (manavat).”

Compare i. 117, 21, where instead of manu, or manush, the word manusha is employed:

 Yövaṁ vṛiṇena Aśvinā vaṃpatā iṣham duhantā manushāya daśrā | abhi dasyum bhakreṇa dhamantā utu jyotiḥ chakrathur āryāya |

“Sowing barley with the wolf, ye, o potent Aśvins, milking out food for man (manusha), blowing away the Dasyu with the thunderbolt (?), have made a broad light for the Ārya.” 17

i. 175, 3. *Tvam hi śuṛāh sanitā chodayo manusho ratham | sahāvān dasyum avratam oṣhaḥ pātram na śośiṣhā |

“Thou, a hero, a benefactor, hast impelled the chariot of man: victorious, thou hast burnt up the rite-less Dasyu, as a vessel is consumed by a blaze.”

ii. 20, 6. *Sa ha śruta Indro nāma deva urydāveh bhaṭaḥ manuṣhe das-matamāḥ | ava priyaṃ arśasānasya sahāvān śiro bharad dāsasya svadhā- vān | 7. Sa vṛittraḥā Indraḥ kṛṣṇayonih purandaro dāsīr airayad vi | ajanayad manave kṣhām apāscha satrā śaṁsam yajamānasya tājōt |

“The god renowned as Indra hath arisen most mighty for the sake of man. Violent, self-reliant, he has smitten down the dear head of the destructive Dāsa. 7. Indra, the slayer of Vṛittra, the destroyer of cities, has scattered the Dasyu (hosts) sprung from a black womb. He

16 A similar opposition between the word āyu, “man,” and dasyu is to be noted in the following passage, vi. 14, 3: nōṇā hi Agne avaśe spardhante rāyo aryah | tvra-vanto dasyum āyaeva evratiḥ sikṣhanto avratam | “In various ways, o Agni, the riches of the enemy emulously hasten to the help (of thy worshippers). The men destroy the Dasyu, and seek by rites to overcome the riteless.”

17 See Prof. Roth’s explanation of this passage as given in a note to the article on Manu the progenitor of the Aryan Indians, Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. xx. p. 418.
has produced for man the earth\(^{18}\) and the waters; he has perfectly fulfilled the aspiration of his worshipper.”

vi. 21, 11. \textit{Nu me ā vācham upa yāhi vīdvan vīsvebhiḥ sūno sahaso yajatraḥ | ye agnijihāḥ rītasāpaḥ āsur ye manum chakrur uparam dasāya |}

“Do thou, o wise god, son of strength, approach my hymn with all the adorable (deities), who were fire-tongued, rite-frequenting, and made man superior to the Dāsa.”

viii. 87, 5. \textit{Abhi hi satya somapāh ubhe bahūtha rodasi | Indrāsi sunvato vridhaḥ patir divaḥ | 6. Tvam hi śaśvatnām Indra dartā purām asi | hantā dasyor manor vridhaḥ patir divaḥ |}

“5. For thou, o true soma-drinker, hast overcome both worlds. Indra, thou art the prosperer of him who makes libations, the lord of the sky. 6. Thou, Indra, art the destroyer of all the cities, the slayer of the Dasyu, the prosperer of man, the lord of the sky.”

ix. 92, 5. \textit{Tan nu satyam pavamānasya astu yatra viṣve kāravaḥ sāmnasanata | jyotir yad ahe akṣigod u lokam prāvad manum dasyave kar abhikam |}

“Let this be the true (abode) of the pure god (Soma) where all the sages have assembled; since he has made light and space for the day, has protected man, and repelled the Dasyu.”

x. 49, 7. \textit{Yad mā sāvo manushah āha nirnije rīdhak krishe dāsāṃ kritisvam hathaiḥ |}

“When the libation of man calls me to splendour, I tear in pieces (?) with blows the vigorous Dāsa.”

x. 73, 7. \textit{Tvam jaghaṇtha Namuchim makhasyum dāsam kriṅvānāḥ rishayo vimāyam | tvam chakartha manave syonān patho devatā anjasā iva yānān |}

“Thou hast slain the lusty Namuchi, making the Dāsa bereft of magic against the rishi: thou made for man beautiful paths leading as it were straightway to the gods.”

It is to be observed that in none of these passages is the Brahmanical, or any other, caste singled out as having been the special object of divine protection. Men, or Āryas, are the favourites of the gods. And

\(^{18}\) In iv. 26, 7, Indra says: \textit{“Aham bhūmim adadāmin āryaṇa aham viśhitim dāsashe marītya | “I gave the earth to the Ārya; I gave rain to the sacrificing mortal.”}
even in such hymns as R.V. i. 112; i. 116; i. 117; i. 119, etc., where the Aśvins are celebrated as having interposed for the deliverance of many of their worshippers, whose names are there specified, we are nowhere informed that any of these were Brāhmans, although reference is often made to their being rishis.  

There is one other text of considerable interest and importance, R.V. iii. 34, 9, which, although it is unconnected with Manu, may be here cited, as it connects the word ārya with the term varya, "colour," which in later times came to signify "caste," as applied to the Brāhmans and other classes. It is this:

Sasānātyān ute sūryān sasāna Indraḥ sasāna puruḥjayaṁ gām |  
| hiranyayam uta bhogān sasāna hāvē dasyaṁ pra āryaṁ varṇam āvat. |

"Indra bestowed horses, he bestowed the sun, he bestowed the many-nourishing cow, he bestowed golden wealth: having slain the Dasyu, he protected the Āryan colour."

It is to be observed that here the word varya is used in the singular. Thus all the persons coming under the designation of Ārya, are included under one class or colour, not several.

We shall see in the next chapter that, irrespective of the verse of the Purusha Sūkta, there are in the Rig-veda Sanhitā a few texts in which the Brāhmans are mentioned alone of all the four castes, without any distinct reference being found anywhere to the second class as Rājanyas, or Kshattriyas, or to the third and fourth as Vaiśyas and Śūdras.

In the mean time I shall advert to some other phrases which are employed in the hymns, either to denote mankind in general, or to signify certain national or tribal divisions. The most important of these is that of the "five tribes," who are frequently referred to under the appellations of pancha-kriṣṭayaḥ, pancha-kshitayaḥ, pancha-kshitayo mānushyāḥ (vii. 97, 1), pancha-charshanaḥ, pancha-janaḥ, pānchajanyā viś (vii. 52, 7), pancha bhūma (vii. 69, 2), pancha jāta (vi. 61, 12).  

19 See Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1866, pp. 7 ff.
20 Śāyaṇa, indeed, interprets the word āryam varyam by uttamam varyāṁ trayair- 
giśanam | "the most excellent class consisting of the three upper castes;" but he of course explains according to the ideas of his own age. In the Sātpatika Brāhmaṇa, Kāṃsa (Adhv. Kāṇḍa, i. 6) it is stated that the upper three castes only were Āryas and fit to offer sacrifice (ārya eva brāhmaṇa eva kṣattriya eva vaisya eva te hi 
yajiniyāḥ) see Journ. Roy. As. Soc. for 1866, p. 281.
21 In iii. 49, 1, mention is made not of the five tribes, but of all the tribes: S'aṁsa
Some of these terms are occasionally used of the gods, as in x. 53, 4: ʌrjāda utsa yajniyāśaḥ panchajanā mama hotraṁ jushadēvaṁ | "Ye five tribes who eat (sacrificial) food, and are worthy of adoration, receive my oblation with favour."  

On this verse Yāska remarks, Nirukta, iii. 8: "Gandharvāḥ pitaro devā asurā rakshāṇī" ity eke | "chatvāro varṇā nishādah panchamaḥ" ity Aupamanyavah | "Some say the word denotes the Gandharvas, fathers, gods, asuras, and rakshases. Aupamanyavah says it denotes the four castes and the Nishādas."  

If Aupamanyava was right, the Nishādas also were admissible to the worship of the gods in the Vedic age, as the "five classes" are represented in various texts as votaries of Agni. Such are the following:  

vi. 11, 4. Āyuṁ na yāṁ namanā rātahavyāṁ anjantī suprayasam pancha janāḥ | "Agni, whom, abounding in oblations, the five tribes, bringing offerings, honour with prostrations, as if he were a man."

Sāyaṇa here defines the five tribes as "priests and offerers of sacrifices" (rītīvya-yajamāna-lakshanāḥ).

ix. 65, 22. Ye somāsaḥ . . . sunvire . . . 23. Ye vā janēshu panchasur

mahāṁ Indraṁ yasmin vívū ā krishṭāyaṁ somapāḥ kāmaṁ avyan | "Praise the great Indra, in whom all the tribes drinking soma have obtained their desire."

22 Compare x. 60, 4. "In whose worship Ikshvāku prospers, wealthy and foe-destroying, like the five tribes in the sky (divīva pancha krishṭāyaḥ). Sāyaṇa, however, renders "His five tribes (the four castes and the Nishādas) are as (happy as) if in heaven." Prof. Müller, Journ. Roy. As. Soc. for 1866, p. 462, renders, "as the five tribes in heaven."

23 In his note on this passage in his "Illustrations of the Nirukta," p. 28, Prof. Roth remarks: "The conception of the five races which originally comprehended all mankind . . . is here transferred to the totality of the divine beings. Hence also arises the diversity of understanding, when the number has to be indicated." Prof. Roth then quotes part of Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, iii. 31, which I give a little more fully from Dr. Haug's edition : Panchajanyāṁ vai etad uktheḥ yad vaiśvadevaṁ | sarvasūnaṁ vai etat panchajananāṁ uktheḥ deva-manushyāṇāṁ gandharvāḥ paraśarsaṁ sarpaṇāṁ cha pitṛyāṁ cha | eteśūnaṁ vai etat panchajananāṁ uktham | sarvaīnam panchajananā viduḥ | ā enam panchinyāi janatīyai havino gachhanti ya evaṁ ceda | "This Vaiśvādeva uktha belongs to the five classes of beings. It belongs to all the five classes of gods, men, gandharvas and apsaras, serpents, and fathers. To these five classes belongs this uktha. All these five classes know him (who uses it). Those of this five-fold set of beings who are skilled in invocation come to the man who knows this." See Dr. Haug's Ait. Br. ii. 214, where it is said that Gandharvas and Apsaras are counted as one class.
"Or those soma-libations which have been poured out ... (23) among the five tribes."

x. 45, 6. *Vīraṁ chid adhirn abhinat parāyan janāḥ yad agnim ayajanta pancha |

"He (Agni), travelling afar, clove even the strong mountain, when the five tribes worshipped Agni."

vii. 15, 2. *Yah pancha charshaṇir abhi nishasāda dame dame | kavir grihapatir yuva |

"The wise and youthful master of the house (Agni) who has taken up his abode among the five tribes in every house."

In vi. 61, 12, Sarasvatī is spoken of as "augmenting or prospering the five tribes" (*pancha jātā vardhayanti*).

In viii. 52, 7, it is said: *Yat pānchajanyayā visā Indre ghoshāḥ asrikshata | "When shouts were uttered to Indra by the people of the five tribes," etc.

In R.V. i. 117, 3, Atri is styled *rishim pānchajanyam*, "a rishi belonging to the five tribes." In v. 32, 11, the epithet *satpatih pānchajanyah*, "the good lord of the five tribes," is applied to Indra. And in ix. 66, 20, Agni is called the purified rishi, the priest of the five tribes (*pānchajayah purohitah*).²⁴

In other passages, however, it is far from clear that the "five races" are intended to be identified with the Aryas, or people of honourable race, to whom the authors of the hymns belonged. Such, perhaps, is the case in the following verse: ii. 2, 10. *Aśmakaṁ dyumnam adhi pancha kriṣṭiṣhu uchchā suvar na śuṣuchita dusṭaram | "May our glory shine aloft among the five tribes, like the heaven unsurpassable." See also vi. 46, 7, to be quoted below.

On the same subject, Professor Roth remarks as follows in his Lexicon under the word *kriṣṭi*: "The phrase *five races* is a designation of all nations, not merely of the Aryyan tribes. It is an ancient enumeration, of the origin of which we find no express explanation in the Vedic texts. We may compare the fact that the cosmical spaces or points of the compass are frequently enumerated as *five*, especially in

²⁴ See Mahābhārata, iii. 14160, as referred to by Roth under *jana*, where the birth of a being of five colours, apparently a form of Agni, is described, who was generated by five rishis, and who was known as the god of the five tribes (*pānchajanyas*) and the producer of five races.
the following text of the A.V. iii. 24, 2: ipment 2 pancha raniho mānavaḥ pancha krīṣṭayāḥ | 'these five regions; the five tribes sprung from Manu'; among which (regions) we should have here to reckon as the fifth the one lying in the middle (dhrvā dik, A.V. iv. 14, 8; xviii. 3, 34), that is, to regard the Aryyas as the central point, and round about them the nations of the four regions of the world. . . . . According to the Vedic usage, five cannot be considered as designating an indefinite number.'

We cannot therefore regard the use of the term "five races" as affording any evidence of the existence of a rigidly defined caste-system at the period when it was in frequent use. The frequent reference to such a division, which fell into disuse in later times, rather proves the contrary. The caste-system was always a quadruple, not a quintuple, one; and although the Nishādas are added by Aupamanyava as a fifth division of the population, this class was esteemed too degraded to allow us to suppose that they could ever have formed part of a universally recognized five-fold division, of which all the parts appear to be regarded as standing on an equal, or nearly equal, footing.

It is supposed by Dr. Kuhn that the "five tribes" are to be identified with the clans whose names are mentioned in the following verse:

i. 108, 8. Yad Indrāṇī Yadusuh Turvaśesu yad Druhyuso Anusuh Pūrusho sthāḥ | atāḥ pari vrīṣṭayāv ā hi yātam athā somasya piśataṁ sutasya |

"If, o Indra and Agni, ye are abiding among the Yadus, Turvaśas, Druhyus, Anus, Pūrus,—come hither, vigorous heroes, from all quarters, and drink the Soma which has been poured out."

Although, however, these tribes are often mentioned separately in the Rig-veda, this is either the only, or almost the only, text in which they are all connected with one another. Their identity with the "five classes" is therefore doubtful.

There is another word employed in the Rig-veda to designate a race well known to the authors of the hymns, viz., nāhush. We have already met with this term in a verse (x. 80, 6) I have quoted above, where it appears clearly to denote a tribe distinct from the descendants of Manush; and the adjective derived from it occurs in vi. 46, 7 (=

See Weber's Indische Studien, i. 202, where Dr. Kuhn's paper in the Hall. Allg. Lit. Z. for 1846, p. 1086, is referred to.
S.V. i. 262), where also the tribes of Nahush appear to be discriminated from the five tribes, whoever these may be supposed to be. The words are these: \textit{Yad Indra nāhushishvā o/o nṛṇmaṁ cha kṛṣṭiśhu yadh vā pancha kṣhītinaṁ dyunnam ā bhāra satrā viśvāni pāūnyā} “Indra, whatever force or vigour exists in the tribes of Nahush, or whatever glory belongs to the five races, bring it (for us); yea all manly energies together.”

Professor Roth (see his Lexicon, s. v.) regards the people designated by the word \textit{nahush} as denoting men generally, but with the special sense of stranger, or neighbour, in opposition to members of the speaker's own community; and he explains the words of x. 80, 6, twice referred to above, as signifying “the sons of our own people, and of those who surround us.”

These descendants of Nahush, whoever they may have been, are, however, distinctly spoken of in x. 80, 6 (the passage just adverted to), as worshippers of Agni, and can scarcely, therefore, have been regarded by the Aryas as altogether aliens from their race and worship.

Setting aside, as before, the Purusha Sūkta, there are few distinct references in the hymns of the Rig-veda to the creation of men, and none at all to the separate creation of castes. The following text ascribes the generation of mankind to Agni, R.V. i. 96, 2: \textit{Sa pārvayā nividā kavyata āyor imāḥ prajāh ajanayad manūnām vieavatā cha kṣhasā dyām apaḥ cha deva Agniṁ dhārayan ōraviṇdām} “By the first nivid, by the wisdom of Āyu, he (Agni) created these children of men; by his gleaming light the earth and the waters: the gods sustained Agni the giver of riches.”

The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa introduces this verse by the following passage: \textit{Prajāpatir vai idam eka eva agre āśa so ‘kāmayata “prajāyeya bhūyān syām” iti; sa tapo ’tapyata sa vācham ayachhat sa saṃvatsarasya parastād vyāharad dvādaśa kṛiteḥ dvādaśapadā vai esā nivit etām vaśa tām nividām vyāharat tāṁ sarvāni bhūtāny aneṣa-piiyanta tād etad ‘ḥiśiḥ paśyan abhyāne vachab “sa pārvayā” ityādīnā “Prajāpati alone was formerly this universe. He desired ‘may I be propagated, and multiplied.’ He practised austere fervour. He suppressed his voice. After a year he spoke twelve times. This nivid}

\textsuperscript{26} See Dr. Haug’s translation in his Ait. Br. ii. 143; and Benfey’s German version in his Orient und Occident, ii. 512.
THE INDIAN RACE FROM MANU.

consists of twelve words. This nivid he uttered. After it all beings were created. Beholding this the rishi uttered this verse, 'by the first nivid,' etc.

The generation of "creatures" (praジャ) is ascribed in various texts to different gods, in iii. 55, 19 to Tvash्तri Savित्रिक; in ix. 86, 28 to Soma; in viii. 85, 6 (ya imा jajāna viśवा jātān人工) to Indra. In x. 54, 3 Indra is said to have "generated the father and mother (heaven and earth) from his own body" (yan mātaraṇ cha pītaraṇ cha sākam aja-nayathās taveh svāyāh); while Viśvākarma, who in x. 81, 2, 3 is said to have generated heaven and earth, is also in x. 82, 3 called "our father and generator" (yo naह pitzā janīतa). All these passages are, however, too vague to afford us any insight into the ideas of their authors regarding the creation of the human race.

SECT. II.—Legends and Notices regarding Manu from the Satapatha, Aitareya, and TaIttiriya Brāhmaṇas, the TaIttiriya Sanhitä, and the Chhāndogya Upanishad.

The first passage which I adduce contains the very important legend of the deluge, which has already been quoted in the 2nd vol. of this work, pp. 324 ff., and which has also been rendered into English by Professor Max Müller (Anc. Sansk. Lit. pp. 425 ff.) and by Professor M. Williams (Ind. Epic Poetry, p. 34), as well as into German by its earliest translator, Professor Weber, in the year 1849 (Ind. Studien, i. 163 f.).

Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, i. 8, 1, 1. Manave ha vai prātar avaneyam udakam ąjahrur yathā īdam pāṇibhyam avanejanāya āharanti | evaih tasya avanenijānasya matsyaḥ pāṇi āpede | 2. Sa ha ąsmai vācham uvāda "bībhrihi mā pārayishyəmī tvā" iti | "kasmād mā pārayishyasi" iti | "aughāḥ imāḥ sarāṇāḥ praJāh nirodhā tatas tvā pārayitāmi" iti | "Katham te bhrītir" iti | 3. Sa ha uvācha "yāvaḥ vai kshullakāḥ bha-vāmō bahē vai nas tāvad nāśtrāh bhavaty uta matsya eva matsyam gilati | kumbhyān mā grō bīharāśi | sa yadā tām ativarāhā atha karshūm khaṭeVa tasyān mā bīharāśi | sa yadā tām ativarāhā atha mā samudram abhyavaharāśi | tarhi vai atināśhtra bhavītāmi" iti | 4. Saśvad ha 27 Perhaps, however, we are to understand Tvas्तri's function of aiding in pro-creation to be here referred to.

27 Saśvad-ī exists 'tra sūmarthyāt kshipra-vāchanaḥ.—Comm.
TRADITION OF THE DESCENT OF

"In the morning they brought to Manu water for washing, as
men are in the habit of bringing it to wash with the hands. As he was thus washing, a fish came into his hands, (2) (which spake to him) 'preserve me; I shall save thee.' (Manu enquired) 'From what wilt thou save me?' (The fish replied) 'A flood shall sweep away all these creatures; from it I will rescue thee.' (Manu asked) 'How (shall) thy preservation (be effected)?' 3. The fish said: 'So long as we are small, we are in great peril, for fish devours fish; thou shalt preserve me first in a jar. When I grow too large for the jar, then thou shalt dig a trench, and preserve me in that. When I grow too large for the trench, then thou shalt carry me away to the ocean. I shall then be beyond the reach of danger.' 4. Straightway he became a large fish; for he waxes to the utmost. (He said) 'Now in such and such a year, then the flood will come; thou shalt, therefore, construct a ship, and resort to me; thou shalt embark in the ship when the flood rises, and I shall deliver thee from it.' 5. Having thus preserved the fish, Manu carried him away to the sea. Then in the same year which the fish had enjoined, he constructed a ship and resorted to him. When the flood rose, Manu embarked in the ship. The fish swam towards him. He fastened the cable of the ship to the fish's horn. By this means he passed over this northern mountain. 6. The fish said, 'I have delivered thee; fasten the ship to a tree. But lest the water should cut thee off whilst thou art on the mountain, as much as the water subsides, so much shalt thou descend after it.' He accordingly descended after it as much (as it subsided). Wherefore also this, viz., 'Manu's descent' is (the name) of the northern mountain. Now the flood had swept away all these creatures; so Manu alone was left here. 7. Desirous of offspring, he lived worshipping and toiling in arduous religious rites. Among these he also sacrificed with the pāka offering. He cast clarified butter, thickened milk, whey and curds, as an oblation into the waters. Thence in a year a woman was produced. She rose

36 Bhāvino 'rthasya siddhyarthaiḥ devatā eva matsya-rūpeya ojāgama | "To accomplish what was to follow, it was a deity which came in the form of a fish."—Comm.
37 Aukhaḥ udaka-sanghātaḥ | sa imāḥ Bharatarvarsha-nivāsinīḥ prajāḥ niḥśeṣāṁ vodhā | desāntoram prāpayitū | "The flood will entirely carry these creatures abiding in Bharatarvarsha;—will convey them to another country."—Comm.—I do not see why the verb nirodhā should have the sense here assigned to it: at all events we are afterwards told that Manu alone was left after the flood.
38 Or, if adhīdudrūs be the true reading, "he hastened to."
39 The Himavat or Himālaya, according to the Commentator.
up as it were unctuous. Clarified butter adheres to her steps. Mitra and Varuṇa met her. They said to her, 'Who art thou?' 'Manu's daughter,' (she replied). 'Say (thou art) ours,' (they rejoined). 'No,' she said, 'I am his who begot me.' They desired a share in her. She promised that, or she did not promise that; but passed onward. She came to Manu. 9. Manu said to her, 'Who art thou?' 'Thy daughter,' she replied. 'How, glorious one,' asked Manu, '(art thou) my daughter?' 'Thou hast generated me,' she said, 'from those oblations, butter, thick milk, whey and curds, which thou didst cast into the waters. I am a benediction. Apply me in the sacrifice. If thou wilt employ me in the sacrifice, thou shalt abound in offspring and cattle. Whatever benediction thou wilt ask through me, shall accrue to thee.' He (accordingly) introduced her (as) that (which comes in) the middle of the sacrifice; for that is the middle of the sacrifice which (comes) between the introductory and concluding forms. 10. With her he lived worshipping and toiling in arduous religious rites, desirous of offspring. With her he begot this offspring which is this offspring of Manu. Whatever benediction he asked with her, was all vouchsafed to him. This is essentially that which is Iḍā. Whosoever, knowing this, lives with Iḍā, begets this offspring which Manu begot. Whatever benediction he asks with her, is all vouchsafed to him.'

40 Such is the rendering of śudamānā given by the Commentator, who is followed by Professors Weber and Müller. Professor Roth in his Lexicon, s.v., explains it by "firm," i.e. "the woman arose solid out of the fluid mass."

41 I should observe that the same verb (praṇajne) by which the generative act of Manu is here described, is in other passages of the same Brāhmaṇa (ii. 2, 4, 1 ; ii. 5, 1, 1 ; vi. 1, 1, 8 ; vi. 1, 3, 1 ; vii. 5, 2, 6 ; xi. 5, 8, 1) applied in another sense to the god Prajāpati, of whom it is said that he considered how he should beget progeny (as atkshata 'katham nu praṇayya). (Compare xi. 1, 6, 1.) In other parts of the same work, however, it is said that Prajāpati created (asrījata) the waters (vi. 1, 1, 9), or creatures (praṇāḥ asrījata, vii. 4, 3, 5 ; x. 2, 2, 1); and the fact of the word "beget" being applied to Prajāpati, either in a figurative, or anthropomorphic sense, does not authorize us to suppose that the author of the Sūtrapaṇa Brāhmaṇa, in the passage before us (the legend of the deluge), intended to represent Manu as the creator of the human race, and not as their progenitor in the natural sense. (In R.V. i. 33, 1 ; vi. 70, 3, we find the phrase praṇyayamahi praṇābhīḥ | pra praṇābhīr jaya | 'let us beget children,' "he begets children.")

42 Compare Taitt. Sanhitā, v. 1, 5, 6. "S'ivo bhava praṇābhīyām" ity āha praṇābhīya eva enam śāmyati | "mānuśībhīyas tevaṁ aṅgirah" ity āha mānasyo hi praṇāḥ | "He says, 'be auspicious to the twain offspring;' for he pacifies him from (injuring) the offspring. He says, 'We pacify thee from (injuring) the human offspring, o Angiras.' For creatures are descended from Manu."
From this interesting legend we learn that, according to its author's belief, Manu was not the creator of mankind, as some later accounts considered him to have been, but himself belonged to an earlier race of living beings, which was entirely destroyed by the deluge which is described. The legend regards him as a representative of his generation, who, for some reason, perhaps his superior wisdom, or sanctity, or position, was selected out of the crowd of ordinary mortals to be rescued from the impending destruction. That he was regarded as a mere man, and not as a being of a superior order, is shown by the fact of his requiring the aid of a higher power to preserve him. A supernatural fish, apparently some divine person, conceived as taking the form of a creature which would be perfectly secure and at home in the midst of the raging waters, undertook to deliver him, and guided the ship on which he was directed to embark, through all dangers to its destined haven. No one but Manu took refuge in the ship, for he alone, the story expressly records, was preserved, while all the other living beings were overwhelmed. Finding himself the sole survivor when the waters subsided, he became desirous of progeny; and with intense devotion performed certain religious rites in the hope of realizing his wish through their efficacy. As a result of his oblations, a woman arose from the waters into which they had been cast. A male and a female now existed, the destined parents of a new race of men who sprang from their union,—a union the fruitfulness of which was assured by their assiduous practice of sacred ceremonies. From Manu and Iḍā, we are expressly told, the race known as that of Manu, i.e. the race of men, was produced. The legend says nothing whatever of this race being originally characterized by any distinction of castes, or about four sons, the ancestors of Brāhmans, Kshatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras being born to Manu and Iḍā. We must therefore suppose that the author of the legend intends to represent the early race of mankind, or at least the first inhabitants of Bharatavarsha, as descended from one common progenitor without any original varieties of caste, however different the professions and social position of their descendants afterwards became. We are consequently entitled to regard this legend of the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa as at variance with the common fable regarding the separate origin of the Brāhmans, Kshatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras.
The following are some other passages in which Manu and Īdā are both referred to:

Taitt. S. ii. 6, 7, 1. Manuh prithiyeṇāḥ yajniyāṃ aichhat | sa ghrītam
nishiktam avindat | so 'bravīt "ko 'sya īśvaro yajne 'pi karttor" iti | tav
abratām Mitra-Varuṇau "gor eva āvām īśvarau karttoḥ svāḥ" iti | tau
tato gām samairayatām | sā yatras yatras nyakrāmat tato ghrītam api-
yata | tasmād ghrītapadā uchyate | tad asyai janaṃ | ... . . . 3. Īdā
upahavyate | paśavo vai Īdā | paśūn eva upahavyate | chatur upahavyate |
chatushpādo hi paśavah | "Mānave" ity āha | Manur hy etām agre
paśyat | "ghrītapadā" ity āha | yad eva asyai padād ghrītam apiyata
tasmād evam āha | "Maitrāvarūṇī" ity āha | Mitrāvarūṇau hy enam
samairayatām |

"Manu sought whatever upon earth was fit for sacrifice. He found
butter poured out. He said, 'Who has power to employ this in sacri-
fice also?' Mitra and Varuṇa replied, 'We two have power to employ
the cow.' They then sent forth the cow. Wherever she went forth,
butter was pressed out. Hence she is called the 'butter-footed.' This
is her birth ... . . . 3. He calls upon Īdā. Animals are Īdā. He calls
upon animals. He calls upon them four times. For animals are four-
footed. He says 'Mānave.' For Manu first saw her. He says 'Butter-
footed.' He says so, because butter was pressed from her foot. He
says 'Maitrāvarūṇe.' For Mitra and Varuṇa sent her forth." (Comp.
Taitt. Br. iii. 7, 5, 6.)

Taitt. Br. i. 1, 4, 4. Īdā vai Mānave yajnānukāsīṇyāṃ 43 āsit | sa 'śriyād
"Asurā āgnim adadhatē" iti . . . . | 6. Sa 'bravīd Īdā Manum "tathā
evai aham tava āgnim ādāśayāmi yathā pra prajaya paśubhir mithunāir
janishyate pratya asmin loke sthāsyati abhi śvārgam lokaṃ jeyasī|
iti | gāṛhapatyaṃ āgre ādadhāt | ... . . . gāṛhapatyaṇena asmi praṛjāṃ
paśūn praṛjanayat |

"Īdā, the daughter of Manu, was a revealer of sacrifice. She heard,
'the Asuras are placing fire.' ... . . . 6. Īdā said to Manu, 'I shall so
place thy fire that thou shalt increase in offspring, cattle, and twins;
thou shalt be firmly established in this world, and shalt conquer the
heavenly world.' 44 She first placed the gāṛhapatya fire. It was

43 Yajna-tattva-prakūśana-samarthā.—Comm.
44 Compare the Kāṭhaka Br. viii. 4, quoted in Weber's Indische Studien, iii. 463,
where Īdā is said to have promised to Manu: tathā te Āgņim ādāśayāmi yathā ma-
through the gārhapatyā that she produced for him offspring and cattle.”

“Tatt. S. i. 7, 1, 3. Sarveṇa vai yajnena devāḥ svargaṁ lokam āyān | pākayajnena Manur āśrāmyat | sā Iḍā Manum uपāvarttata | tām devā- surāḥ eyahvayanta pratichim devāḥ parāchim Aṣurāḥ | sā devān uपā- varttata |

“The gods arrived at the heavenly world by the whole sacrifice. Manu worshipped with the pākayajna. That Iḍā came to Manu. The gods and asuras called her away in different directions, the gods in front, the asuras behind. She came to the gods.”

The following texts refer to Manu alone, as a celebrator of religious ceremonies:

Tatt. S. ii. 5, 9, 1. “Agni mahān asi” ity āha | mahān hy esha yad Agniḥ | “brāhmaṇa” ity āha | brāhmaṇo hy esha | “bhārata” ity āha | esha hi decebhyo havyam bharati | “devedha” ity āha | devāḥ ṣya etam aindha | “Manideha” ity āha | Manur hy etam ultaro deb- bhyāḥ aindha |

“He says, ‘Agni, thou art great.’ For this Agni is great. He says, ‘o Brāhmaṇ.’ For he is a Brāhmaṇ. He says, ‘o Bhārata.’ For he bears the oblation to the gods. He says, ‘kindled by the gods.’ For the gods kindled him. He says, ‘kindled by Manu.’ For Manu kindled him after the gods.’

Tatt. S. vi. 2, 5, 2 f. Triverato vai Manur asiḥ deiveratā asurā ekavatā devāḥ | prātar madhyandine sāyaṁ tad Manor vratam āśit pākayajnasya rūpaṁ pushtyaṁ | prātāscha sāyaṁca asurāṇāṁ nirmadhyam kahūḍho rūpaṁ | tatas te parābhavan | madhyandine madhyarattre devānām tatas tāṁ svargaṁ lokam āyan |

“Manu performed three rites; the asuras two; the gods one. Manu’s rite was in the morning, at noon, and in the evening, the form of a pākayajna for nourishment. That of the asuras was in the morning and evening, without any midday rite, a form of hunger. Hence they perished. That of the gods was at midnight and midnight. Hence they prospered, and arrived at the heavenly world.”

Tatt. S. vii. 5, 15, 3. Etyā (i.e. abhijityā) vai Indram devāḥ ayājayan | tasmād “Indrasevaḥ” | etyā Manum manushyaḥ | tasmād “Manusaveḥ” | mūṣhyā devin upaprajānīsyante | “I will so place Agni for thee, than men shall be born among the gods.”
yathā Indro devānām yathā Manur manushyānām eva bhavati yathā evaṁ videṇā etayā iṣṭyā yajate |

"With this (abhijiti) the gods sacrificed for Indra. Hence it is called 'Indra-sava.' Men sacrificed with it for Manu. Hence it is called 'Manu-sava.' As Indra is among gods, and Manu among men, so he becomes who thus knowing sacrifices with this oblation."

In Taitt. S. ii. 2, 10, 2, we find nearly the words which Kullāka quotes on Manu's Institutes, i. 1: Yād vai kincha Manur avadat tad bhesajam | "Whatever Manu said was a remedy."

In Satapatha Br. vi. 6, 1, 19, Manu is called a Prajāpati: "Prajāpataye Manave svāhā" iti | Prajāpatir vai Manuḥ | sa hi idam sakram amanuta | Prajāpatir vai etad agre karma akarot | "Svāhā to Manu the lord of creatures. Manu is a lord of creatures (prajā-pati) for he thought (amanuta) all this. The lord of creatures (prajā-pati) formerly did all this work."

The following story in its different versions also connects Manu with religious observances and represents him as very devout:

S. P. Br. i. 1, 4, 14 ff. Manor ha vai rishabhah āsa | tasminn asuraghnī sapatna-ghnī vāk pravishṭā āsa | tasya ha sma śvasathād rvathād asura-rākshasāni mṛidyamānāni yanti | te ha asurāḥ samūdhre "pāpam vata no 'yam rishabhāḥ sachate kathaṁ na imaṁ dabhmyāma" iti | "Kilatākuti" iti ha asura-brahmāv āsatuḥ | tathā ha uchathuḥ "śraddhā-devo vai Manuḥ | ācām nu vedāva" iti | tathā ha ugyati uchatur "Mano yājayāva tvā" iti | "kena" iti | "anena rishabhena" iti | "tathā" iti | tasya ālābhdhaya sa vāg apachakrāma | sa Manor eva jāyām Mānavīm praviveśa | tasyai ha sma yatra vadantyai śrīvatvai tato ha sma eva asura-rākshasāni mṛidyamānāni yanti | te ha asurāḥ samūdhre "ito vai naḥ pūpiyaḥ sachate bhūyo hi mānushāḥ vāg vedāti" iti | Kilatākuti ha eva uchathuḥ "śraddhā-devo vai Manur ācām nu eva vedāva" iti | tathā ha ugyati uchatur "Mano yājayāva tvā" iti | "kena" iti | "anena eva jāyāva" iti | "tathā" iti | tasyai ālābhdhaya sa vāg apachakrāma sa yajnam eva yajna-pātrāṇi praviveśa | tato ha enāṁ na sekatur nirhanum | sa esā asura-ghnī vāg uvedāti | sa yasya ha evaṁ vidushāḥ etām atra vācham pratyuvedādayanti pūpiyāṁso ha eva asya sapatnabh bhavanti |

"Manu had a bull. Into it an Asura-slaying, enemy-slaying voice had entered. In consequence of this (bull's) snorting and bellowing, Asuras and Rakshasas were continually destroyed. Then the Asuras
said: 'This bull, alas, does us mischief; how shall we overcome him?' Now there were two priests of the Asuras called Kīlāṭa and Akuli. They said: 'Manu is a devout believer: let us make trial of him.' They went and said to him, 'let us sacrifice for thee.' 'With what (victim)?' he asked. 'With this bull,' they replied. 'Be it so,' he answered. When it had been slaughtered, the voice departed out of it, and entered into Manu's wife Manavī. Wherever they hear her speaking, the Asuras and Rākshasas continue to be destroyed in consequence of her voice. The Asuras said: 'She does us yet more mischief; for the human voice speaks more.' Kīlāṭa and Akuli said, 'Manu is a devout believer: let us make trial of him.' They came and said to him, 'Manu, let us sacrifice for thee.' 'With what (victim)?' he asked. 'With this (thy) wife,' they replied. 'Be it so,' he answered. When she had been slaughtered the voice departed out of her and entered into the sacrifice and the sacrificial vessels. Thence they were unable to expel it. This is the Asura-slaying voice which speaks out (when the two stones are struck with the sāmya, as a part of the ceremonial). Wretched become the enemies of that man for whom, when he knows this, they cause this voice here to reverberate.'

Taitt. Br. iii. 2, 5, 9. Manoh ṛṛaddhā-devasya yajamānasasya asura-ghnī vag yajnāyudhesu pravishṭa āsit | te suraḥ yāvanto yajnāyudhānām udvadatām upāśrinuvans te parābhavan |

"An asura-slaying voice had entered into the sacrificial implements of the devout believer and sacrificer Manu. The Asuras, as many as heard the sacrificial implements sounding, were overcome."

Kāṭhaka Br. ii. 30, 1.45 Manor vai kapālāny āsan | tair yāvato yāvato surān abhyupādadhat te parābhavan | atha tarhi Trishṇā-varūṭrī 46 āstām asura-brahmau | tā asurāḥ abruvann "imāni shāṭ kapālāṇi yāche-thām" iti | taṃ prataritvāḥ abhiprāpadyatām "Vāyave Agne Vāyave Indra" iti | "kīmānau sthāḥ" ity abravīt | "imāni nau kapālāni dehi" iti | tāny ābhīyam adādāt | tāny aranyām parārātya samapiṇśṭām | tad Manor gūco 'bhiyavatishṭhanta | tāni rishabhaḥ sama-leṭ | tasya ruvato yāvanto surāḥ upāśrinuvams te parābhavan |

45 Extracted from Weber's Indische Studien, iii. 461 f. A translation of this, as well as of the next passage, is given by Prof. Weber in the Journal of the German Oriental Society, vol. xviii. 284 ff.
46 Roth in his Lexicon s, v. reads Trishṇā-varūṭrī.
tau prātārītvānā abhiprāpadyetām “Vāyave Agne Vāyave Indra” iti | “kiṁkāmau sthāh” ity abravīt | “anena teva rishabhena yājayaca” iti | tat patnām yajur vadantim pratyapadyata | tasyāḥ dyāṃ vāg atīṣh- 
that | tasyāḥ vadyantyāḥ yāvantu ‘surāḥ upāśīrṇavāṁs te parābhavaṇ | 
tasmād naktān stri chandrataraṇī vadati | tau prātārītvānā abhiprā-
padyetām “Vāyave Agne Vāyave Indra” iti | “kiṁkāmau sthāḥ” ity abravīt | “ānayā teva patnyā yājayaca” iti | sā paryagnikrītā āsīt | atha Indro ’chāyad “Maneem śrāddhādevam Trishthāvarūtri asura-brāhmaṇā jāyayā vyārhatām” iti | sa āgachhat | so ’bravaṇ “ābhyaṁ teva yājayāni” iti | “na” ity abravīd ’na vai aham anayor īse” iti | atīthipatīr vīva atiher īse” ity abravīt | tā asmai prāyaścḥhat | sa pra-
tivēśo vediṇ kurvann āsta | tā aprīśchhatām “ko’ṣi” iti | “brāhmaṇah” iti | “katamo brāhmaṇah” iti | “kim brāhmaṇasya pitaram kim u pri-
chhasi mātaram | śrutaṁ ched asmin vedyam sa pitā sa pitāmahāḥ” iti | tā avīttam “Indro vai” iti | tau prāputātām | tayor yāḥ prokshaśīr āpāḥ āsaṁś tābhir anuvirijya śīrsho aśc̣ḥhinat | tau vriśaś ca yavāśaś cha abhayatām | tasmāt tau varshaśu śūshyatāḥ | adhbhir hi hatau | tām paryagnikrītām udāśriat | tayā ”rāṅnot | tāḥ imāḥ Mānayāḥ prajāḥ | yat paryagni-kritam pāṭn̄vatām uṭṣriyati yām eva Manur ārdhīn ārdhnot tām rīdhn̄oti |

“Manu had platters. All the Asuras, against whom he laid out the sacrifice with these were destroyed. Now Trishtha and Varūtri were at that time the priests of the Asuras. The Asuras said to them, ‘ask for these six platters.’ These two arrived as morning guests, repeating the formula, ‘To Vāyu, o Agni, to Vāyu, o Indra.’ ‘What do you desire?’ asked Manu. ‘Give us these platters,’ they replied. He gave them to them. Taking them they smashed them in the forest. Then Manu’s cattle were standing round. The bull licked the platters. As many Asuras as heard him bellowing were destroyed. The two Asura priests came as morning guests, repeating the formula, ‘To Vāyu, o Agni, to Vāyu, o Indra.’ ‘What do you desire?’ enquired Manu. ‘Let us sacrifice for thee with this bull,’ they answered. He then came to his wife who was uttering a yajush. Her voice reached to the sky. As many Asuras as heard her speaking were destroyed. Hence a woman speaks more pleasantly by night. The two Asura priests arrived as morning guests, repeating the formula, ‘To Vāyu, o Agni, to Vāyu, o Indra.’ ‘What do you desire?’ asked Manu. ‘Let us sacrifice for thee with
this thy wife (as the victim),’ they replied. The fire was carried round her. Then Indra perceived, ‘Trishtha and Varutri, the two Asura priests are depriving the devout believer Manu of his wife.’ He came and said (to Manu), ‘Let me sacrifice for thee with these two Asura priests (for victims)._’ ‘No,’ answered Manu, ‘I am not their master.’ ‘The host is master of the guest,’ rejoined Indra. Manu then gave them to him. (Standing) near them he was making an altar. They asked ‘Who art thou?’ ‘A Brähman,’ he replied. ‘What (class of) Brähman,’ they enquired. He rejoined (with a verse), ‘Why askest thou the father or the mother of a Brähman? If Vedic tradition is to be discovered in him, that is his father, that his grandfather.’ They knew, ‘this is Indra.’ They fled. He threw after them the water which was there for consecration, and therewith cut off their heads. They became, (the one) a vrisha, (the other) a yaavasha plant. Hence these (two plants) wither in the rains, because they were killed with water. He released her (Manu’s wife) after the fire had been carried round her. By her he prospered. These are the creatures sprung from Manu. Whenever a man releases the victim offered to Agni Pātnivata, after fire has been carried round it, he prospers with the same prosperity with which Manu prospered.”

Compare with this a passage of the Taitt. Sanh. vi. 6, 6, 1. Indraḥ patniyā Manum ayājayat | tām paryagnikrītām udayajit | tayā Manur ārāhnat | yat paryagnikritam pātnivatam utṣūjati yām eva Manur riddhim ārāhnat tām eva yajamāna riddhnoti |

“Indra was sacrificing for Manu with his wife (as the victim). He released her after the fire had been carried round her. By her Manu prospered. Whenever the worshipper releases the victim offered to Agni Pātnivata after fire has been carried round it, he prospers with the same prosperity with which Manu prospered.”

I quote the following passages also from the interest which they possess as relating to a personage so ancient and venerable as Manu is reputed to be:

Aitareya Brähmana, v. 14. Nābhānediśthaṁ vai Mānavam brahma-
charyyāṁ vasantam bhrātaro nirabhajan | so ‘brahid etya “kim mahyam abhākta” iti | “etam eva nīśṭhāvam avadātāram” ity abruvau | tas-
mād ha apy etarhi pitaram putrāḥ “nīśṭhāvo ‘vavadiṁ’ ity eva ācha-
kṣate | sa pitaram etya abruvau “tvāṁ ha vāva mahyam tata abhāksur”
iti | tam pitā 'bravid “mā putraka tad ādṛīṭhāḥ | Angiraso vai ime
svargāya lokāya satram āsato | te shashtham shashtham eva ahar āgatyā
muhyanti | tān ete sūkte shashṭhe ’hāni sāṁsaya | teshāṁ yat sahasraṁ
satra-parivēshaṁ Na νat te svар yanto dāśyanti” iti | “tathā” iti | tān
upait “pratigrihyatā Mānacan sumedhasah” iti | tam abruwan “kīn-
kāmo vadsai” iti | “idam eva vaḥ shashṭham ahaḥ praṇāpayaṁ” ity
abravid “atha yad vai etat sahasraṁ satra-parivēshaṁ tad me svar
yanto datta” iti | “tathā” iti | tān ete sūkte shasṭhe ’hāny asāṁsayaḥ |
tato vai te pra yajnam ajānan pra svargaṁ lokam | tad yad ete sūkte
shasṭhe ’hāni sāṁsati yajnasya praṇātayai svargasya lokasya anukhyāt-
yai | tam svar yanto’bruwan “etat te brāhmaṇa sahasraṁ” iti | tad
enaṁ samākuraṇam purușah krishṇaśa-vāsy uttaratāḥ upothāya abravid
“mama vai idam mama vai vāstuhām” iti | so ‘bravid “mahyaṁ vai
idam adur” iti | tam abrañit “tad vai nau tava eva pītāri prānash” iti |
sa pītāram ait | tam pitā ‘bravid “nau te putraka adur” iti | “adur
eva me” ity abrañit “tat tu me puruṣah krishṇaśa-vāsy uttaratāḥ upo-
datishṭat ‘mama vai idam mama vai vāstuhām’ iti adita” iti | tam pitā
‘brañit “tasya eva putraka | tat tubbhyāṁ sa dāśyati” iti | sa punar etya
abrañit “tava ha vāva kila bhagavaḥ idam iti me pītā āha” iti | so
‘brañit “tad aham tubbhyam eva dadāmi yaḥ eva satyam avādīr” iti |
tasmād evaṁ vidushā satyam eva vadiṭavyam | sa eva sahasra-sanīr man-
tro yad nābhaṇedīṣtham | upa enam sahasraṁ namati pra shashṭhena
ahna svargaṁ lokam jānati yaḥ evaṁ veda | 47

“The brothers of Nābhāṇedīṣtha disinherit him whilst he was
living in the state of a Brahmachārin. Coming (to them) he said:
‘What share have you given to me?’ They replied, ‘(we have given
thee) this judge and divider (as thy share).’ In consequence sons even
now speak of their father as the ‘judge and divider.’ He came to his
father and said, ‘Father, they have given thee to me as my share.’
His father answered, ‘Do not, my son, care about that. These Angirasas
are performing a sacrifice in order to (secure) the heavenly world; but
as often as they come to the sixth day (of the ceremony) they become
perplexed. Make them recite these two hymns (R. V. x. 61 and 62)
on the sixth day; and when they are going to heaven, they will give

47 This passage has been already translated into German by Prof. R. Roth,
Journal of the German Oriental Society, vi. 241, and into English by Prof. Max
p. 341 f.
thee that provision of a thousand which has been made for the sacrifice.' He said, 'So be it.' He approached them, saying, 'Receive me, the son of Manu, ye sages.' They replied, 'With what object dost thou speak?' He said, 'Let me make known to you this sixth day; and then you shall give me this sacrificial provision of a thousand, when ye are going to heaven.' 'Let it be so,' they answered. He made them repeat these two hymns on the sixth day. They then knew the sacrifice, and the heavenly world. Hence when any one repeats these two hymns on the sixth day, it is with a view to a knowledge of the sacrifice, and to the revelation of the heavenly world. When they were going to the heavenly world, they said to him, 'This thousand, o Brāhman,' is thine.' As he was collecting (the thousand) a man in dark clothing rose up before him from the north, and said, 'This is mine; what remains on the spot is mine.' Nābhānedishṭha replied: 'But they have given it to me.' (The man) rejoined: 'It belongs to (one of) us; let thy father be asked.' He went to his father, who enquired: 'Have they not given thee (the thousand), my son?' 'They did give it to me,' he replied, 'but a man in dark clothes rose up before me from the north, and took it from me, saying, 'This is mine; what remains on the spot is mine.''' His father said: 'It is his; but he will give it to thee.' He returned, and said (to the man): 'This is thine, reverend sir, so my father says.' (The man) replied: 'I will give it to thee, who hast spoken the truth.' Wherefore one who has this knowledge should speak only truth. That is a hymn which bestows a thousand, that Nābhānedishṭha hymn. A thousand falls to his lot, he knows the heavenly world on the sixth day—the man who knows this.'

Taittiriya Sanhitā, iii. 1, 9, 4. Manuḥ putrebhyo dāyaṁ vyabhajat | sa Nābhānedishṭham brahmacharryaṁ vasantaṁ nirabhajat | sa āgachhat | so 'bravit "kathā mā nirabhāg" iti | "na teā nirabhākṣham" ity abravid "Angirasah ime satram āsate te svargam lokam na prajānantī | tebhyaḥ idam brāhmaṇam brūhi | te svargam lokam yanto ye esāṁ paśas tāṁś te dāsyanti" iti | tād ebhyo 'bravit | te svargam.

46 See R.V. x. 62, 7.
49 The application of this title to Nābhānedishṭha is to be remarked, as his father Manu is recorded in the Puranic legends as ancestor of the solar race of kings. See the passage from the M. Bh. i. 3135 ff., quoted above, p. 126.
lokam yanto ye eshām paśavaḥ āsāṁś tāṁ asmai adadhā | tam paśubhiṣ charantam yajna-vāstau Rudraḥ āgachhat | so 'bravīt "mama vai ime paśavaḥ" īti | "adur vai mahyam imān" īty abravīt | "na vai tasya te īśate" īty abravīt | "yad yajnavāstau hīyate mama vai tad" īti | tasmād yajnavāstau na abhyavetam | so 'bravīt | "yajne mā bhaja attha te paśun na abhimaṁsyē" īti | tasmāi etam manthinaḥ saṁsrāvam ajuhot | tato vai tasya Rudro paśun na abhyamanyata | yatra etam eva vidvān manthinaḥ saṁsrāvam juhoti na tatras Rudrāḥ paśun abhimanyate

"Manu divided his property among his sons. He disinherited his son Nābhānedīṣṭha who was living as a Brahmacārin. He came and said, 'How hast thou disinherited me? 'I have not disinherited thee,' replied (his father); 'these Angirases are celebrating a sacrifice; they do not know the heavenly world; declare to them this Brāhmaṇa; and when they are going to heaven, they will give thee the cattle they have.' He declared the Brāhmaṇa to them, and when they were going to heaven they gave him the cattle they had. Rudra came to him as he was on the place of sacrifice employed with the cattle and said: 'These are my cattle.' 'But,' replied Nābhānedīṣṭha, 'they have given them to me.' 'They have not power to do so; that which is left on the place of sacrifice is mine,' answered Rudra. Hence the place of sacrifice must not be approached. (Rudra further) said: 'Give me a share in the sacrifice, and I shall not injure thy cattle.' He offered him this libation of soma and flour. Then Rudra did not injure his cattle. Whenever any one knows this libation of soma and flour and offers it up, Rudra does not injure his cattle.' 50

A passage, quoted above, p. 26 f., from the Taittirīya Sanhitā, vi. 5,

50 The reader who knows German, and wishes to see an able discussion of the question, whether the legend of Nābhānedīṣṭha, as given in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, has any real connection with the two hymns of the Rig-veda (x. 61 and 62) which are referred to in it, and whether it contains any reminiscence, or symbolical representation, of ancient historical events, may consult Prof. Roth's paper on the subject, in the 6th vol. of the Journal of the German Oriental Society, pp. 243 ff. The learned writer settles both questions in the negative, maintaining that the legend is manufactured out of certain misinterpreted allusions in the hymns, with the view of asserting the superiority of priestly knowledge to earthly power and worldly wealth, and that there never existed either a Nābhānedīṣṭha or a Manu. The object which I have in view in the collection of these texts does not require that I should express any opinion on these points. I only seek to ascertain what were the traditions received by the most ancient Indian writers themselves regarding the origin of their race, and not what was the historical value of those traditions.
6, 1 ff., may perhaps also be considered as affirming the descent of men from Manu when it declares them to be the offspring of Vivasvat; since the latter is regarded as the father of Manu.

In the Chhândogya Upanishad, iii. 11, 4 (p. 178 of Bibliotheca Indica, vol. iii.) the following reference to Manu occurs:

_Tad ha etad Brahmā Prajāpataye Prajāpatir Manave Manuh prajābhyaḥ | tad ha etad Uddālakāya Āruṇaye putrāya jyeshṭhāya pītā brahma provācha |

"This (doctrine) Brahmā declared to Prajāpati, Prajāpati to Manu, Manu to (his) offspring. This sacred truth was declared to his eldest son Uddālaka Aruṇi by his father."

The first half of this passage is repeated in viii. 15, 1, of the same work (p. 625).

In his commentary on the former of the two passages, Sankara Āchāryya gives this explanation:

_Brahmā Hiranyagarbho Virāje Prajāpataye uvācha | so 'pi Manave |
Manur Ikshvāku-ādibhyah prajābhyaḥ provācha |

"Brahmā Hiranyagarbha declared it to the Prajāpati Virāj; he to Manu; and Manu declared it to his descendants Ikshvāku and the rest."

In his note on the second passage, viii. 15, 1, he varies somewhat in his explanation of the personages by whom the doctrine was transmitted:

_Brahmā Hiranyagarbhaḥ Paramēśvara vai tad-devārenā Prajāpataye Kaśyapāya uvācha | asāv 'opi Manave sva-putrāya | Manuḥ prajābhyaḥ |

"Brahmā Hiranyagarbha, or the supreme Lord (Paramēśvara) through his instrumentality, declared it to the Prajāpati Kaśyapa; he to his son Manu; Manu to his descendants."

In these two passages of the Chhândogya Upanishad Brahmā is distinguished from Prajāpati, and Prajāpati from Manu, who again is said to have handed down the doctrine, not to any one person in particular, but "to the offspring," or "descendants" (prajābhyaḥ), apparently his own descendants. This Upanishad therefore seems to coincide in the doctrine of the hymns, and of the Saṃapatha Brahmaṇa, that Manu was the progenitor of mankind. The Commentator, it will have been noticed, in one place declares that Prajāpati is identifiable with Virāj, and again that Kaśyapa is to be understood under that appellation. Virāj and Kaśyapa are not, however, generally regarded as the same.
Nor is Kaśyapa commonly considered to be Manu’s father. In the passages from the Rāmāyaṇa, ii. 110, and Mahābhārata, quoted above, pp. 115 and 126, Kaśyapa is said to be the father of Vivasvat, and he again of Manu.

However this may be, as Manu is said to have handed down the sacred tradition to his descendants, we must suppose that those descendants included the whole of the progenitors of the Aryan Indians who were worthy of being made the depositaries of such a tradition; and must therefore conclude that the Chhāndogya Upanishad agrees with the passage quoted above, p. 126, from the Mahābhārata, in recognizing Manu as the progenitor of the Brāhmans, as well as the other castes.

Sect. III.—Extracts from the Mahābhārata regarding Manu.

I have already adduced in the preceding chapter, page 126, an important passage of the Mahābhārata, Ādiśrīvan verses 3128 ff., in which Manu Vaivasvata is expressly declared to have been the progenitor of mankind including the four castes. A legend of the deluge, corresponding to the one which has been adduced from the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, in the last section, is also to be found in the Vana-parvan of the Mahābhārata, and although it does not represent Manu as the parent from whom the human race was reproduced, but as the creator by whom the world was renewed, after the flood, I shall extract the entire text. Its style of narration is tedious, when compared with the quaint brevity of the Brāhmaṇa; but I shall condense it as much as possible in the translation. It begins thus, verse 12747:

Sa matsya-vachanaṁ śrutvā kripayā 'bhipariplutaḥ Manur Vaivasvato
'griññat tam matsyaṁ pāṇinā svayam | udakāntam upānīya matsyaṁ
Vaivasvato Manuḥ | alinjire prakshipat tam chandraṁśu - sadṛśa-
prabhé | sa tatra vavridhe rājan matsyaḥ parama - satkriṣṭaḥ | pu-
travat sākarot tasmāi Manuṁ bhāvam visēṣhataḥ | atha kālena mahāta
sa matsyaḥ suṣmahān abhūt | alinjire yathā chaiva nāsaṁ saṁbahavat
kila | atha matsya Manuṁ drīṣṭeśa punar evābhyaḥśhata | "bhag-
avan sādhu me 'dyānyat sthānaṁ sampratipādaya " | 12760. Uddhri-
tyālinjirāt tasmāt tataḥ sa bhagavān Manuḥ | tam matsyaṁ anayad
vāpīṁ mahaśiṁ sa Manus tadā | tatra tam prakshipach chāpi Manuṁ
para-puranjaya | athāvarddhata matsyaḥ sa punar vursha-gaṅgan ba-
hūn | deī-yojanayatā vāpi eśīritā chāpi yojanam | tasyāṁ nāsaṁ saṁ-
bhavat matsyo rājiva-lochanah | vichēṣṭituṁ cha Kaunteya matsyo cā-
pyāṁ viśampate | Manuṁ matsyas tato drīṣṭeśa punar evābhyaḥśhata | "naya māṁ bhagavan sādha samudra-mahishim priyāṁ | Gangāṁ tatra
nivatsyāṁ yathā vātā māṇyaṁ | 12765. Nidēse hi mayā tathāyaṁ
sthātaryam anasūyatā | eriddhir hi paramā prāpṭa teṣ-teṣe hi mayā
'nagha" | evam ukto Manu matsyaṁ anayad bhagavān caśi | nadiṁ
Gangāṁ tatra chainam svayam prakshipad achyutaḥ | sa tatra vavridhe
matsyaḥ kanchit kālam arindama | tataḥ punar Manuṁ drīṣṭeśa ma-
ṣyo vachanam abravīt | "Gangāyāṁ na hi śaknami brihatvāch cheshtituṁ
prabho | samudraṁ naya māṁ āṣu prasidha bhagavann " iti | uddhriyā
Gangā-salilat tato matsyaṁ Manuḥ svayam | samudram anayat pārthā
tatra chainam avāsrijat | 12770. Sumahān api matsyas tu sa Mano
nayatas tadā | āśid yatheshta-hāryāśeśa sparśa-gandha-sukhaśeśa vai |
yādā samudre prakshiptaḥ sa matsyo Manuṁ tadā | tata evam idāṁ
vākyāṁ smayamāṁ evaṁbravīt | "bhagavan hi kṛitā rakshā teyyā sarevā
viṣeshataḥ | prāpta-kālaṁ tu yat kāryaṁ teyyā tach chhrīyayāṁ
mama | achirād bhagavan bhūnam idāṁ sthāvara-jāngamam | sarevam
eva mahābhāga pralayaṁ vai gamishyati | samprikshalana-kālo 'yāṁ
lokāṁ samupashthitaḥ | tasmāt tevām bodhayāṁ adya yat te hitam
anuttamam | trasāṁ sthāvarāgyāṁ cha yach chengāṁ yach cha nen-
gati | tasya sarevasya sampraṃptaḥ kālaḥ parama-dārūṇaḥ | nauḥ cha
kāryītayā te drīḍhā yuktā-vaṭārakā | tatra saptarshibhiḥ sārddham
āruhetā mahāmune | vijāṁ chaiva sarevāṁ yathoktāṁ devijāṁ purā |
tasyāṁ ārohayer nāvī susanguptāni bhāgaśaḥ | nauv-sthāḥ cha māṁ
pratikshetāṁ tato muni-jana-priya | āgamishyāṁ ahaṁ śrīṅī vijne-
yas tena tāpasa | evam etat tvayā kāryam āprishṭo 'si vrajamy aham |
ta na śakya mahatyo vai āpas tartum maya vinā | 12780. Nabhī-śaṅkyaṃ idaṁ cāpi vachanam me tvayā viñho" | "evam karishye" |
itī taṁ sa matsyaṃ pratyaśabhāșta | jagmatuṣa cha yathākāmaṃ anu-|
janāpya parasparam | tato Manuḥ mahārāja yathoktam masyaṅaṃ ha |
vijāny ādāya sarvāṃ sāgaram puṃṣṭc tattā | naukayā śubhāva vīra |
mahārīṃgaṃ arindama | chintayāmāsa cha Manus taṁ matsyaṃ pri-|-
thēvaṃ | sa cha taṁ-chintitaṁ jñāteva masyaḥ parapurāṇaṃ | śringī |
tatrājaṃgāṃsu tattā Bharata-sattama | taṁ dṛṣṭvā maṇuja-eyāgra |
Manuḥ masyaṁ jālārṇavo | 12785. Śringināṃ taṁ yathoktena rūpaṇa-|-
drīṁ ivoṣktarāṇa | vafārkamayaṁ pāśam utha masyaṅaṣya mūrdhana | |
Manuḥ maṇuja-śārdula taṁśina śringe nyavesayat | saṁyataṁ tena pāṣena |
matsyaḥ para-purāṇaḥ | vēgaṇa mahatā naśaṃ prakṛṣṭaṁ teṇaṁ-bhāsa | sa cha taṁs tārāyana nācā samudraṃ manujsēvara | nṛtyaṃnam |
ivombhīḥ garjamanam ivāṃbhasā | kṣabhyamāṅa mahāvataiḥ sā naus |
tasmin mahōdahau | ghūrṇēṣaḥ cha peṣuva strī mātton para-purāṇaḥ |
naiva bhūmir na cha diṣṭaḥ pradīpo vā chakāśīre | 12790. Sarvaṃ ām-|-
bhasam evōṣīt khaṁ dyauṣ cha narapunjāva | evam bhuṭe tattā lokā sankula | Bharatarshaḥbaḥ | adṛṣyanta saptaṛṣhaḥ Manuḥ masyas tathaiva cha |
evam bahūn varṣha-gaṇuṁ taṁ nāvaṃ so 'tha masyaṅaḥ | kacharṣṭaṅdrito |
rājaṅ tasmin salīla-sanchaṅye | tato Ṣimavataḥ śringāṁ yat param Bharatarshaḥbaḥ |
tatrākarṣhat tato nākaṁ sa masyaḥ Kurunandana | athābraṅīt |
tadda masyas tān rīṣiḥ prahasan śanaiḥ | "asmin Ṣimavataḥ śringe naśaṃ badhīte māchīm" | sa baddhā tatra taṁ tāraṃ rīṣhībh Bharatarsha-|-
ḥbaḥ | 12795. Nauḥ masyaṅaṣya vachaḥ śrutvā śringe Ṣimavataḥ tattā | taĉh |
cha Naubandhanaṁ nāma śringeḥ Ṣimavataḥ param | khyatam adyāpi |
Kaunseya tad vidhī Bharatarshaḥbaḥ | athābraid anismiḥhas tān rīṣiḥ | sa hitas tattā | "aham Prajāpatir Brahmā yat-paraṁ nādhigamyat |
matsya-rūpeṇa yūyām cha mayā 'smād mokṣita bhayaḥ | Manunā cha |
prajāḥ saṃcāḥ sa-devāsura-maṇuṣhaḥ | srasṭāvyayāḥ saṇa-lokaḥ cha yach |
chenaṁ yach cha negati | tapasaḥ cāpi tivreṇa pratibhā 'sya bhavishyati | maṭ-prasādāt prajā-sarṣa na cha moham gamīṣhyati" | 12800. Ity |
ukteva vachanam masyaḥ khaṇandaṛśanaṁ gataḥ | srasṭu-kāmaḥ prajāḥ |
chāpi Manuḥ Vaivasaṅaḥ svayam | pramūḍho 'bhut prajā-sarṣa tapas āpe me |
mahat tataḥ | tapasaḥ mahatā yuktāḥ so 'tha srasṭhṛm prachakrame | sar-|-
vāḥ prajā Manuḥ sākṣād yathāveḍ Bharatarshaḥbaḥ | ity etad masyaṅaṃ |
nāma purāṇaṃ parīkṛṣitam |
Mārkaṇḍeya said: There was a great rishi Manu, son of Vivasvat, majestic, in lustre equal to Prajāpati. In energy, fiery vigour, prosperity, and austere fervour he surpassed both his father and his grandfather. Standing with uplifted arm, on one foot, on the spacious Badari, he practised intense austere fervour. 12750. This direful exercise he performed, with his head downwards, and with unwinking eyes, for 10,000 years. Once, when, clad in dripping rags, with matted hair, he was so engaged, a fish came to him on the banks of the Chīrīṇī, and spake: 'Lord, I am a small fish; I dread the stronger ones, and from them you must save me. For the stronger fish devour the weaker; this has been immemorially ordained as our means of subsistence. Deliver me from this flood of apprehension in which I am sinking, and I will requite the deed.' 12755. Hearing this, Manu, filled with compassion, took the fish in his hand, and bringing him to the water threw him into a jar bright as a moonbeam. In it the fish, being excellently tended, grew; for Manu treated him like a son. After a long time he became very large, and could not be contained in the jar. Then, seeing Manu, he said again: 'In order that I may thrive, remove me elsewhere.' 12760. Manu then took him out of the jar, brought him to a large pond, and threw him in. There he continued to grow for very many years. Although the pond was two yojanas long, and one yojana broad, the lotus-eyed fish found in it no room to move; and again said to Manu: 'Take me to Gangā, the dear queen of the ocean-monarch; in her I shall dwell; or do as thou thinkest best, (12765) for I must contentedly submit to thy authority, as through thee I have exceedingly increased.' Manu accordingly took the fish and threw him into the river Gangā. There he waxed for some time, when he again said to Manu: 'From my great bulk I cannot move in the Gangā; be gracious and remove me quickly to the ocean.' Manu took him out of the Gangā; and cast him into the sea. 12770. Although so huge, the fish was easily borne, and pleasant to touch and smell, as Manu carried him. When he had been thrown into the ocean he said to Manu: 'Great lord, thou hast in every way preserved me: now hear from me what thou must do when the

---

81 He could not have stood on one foot and with his head downwards (if this means standing on his head) at one and the same time. The text may mean that these attitudes were successively adopted.
time arrives. Soon shall all these terrestrial objects, both fixed and moving, be dissolved. The time for the purification of the worlds has now arrived. I therefore inform thee what is for thy greatest good. 12775. The period dreadful for the universe, moving and fixed, has come. Make for thyself a strong ship, with a cable attached; embark in it with the seven rishis, and stow in it, carefully preserved and assorted, all the seeds which have been described of old by Brâhmans. 82 When embarked in the ship, look out for me: I shall come recognizable by my horn. So shalt thou do; I greet thee and depart. These great waters cannot be crossed over without me. 12780. Distrust not my word.' Manu replied, 'I shall do as thou hast said.' After taking mutual leave they departed each on his own way. Manu then, as enjoined, taking with him the seeds, floated on the billowy ocean in the beautiful ship. He then thought on the fish, which, knowing his desire, arrived with all speed, distinguished by a horn. When Manu saw the horned leviathan, lofty as a mountain, he fastened the ship's cable to the horn. Being thus attached, the fish dragged the ship with great rapidity, transporting it across the briny ocean which seemed to dance with its waves and thunder with its waters. Tossed by the tempests, the ship whirlled like a reeling and intoxicated woman. Neither the earth, nor the quarters of the world appeared; (12790) there was nothing but water, air, and sky. In the world thus confounded, the seven rishis, Manu, and the fish were beheld. So, for very many years, the fish, unwearied, drew the ship over the waters; and brought it at length to the highest peak of Himavat. He then, smiling gently, said to the rishis, 'Bind the ship without delay to this peak.' They did so accordingly. 12795. And that highest peak of Himavat is still known by the name of Naubandhana (‘the Binding of the Ship’). The friendly fish (or god, animisha) then said to the rishis, 'I am the Prajâpati Brahmâ, than whom nothing higher can be reached. In the form of a fish I have delivered you from this great danger. Manu shall create all living beings, gods, asuras, MEN, with all worlds, and all things moving and fixed. By my favour and through severe austere fervour, he shall attain perfect insight into his creative work, and shall not be-

82 The S'atapatha Brâhmaṇa is silent as to these seeds, as well as to the seven rishis; but it is possible that the reference here made to them may have been borrowed from some other ancient source.
come bewildered.' 12800. Having thus spoken, the fish in an instant disappeared. Manu, desirous to call creatures into existence and bewildered in his work, performed a great act of austere fervour; and then began visibly to create all living beings. This which I have narrated is known as the Mātsyaka Purāṇa (or 'Legend of the Fish')."

It will be observed that towards the close of this narrative it is stated that Manu (not Brahmā himself) was the creator of Men, as well of gods and asuras; and that no reference is made to the formation of separate castes.

The commentators seem disinclined to take this legend in its literal sense. We shall see below what reason the scholiast on the Bhāgavata Purāṇa assigns for this procedure. The following are some of the remarks of the Commentator Nīlakanṭha on the above passage of the Mahābhārata:

"Manoḥ" manute ity abhimānātmako 'hankāro Manuḥ | visesheṇa vaste āchādayati chit-prakāśam iti viveka-jñānam tad-vān vivasvān māyāt īsaraḥ "māyināṁ tu mahēśvaram" iti śrutēḥ | tasya Vaivarsatasya charitam sancharanam | "avidyā-nāśe saty āvidyako 'hankāraḥ katham sancharati | nahi tantu-dāhe paṭas tishṭhāti" ity ākshepaḥ | . . . atra para-brāhmaṇa eva rūpāntaram matsyākhyo jīvaḥ | so 'hankāreṇa Manunā uttarottara-śreshṭhesu alinirādi-rūpesu sthūla-dehesu tapo-balād ni-pāyate | sa cha samudrākhye vairāje dehe nipātitaś cha kalpante avidyā-nāśa rūpe saty api dādha-(daggāha?) -pāta-nyāyena anuvarttāmām anāhārāṁ saptarāj-saṅjna-kāhī prāṇādibhiḥ vīja-saṅjna-kī prārabdha-karmabhiḥ cha sahitāṁ charama-deha-nāve āruḍhām vāsanā-varatrayā jīva-matsyena pralaya-kāle 'py uhyamānam meru-śringa same 'chale bhavato (Hīmaved-?) rūpe sadvāsanayā labdhāspadāṁ vilānam anulakṣya jīva-matsyo 'darsanam prāptaḥ | ati-vīline hy ahankāre jivate 'm naśyati | sa punar nirasta-jīva-bhāvo 'hankāro brahma-rūpātām āpanno yathā pūreṇa vāsanāya jagat spriṣati | nāsťē 'py avidyākhye kāraṇe saṁsāra-bhāna-lakṣhaṇaṁ kārṇaṁ chakra-bhramam iva kanchit kālam anuvarttate ity adhyāya-tātparyam | ākṣarārthas te ityādi | "Manu,' which that imagines, denotes the consciousness of self (ahankāra), consisting in the idea that objects refer to one's self (abhimāna).55 'Vivasvat' is he who possesses the discriminating knowledge that (such and such a thing) obscures the light of the mind, i.e.

he is the Illuder, Íśvara, for the Veda speaks of 'Maheśvara the Illuder.' It is the 'history,' the action, of this son of Vivasvat, that is related. It is objected, 'how can Ahankāra, which arises from ignorance, operate when ignorance is destroyed?' for when the threads are burnt the cloth no longer remains. Here the embodied soul, called in this passage a 'Fish,' is only another form of the supreme Brahma. This 'Fish' is thrown by 'Manu,' who is Ahankāra, through the power of austere fervour, into gross bodies, here represented by 'a jar,' 'a pond,' etc., which gradually rise in excellence. Being at last cast into the body of Virāj, called 'the ocean,' although 'the close of the Kalpa' means the destruction of ignorance, still the embodied soul denoted by the 'Fish,' contemplating Ahankāra still remaining like the ashes of burnt cloth, then entering, along with the breath and other vital airs named 'the seven rishis,' and the works of a former birth designated as 'seeds,' into the ship which signifies its last body, and then borne along even in the period of dissolution by the embodied soul itself symbolized as a 'Fish,' by means of the 'rope' of the remaining consciousness of past perceptions (vāsanā), obtaining at length through a consciousness of former perceptions, which were pure (sad-vāsanā), a resting-place on a mountain like the peak of Meru, represented by the Himavat (?), and finally dissolved;—the embodied soul under the figure of a 'Fish' having contemplated all this,—vanishes. For when Ahankāra has become entirely dissolved, the state of the embodied soul ceases. Then Ahankāra, after the state of the embodied soul has been dispelled, obtains the condition of Brahma; but by its consciousness of past perceptions creates the world as before. Even when the cause called ignorance has been destroyed, the effect in the shape of the semblance of the world continues for some time, like the revolution of a wheel. Such is signification of the section.'

According to this allegorical interpretation "Vivasvat," father of Manu, represents Íśvara, the Illuder. "Manu" is Ahankāra, or self-consciousness. The "Fish" is the embodied soul, which fancies itself to be, but is not, distinct from the Supreme spirit. Ahankāra, denoted by 'Manu,' places the embodied soul, symbolized by the "Fish," in a variety of bodies gradually increasing in excellence, which are signified

54 The words are taken from one of the Upanishads, to which, at the time of correcting this sheet, I am unable to give the necessary reference.
by the "jar," "pond," "Gangā," and "ocean." Although the end of the Kalpa means the removal of ignorance, still Ahankāra continues for a time; and along with the "seven rishis," who stand for the vital airs, and the "seeds," which are former works, embarks on the "ship," which is its last body, and is drawn over the ocean by the embodied soul by means of a "rope," which signifies the consciousness of former perceptions. Ahankāra at length finds a resting-place, denoted by Mount Himavat; and when it has been destroyed, the embodied soul vanishes. Ahankāra, however, passes into the form of Brahma, and, through the operation of the cause explained by the Commentator, creates the world anew.

It is scarcely necessary to remark that the narrator of the legend himself appears to have had no idea of making it the vehicle of any Vedantic allegory such as is here propounded.

The following is another version of the same legend from the Matsya Purāṇa:


55 This passage is extracted in Professor Aufrecht's Catalogue of the Bodleian Sanskrit MSS. p. 347.
56 The Taylor MS. reads babhūva, instead of vachanam.

57 Instead of anarthāt the Taylor MS. reads anāthān.
58 The Taylor MS. reads here evam krita-yugasyādua.
59 Kūrma-sannibhā | Taylor MS.
60 The Taylor and Gaikowar MSS. have chandra.
chaikateva vyavasthitāḥ | etad ekārṇavaṁ sarvam karishyanti jagat-trayaṁ | 11. Divyāṁ nāvam41 imāṁ grihya sarva-vijāni sarvāsah | āropya rajjvā yogena mat-prayuktena suvata | 12. Saṁyamya nāvam maṁchchhinge mat-prabhāvābhākṣhitāḥ | ekah sthāsya syi deveshu dagdhehe api parantapa | 13. Soma-sūryāṁ aham Brahmadehah ratha-lokā-samanvitāḥ | Narmadā cha nādi pūnyā Mārkandeyo mahān rishiḥ | 14. Bhavo vedāḥ purāṇāṁ cha vidyābhiḥ sarvato vritam | tvayo sārḍham idāṁ sarvāṁ sthāsyat antara-sankshaye | 15. Ecam ekārṇace jāte Chākhushantara-sankshaye | vedān pravarttayishyāmi tevat-sargādau mahipate | 16. Saṁta uvāca | Ecam ukteśa sa bhagavaṁs tatraivaṁtara-dhiyata | Manur apy āsthito yogam Vāsudeva-prasadājam | 17. Athābhāch cha tathā-bhūtāḥ sampalvah purva-sūchitāḥ | kāle yathokte saṁjāte Vāsudeva-mukhodyate | 18. Śṛṅgi prādurbhāviaṁ matsya-rūpi Janārdanah | Ananto rajju-rūpena Manoh pārśvam upāgamat | 19. Bhūta-sangān samākrishya yogenaśrotya dharmaṁ | bhujanga-rajjvā matsyasya sṛṅgē nāvam ayojyat | 20. Uparyy upasāhitās tasyāḥ praṇipatyā Janārdaṇam | ābhūta-samplave tasminn atite yosa-sāyina | 21. Prishtena Manunā proktam purāṇam matsyāripiṇā | tad idāṁ pravakṣhyāmi śṛṅjusdehām rishi-sattamaḥ | ‘12. Formerly a heroic king called Manu, the patient son of the Sun, endowed with all good qualities, indifferent to pain and pleasure, after investing his son with the royal authority, practised intense austere fervour, (13) in a certain region of Malaya (Malabar), and attained to transcendent union with the Deity (yoga). 14. When a million years had elapsed, Brahmadehah became pleased and disposed to bestow a boon, which he desired Manu to choose. 15. Bowing before the father of the world the monarch said, ‘I desire of thee this one incomparable boon, that when the dissolution of the universe arrives I may have power to preserve all existing things, whether moving or stationary.’ 17. ‘So be it,’ said the Soul of all things, and vanished on the spot; when a great shower of flowers, thrown down by the gods, fell from the sky. 18. Once as, in his hermitage, Manu offered the oblation to the Manes, there fell, upon his hands, along with some water, a Saphari fish (a carp), (19) which the kind-hearted king perceiving, strove to preserve in his water-jar. 20. In one day and night the fish grew to the size of sixteen fingers, and cried, ‘preserve me, preserve me.’ 21. Manu then took and threw him into a large pitcheher, where in one night he

41 The Taylor MS. reads eva-naśam, “the ship of the Vedas.”
increased three cubits, (22) and again cried, with the voice of one distressed, to the son of Vivasvat, 'preserve me, preserve me, I have sought refuge with thee.' 23. Manu next put him into a well, and when he could not be contained even in that, (24) he was thrown into a lake, where he attained to the size of a yojana; but still cried in humble tones, 'preserve me, preserve me.' 25. When, after being flung into the Gangā he increased there also, the king threw him into the ocean. 26. When he filled the entire ocean, Manu said, in terror, 'Thou art some god, (27) or thou art Vāsudeva; how can any one else be like this? Whose body could equal 200,000 yojanas? 28. Thou art recognised under this form of a fish, and thou tormentest me, Keśava; reverence be to thee, Hrishikēśa, lord of the world, abode of the universe!' 29. Thus addressed, the divine Janārdana, in the form of a fish, replied: 'Thou hast well spoken, and hast rightly known me. 30. In a short time the earth with its mountains, groves, and forests, shall be submerged in the waters. 31. This ship has been constructed by the company of all the gods for the preservation of the vast host of living creatures. 32. Embarking in it all living creatures, both those engendered from moisture and from eggs, as well as the viviparous, and plants, preserve them from calamity. 33. When driven by the blasts at the end of the yuga, the ship is swept along, thou shalt bind it to this horn of mine. 34. Then at the close of the dissolution thou shalt be the Prajāpati (lord of creatures) of this world, fixed and moving. 35.'When this shall have been done,' thou, the omniscient, patient rishi, and lord of the Manvantara, shalt be an object of worship to the gods.'

2nd Adhyāya: "1. Sūta said: Being thus addressed, Manu asked the slayer of the Asura, 'In how many years shall the (existing) Manvantara come to an end? 2. And how shall I preserve the living creatures? or how shall I meet again with thee?' The fish answered: 'From this day forward a drought shall visit the earth for a hundred years and more, with a tormenting famine. 4. Then the seven direful rays of the son, of little power, destructive, shall rain burning charcoal. 5. At the close of the yuga the submarine fire shall burst forth,

62 The reading of the Taylor MS. here is partially erased; but it may have been sarva-vedānām, "of all the Vedas." Compare the various reading in verse 11 of the next adhyāya.

63 According to the reading of the Taylor MS. we should have to substitute the words, "Thus at the beginning of the Kṛta age, thou" etc.
while the poisonous flame issuing from the mouth of Sankarshaṇa (shall blaze) from Pāṭāla, and the fire from Mahādeva’s third eye shall issue from his forehead. Thus kindled the world shall become confounded. 7. When, consumed in this manner, the earth shall become like ashes, the æther too shall be scorched with heat. 8. Then the world, together with the gods and planets, shall be destroyed. The seven clouds of the period of dissolution, called Saṁvarṣa, Bhīmanāda, Droṇa, Chaṇḍa, Balāhaka, (9) Vidyoutpatāka, and Soṇāmbu, produced from the steam of the fire, shall inundate the earth. 10. The seas agitated, and joined together, shall reduce these entire three worlds to one ocean. 11. Taking this celestial ship, embarking on it all the seeds, and through contemplation fixed on me fastening it by a rope (12) to my horn, thou alone shall remain, protected by my power, when even the gods are burnt up. 13. The sun and moon, I Brahmā with the four worlds, the holy river Narmadā,64 the great rishi Mārkaṇḍeya, (14) Mahādeva, the Vedas, the Purāṇa with the sciences,—these shall remain with thee at the close of the Manvantara. 15. The world having thus become one ocean at the end of the Chākshusha manvantara, I shall give currency to the Vedas at the commencement of thy creation.’ 16. Sūta continued: Having thus spoken, the divine Being vanished on the spot; while Manu fell into a state of contemplation (yoga) induced by the favour of Vāsudeva. 17. When the time announced by Vāsudeva had arrived, the predicted deluge took place in that very manner. Then Janārdana appeared in the form of a horned fish; (the serpent) Ananta came to Manu in the shape of a rope. 19. Then he who was skilled in duty (i.e. Manu) drew towards himself all creatures by contemplation (yoga) and stowed them in the ship, which he then attached to the fish’s horn by the serpent-rope, (20) as he stood upon the ship, and after he had made obeisance to Janārdana. 21. I shall now declare the Purāṇa which, in answer to an enquiry from Manu, was uttered by the deity in the form of the fish, as he lay in a sleep of contemplation till the end of the universal inundation: Listen.” The Matsya Purāṇa gives us no further information here about the progress and results of the deluge; and this narrative does not appear to be ever afterwards resumed.

64 In the opinion of this writer, therefore, the Narmadā (Nerbudda) must have been a holier stream than the Gangā: otherwise we should have expected him to select the latter as the river to be preserved at the dissolution.
The Bhāgavata P. viii. 24, 7, gives the same story with variations as follows:

Āśīt atīta-kalpānte brāhma naimittika layāḥ | samudropapūtās tatras 
Harir īśvāraḥ | 10. Tatra rāja-rishiḥ kāchid nāmnā Satyavrato mahān | Nārāyaṇa-paro ṭapyaṭ tapaḥ sa saśīsānaḥ | 11. Yo 'śāv asmin mahā- 
kalpe tanayaḥ sa Vivasvataḥ | Sraddhadeva iti khyāta manute Harinā 
ṛpitāḥ | 12. Ekadhā Kṛitamāyāṃ kurvato jala-tapanaṃ | tasyānjaly- 
udake kāchich chāphary ekā 'bhyaṇḍāya | 13. Satyavrato 'njali-gitām 
saha toyena Bhūrata | utsaśarja nadi-taye śapharīṃ Dvāridesvareṇaḥ | tam 
āha sātikarunaṃ mahākārūnakāṃ nripam | yādhibhyo jnāti-gāthibhyo 
dinām māṁ dinacatāla | kathaśi visṛjase rājan bhītaṃ asmin sarvįjale |

... 32. Saptame 'dyatanād ārddehaṃ ahany etad arindama | ni- 
mankshtaty apayāyambhodhau trailokyam bhūr-bhuvākām | 33. Trilok-
yām liyāmanīyāṃ sanvartāṃbhāsi vai tada | upasthāṣyati nauḥ kāchid 
visālā tvam mayeriṇa | 34. Tvam tāvad oshadhīḥ sarvā viṣṇy uchhā- 
vahāni cha | saptarṣibhīṃ parivṛṭitaḥ sarva-sattvopavirāhītaḥ | 45. Āruhya vihātaṁ navaṁ viharishyasya aviklavaḥ | ekārṇaṇe nirāloko 
ṛśīnāṃ eva vṛchāsa | 36. Dohāyayānām tām navaṁ samireṇa bali-
yāsa | upasthāṣyāṃ me śringe nibadhīhi mahāhīna | 37. Ahaṁ tvām 
rīśibhīḥ sākāṁ sahanavām uduvantī | vikarvan viharishyāmi yāvad 
Brāhma niśā prabhō | ... 41. Tātāḥ samuḍraḥ udveḷaḥ sarvataḥ 
plāvayan mahīm | vardhamāno mahāmeghair varhadbhīḥ samādṛṣyata | 42. Dhyāyaṃ bhagavat-ādesāṁ dadṛśe navaṃ āgataṁ | tām āruroha 
viprendrair ādayāushadhi-viśudhāh | 43. Tam uchur munayaḥ prītā 
rājan dhyāyaṃva Keśavaṃ | sa vai nāḥ sankaṭād asmād avita saṁ vihaś-
ṣyati | 44. So'nudhyātas tato rājā prādūrāsid mahānava | ekaśrīngas-
dharo mātyo haimo nīyuta-yaṣanaḥ | 45. Nibadhāya navaṁ sadh-chhringe 
yathokto Harinā purā | varatrenahinā tuṣṭas tuṣṭāva Madhusūdanam |

... 54. Ity uktavantaṃ nṛpitām bhagavān Āḍiśvaruḥ | matsya-
rūpi mahāmbhodhau viharaṇaḥ tattvaṃ abraivit | 55. Purāṇa-saṁhitām 
dīvyaṁ Sāṅkhya-Yoga-kriyāvatīm | Satyavrataṣya rājorser ātma-guh-
yan aśeṣaṭaḥ | 56. Āśrauṣhitīḥ rīśibhīḥ sākām ātma-tattvaṃ asaṁ-
sayam | nāva uṣṇo bhagavataḥ proktam brahma saṇāṇam | 57. Atita-
pralayāṃpye utthilaya sa Vedhase | hatavāuraṁ Hayagrīvam vedāṇ prat-
yāharad Hariḥ | 58. Sa tu Satyaavrato rājā jñāna-vijnāna-saṁyutah |
Vishnuḥ prasādāt kalpe 'smin āsīd Vaivasvato Manuḥ |

"7. At the close of the past Kalpa there occurred an occasional dissolution of the universe arising from Brahmā's nocturnal repose; in which the Bhūrloka and other worlds were submerged in the ocean.
8. When the creator, desirous of rest, had under the influence of time been overcome by sleep, the strong Hayagrīva coming near, carried off the Vedas which had issued from his mouth. 9. Discovering this deed of the prince of the Dānavas, the divine Hari, the Lord, took the form of a Saphari fish. 10. At that time a certain great royal rishi, called Satyavrata, who was devoted to Nārāyaṇa, practised austere fervour, subsisting on water. 11. He was the same who in the present great Kalpa is the son of Visvasvat, called Śrāddhadeva, and was appointed by Hari to the office of Manu. 12. Once, as in the river Kṛitamāla he was offering the oblation of water to the Pitris, a Saphari fish came into the water in the hollow of his hands. 13. The lord of Draviḍa, Satyavrata, cast the fish in his hands with the water into the river. 14. The fish very piteously cried to the merciful king, 'Why dost thou abandon me poor and terrified to the monsters who destroy their kindred in this river?' [Satyavrata then took the fish from the river, placed it in his waterpot, and as it grew larger and larger, threw it successively into a larger vessel, a pond, various lakes, and at length into the sea. The fish objects to be left there on the plea that it would be devoured; but Manu replies that it can be no real fish, but Viṣṇu himself; and with various expressions of devotion enquires why he had assumed this disguise, verses 15–31.] The god replies: 32. "On the seventh day after this the three worlds Bhūrloka, etc., shall sink beneath the ocean of the dissolution. 33. When the universe is dissolved in that ocean, a large ship, sent by me, shall come to thee. 34. Taking with thee the plants and various seeds, surrounded by the sevenrishis, and attended by all existences, (35) thou shalt embark on the great ship, and shalt without alarm move over the one dark ocean, by the sole light of the rishis. When the ship shall be vehemently shaken by

63 Naimitikka. See above p. 45.
66 Manu is called Sruddhadeva in the Mahābhārata also, S'āntip. 4607. In the Brahmāpas, however, he receives the appellation, or epithet, not of Sruddhadeva, but of Srudhadeva. See above, p. 188 ff.
the tempestuous wind, fasten it by the great serpent to my horn—for I shall come near. 37. So long as the night of Brahmā lasts, I shall draw thee with the rishis and the ship over the ocean.” [The god then disappears after promising that Satyavrata shall practically know his greatness and experience his kindness, and Satyavrata awaits the predicted events, verses 38–40.] 41. “Then the sea, augmenting as the great clouds poured down their waters, was seen overflowing its shores and everywhere inundating the earth. 42. Meditating on the injunctions of the deity, Satyavrata beheld the arrival of the ship, on which he embarked with the Brāhmans, taking along with him the various kinds of plants. 43. Delighted, the Munis said to him, ‘meditate on Kesava; he will deliver us from this danger, and grant us prosperity.’ 44. Accordingly when the king had meditated on him, there appeared on the ocean a golden fish, with one horn, a million yojanas long. 45. Binding the ship to his horn with the serpent for a rope, as he had been before commanded by Hari, Satyavrata lauded Madhusūdana.” [Verses 46–53 contain the hymn.] 54. When the king had thus spoken, the divine primeval Male, in the form of a fish, moving on the vast ocean declared to him the truth; (55) the celestial collection of Puranas, with the Sānkhya, Yoga, the ceremonial, and the mystery of the soul. 56. Seated on the ship with the rishis, Satyavrata heard the true doctrine of the soul, of the eternal Brahmā, declared by the god. 57. When Brahmā arose at the end of the past dissolution, Hari restored to him the Vedas, after slaying Hayagrīva. 58. And King Satyavrata, master of all knowledge, sacred and profane, became, by the favour of Viṣṇu, the son of Vivasvat, the Manu in this Kalpa.”

Before adducing the remarks of the commentator Śrīdharā Svāmin on the passage last cited from the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, I shall quote one more version of the same legend from the Agni Purāṇa.67 It is not of any great consequence, as, though more condensed, it coincides in purport with that in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa: which of the two has bor-

67 This has been copied by Professor Aufrecht from a MS. of the Agni Purāṇa, belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society of London. I am informed by Prof. Aufrecht that the East India Office Library has two MSS. of the Vahni Purāṇa, which (although Vahni is, in later Sanskrit, synonymous with Agni) differ entirely in their contents from the Agni Purāṇa.
rowed from the other, or whether both are derived from a common source, I am unable to say.


Professor Aufrecht’s transcript has this reading Manur-uktā; which I have retained, although I was not aware that Manus was commonly used for Manu, except in the Vedic period.
the wicked, and protection of the good. 3. At the close of the past Kalpa there occurred an occasional dissolution of the universe caused by Brahmā’s sleep, when the Bhūroka and other worlds were inundated by the ocean. 4. Manu, the son of Vivasvat, practised austere fervour for the sake of worldly enjoyment as well as final liberation. Once, when he was offering the libation of water to the Pitris in the river Kritamalā, (5) a small fish came into the water in the hollow of his hands, and said to him when he sought to cast it into the stream, ‘Do not throw me in, (6) for I am afraid of alligators and other monsters which are here.’ On hearing this Manu threw it into a jar. Again, when grown, the Fish said to him, ‘Provide me a large place.’ 7. Manu then cast it into a larger vessel (?). When it increased there, it said to the king, ‘Give me a wide space.’ 8. When, after being thrown into a pond, it became as large as its receptacle, and cried out for greater room, he flung it into the sea. 9. In a moment it became a hundred thousand yojanas in bulk. Beholding the wonderful Fish, Manu said in astonishment: (10) ‘Who art thou? Art thou Vishnu? Adoration be paid to thee, o Nārāyaṇa. Why, o Janārdana, dost thou bewilder me by thy illusion?’ 11. The Fish, which had become incarnate for the welfare of this world and the destruction of the wicked, when so addressed, replied to Manu, who had been intent upon its preservation: (12) ‘Seven days after this the ocean shall inundate the world. A ship shall come to thee, in which thou shalt place the seeds, (13) and accompanied by the rishis shalt sail during the night of Brahmā. Bind it with the great serpent to my horn, when I arrive. 14. Having thus spoken the Fish vanished. Manu awaited the promised period, and embarked on the ship when the sea overflowed its shores. 15. (There appeared) a golden Fish, a million yojanas long, with one horn, to which Manu attached the ship, (16) and heard from the Fish the Matsya Purāṇa, which takes away sin, together with the Veda. Keśava then slew the Dānava Hayagrīva who had snatched away the Vedas, and preserved its mantras and other portions.’

The following is Śrīdhara’s comment, before referred to, on the legend of the deluge, as told in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa. These remarks have been well translated and explained in the preface to the 3rd volume of his edition of this Purāṇa (pp. xxxviii ff.) by M. Burnouf, whose elaborate discussion of the legend extends from p. xxiii to p. liv.
Atra idāṁ chintyaṁ "kim ayam mahāpralayo dainandino vá" iti |
tatra tācaág brāhma layaḥ" (v. 7) iti "yo 'sāv asmin mahā-kalpe" |
(v. 11) iti cha ukter "mahāpralayaḥ" iti prāptaṁ "na" iti brūmaḥ |
mahāpralaye prthivy-ūdānam avasēśhāsambhavād "yācād brāhma niśā" |
(v. 37) ity-ūdhy-uktī-virodhāch cha | ato "dainandana" iti yuktam | na |
cha etad api sangachhate | saṁvarttakair anāvṛśhīty-ādibhir vinā āksamād |
eeva "saptame 'hani trailokyāṁ nimankṣhyati"" (v. 32) iti matsyokter |
anupapatteḥ | yathoktam prathama-skaṇḍhe "rūpam" (i. 3, 15) ity ādi |
tad api tadā durghatam | na hi pralaya-devaṁ ṣī "mahāmachāyaṁ nāvya" |
ārohāḥ sambhavati na cha Chākshusha-maṇvantare pralayo 'ṣī | tatāḥ |
cha sati saptamo Manur Vaivasvataṁ ity api durghatāṁ syāt | "tvaṁ |
tācād oshadhīḥ sarvāḥ" (vii. 24, 34) ity-ādi-nirdeso 'pi na sangachhate |
na hi tadā oshadhy-ūdānam sattvānm na cha avasēshṭāḥ sambhavati | tasmād |
anyathā varṇyate | naivāyaṁ vāstavaḥ ko 'pi pralayaḥ | kintu Satyavratasya |
janapadesaya āvirbhāto bhagavān vairāgyartham āksamāt pralaya |
yca darśayāmāsa yathā 'sminn eva Vaivasvata-maṇvantare Mārkaṇḍe |
yāya darśitavān | tad-apekshaya eva cha "mahā-kalpe 'sminn" iti |
viśēṣhānaṁ sangachhate | tatāḥ cha "tataḥ samudraḥ udeleḥ sarvataḥ |
samadriśyata" (v. 41) iti tasyaiva yathā darśanam uktam ity eshā dik |

"Here we have to consider whether this was a great dissolution |
of the universe; or one of those which occur at the close of each day of |
Brahmā. If it be supposed from the expressions 'a dissolution pro- |
cceeding from Brahmā' (v. 7), and 'he is the same who in this Mahā- |
kalpa' (v. 11), that it was a great dissolution, we reply,—no; because |
in a great dissolution the earth and other worlds cannot possibly |
remain in existence, and because this would be opposed to the words 'so long |
as the night of Brahmā lasts' (v. 37). Hence it might appear that it |
must be one of the dissolutions which occur at the end of a day of |
Brahmā. But this also is impossible, because it would be at variance |
with the Fish's words that 'the three worlds should be submerged on |
the seventh day,' (v. 32) suddenly, without the drought and other cala- |
mities which precede a dissolution. What is stated in the first book |
(iii. 15), 'at the deluge, in the Chākshusha Manvantara, he took the |
form of a Fish, and preserved Manu Vaivasvata, whom he placed in a |
ship formed of the earth,' 69 would also in that case be inconceivable; for |

69 Bhāgavata Purāṇa, i. 3. 15. Rupaṁ sa jagrīhe mātreyāṁ Chākshushodāthi-sam- |
plane | nāvya āropana mahāmachāyaṁ opād Vaivasvataṁ Manum | On this passage also
(1.) in neither of the two dissolutions could any one be placed ‘in a ship in the form of the earth’ (as the earth is submerged in the one case and altogether destroyed in the other); (2.) there is no dissolution of the world in the Chākhusha Manvantara; (3.) in the case supposed the existence of a seventh Manu, the son of Vivasvat would be impossible (for the fourteen Manus succeed each other in one Kalpa without the intervention of any dissolution). And in that case, the command to take ‘all the plants into the ship’ (viii. 24, 34), would be inconceivable, since no plants or other such substances are left at such a period. Such being the fact, the narrative must be otherwise explained. It was in fact no real dissolution which is here related. But the deity, who appeared to teach Satyavrata knowledge, shewed him suddenly the semblance of a dissolution to instil into him dispassion, just as in the Vaivasvata Manvantara he shewed to Märkanḍeya. And if referred to this, the words ‘in this Māhakalpa’ will be conceivable. And consequently the words ‘Then the sea was beheld overflowing its shores on every side’ are spoken with reference to what Satyavrata saw (in the vision). Such is an indication of the purport of the Section.”

Sṛidhara Śvāmin here reasons only upon the data supplied by the particular version of the story which he found before him in the Bhāgavata, and does not seem to have extended his researches so far as to ascertain whether the legend might not exhibit some variations as narrated in other Puranas. If he had turned to the Matsya Purāṇa he would have found that one of his objections, viz., that drawn from the absence of any reference to the calamities supposed to precede a dissolution, did not apply to the account there given; since that narrative expressly asserts that these premonitory signs were manifested. Others of his objections apply no doubt to the other narratives as well as to that in the Bhāgavata. According to the ordinary Puranic theory (see above, pp. 43 ff.) fourteen Manus exist in each Kalpa, and one succeeds another without the intervention of any pralaya or dissolution. It is obviously inconsistent with this theory to represent such a dissolution

Sṛidhara remarks: Yadyapi manvantarāvasāne pralayo nāsti tathāpi keśaḥ kau-tukena Satyavrataḥ nyāyā pradarśitā | yathā “akāṅge Märkanḍeyaya” iti drashtavyam || “Although there is no dissolution at the end of a Manvantara, yet, through a certain sport an illusion was shown to Satyavrata, as in the other passage where it is said ‘Suddenly to Märkanḍeya,’ etc.”
as taking place either during the life of any of the Manus, or after his disappearance. It is even doubtful, or more than doubtful (Wilson's Vish. P. i: p. 50 f. and p. 44, above) whether one Manu can exist contemporaneously with another, and yet, according to the Matsya and Agni Purāṇas (see above, pp. 205 ff., 211 f.) Manu Vaivasvata is said to have lived during his predecessor's period, although the Bhāgavata avoids this difficulty by making Satyavrata the hero of the story and by representing him as being born again as Manu Vaivasvata at the beginning of the next Manvantara. (M. Burnouf's Preface above referred to may be consulted for further remarks on this subject.) The authors of the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas do not, however, appear to have been so sensitively alive to inconsistencies of this description as Śrīdharā. Perhaps the system of Kalpas and Manvantaras may not have been so clearly defined, or so generally current, when the older parts, at least of the Mahābhārata, were composed, as at a later period. And even the Puranic writers may not have cared very much to preserve a strict congruity in all that they wrote. In fact they may have had no great faith in the authority of speculations so arbitrary and artificial as those relating to the great mundane periods to which I refer,—speculations which were derived from no higher source than previous writers of their own class. The case, however, was different with the Commentators, who lived at a later period, and who seem to have regarded the established doctrine regarding Kalpas and Manvantaras as an article of faith.

There is, however, no doubt that, for the reasons above assigned, this legend of a Flood, such as is described in the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas, does not fit into the system of Kalpas and Manvantaras. But what is the inference which we ought to draw from this circumstance? M. Burnouf believes (1.) that the theory of great mundane periods and periodical dissolutions of the universe was received in India from very early times (Bhāg. P. iii. Pref. p. xliii.) and (2) that it was older than the legend of a deluge, as, although the latter may have been derived from ancient tradition, the style in which it is related in the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas has nothing of the archaic colouring of the Itiḥāsas contained in the Brāhmaṇas, and it had not, so far as he knew,

70 The Svāyambhuva Manvantara is mentioned in the Sāntip. verse 12658, but no details are given (krīte yuge mahārāja pura Svāyambhuva 'ntare).
been found in any work of the class last named (p. xxvii.), and was not, he anticipated, likely to be discovered there (lili.). The conclusion which he deduces from these premises, and from the absence of any tradition of any great local inundation (pp. xlviii. and li.), is that, although, as related in the Mahâbhârata and the Purâñas, the legend of the deluge has received in some respects an Indian character (xxxii. ff.; xlv. ff.), it is not in its origin Indian, (li.), but was most probably imported into Hindustan from a Semitic source, whether Hebrew or Assyrian (lili.–liv.). The first of M. Burnouf’s premises, regarding the great antiquity of the system of Kalpas, Manvantaras, and mundane dissolutions, is not borne out by the Vedic hymns, or anything that has yet been found in the Brâhmaṇas (see above, pp. 45 ff.). And his anticipation that no reference to a deluge would be discovered in any of the older Indian records has proved incorrect, as is shewn by the legend of Manu quoted above (p. 181 ff.) from the Satapatha Brâhmaṇa.

Professor Weber, by whom attention was first drawn (in his Indische Studien, i. 160 ff.) to this passage, shows how materially it interferes with Burnouf’s results. If there is no proof of the great antiquity of the cosmical theory which that great scholar supposes to be inconsistent with the early existence in India of any tradition of a deluge, whilst on the other hand there is distinct evidence that that tradition was actually current there at a much earlier period than he imagined, it is clear that his supposition of its having been introduced into that country from an exclusively Semitic source loses much of its probability.

The explanation by which Śrīdhara endeavours to maintain the consistency of the Puranic narratives and theories seems to be altogether unfounded. There is no appearance of the authors either of the Bhāgavata, or Matsya, or Agni Purāṇas having intended to represent the deluge as a mere vision. They evidently meant this narrative to be taken literally, just as much as anything else that they describe.

I shall now compare the versions of the legend given in the Mahâbhârata and Purâṇas with each other, and with that quoted above from the Satapatha Brâhmaṇa.

1. The following are the peculiarities of the narrative in the Satapatha Brâhmaṇa:

(1.) It makes no reference to any great mundane periods, such as Kalpas or Manvantaras.
THE INDIAN RACE FROM MANU.

(2.) It does not speak of a dissolution of the world (pralaya), but of a flood (augha) which swept away all living creatures except Manu.

(3.) It does not fix the number of days or years after which the flood should come.

(4.) It speaks of Manu simply, without assigning to him any patronymic, such as Vaivasvata.\textsuperscript{71}

(5.) It contains no allusion to the locality in which he was when the fish came to him.

(6.) It makes no mention of the fish being thrown into any river.

(7.) It is silent as to Manu being accompanied by any rishis when he embarked on the ship, and as to his taking any seeds along with him.

(8.) It speaks of the ship as having rested on the "Northern mountain," and of a place called "Manu's Descent."

(9.) It does not say anything of any deity being incarnate in the fish.

(10.) It represents Iđa as produced from Manu's oblation, and as the mother of his offspring, begotten apparently in the natural way.

It is manifest from this abstract, when compared with what follows, that the flood described in the Brāhmaṇa is distinguishable in various respects from the dissolution, or pralaya, of the later works.

II. The legend as told in the Mahābhārata agrees with that of the S. P. Br. in some, and differs from it in other particulars:

(1.) It does not specify any Kalpa or Manvantara.

(2.) It speaks of a dissolution of the universe (pralaya), and of the time of its purification by water (samprakshalana-kālaḥ) having arrived.

(3.) It makes the fish declare that this event should take place speedily (achirāt), and alludes to no antecedent calamities.

\textsuperscript{71} Manu Vaivasvata is however mentioned in S. P. Br. xiii. 4, 3, 3. "Manu Vaivasvato rājā" ity āha | tasya manuṣhyā viśāh | "He says 'Manu Vaivasvata king.' Men are his subjects." Further on, xiii. 4, 3, 6, Yama Vaivasvata is spoken of as King of the Pitris. Compare R.V. x. 14, 1; 17, 1. In the Vālakhilīya hymns attached to the R.V. iv. 1, Indra is mentioned as drinking Soma in the house of Manu Vivasvat (not Vaivasvata). In the Atharva-veda, viii. 10, 24, Manu Vaivasvata is spoken of as the calf of the cow Virāj (tasyā Manu Vaivasvato vatah). Yama is similarly spoken of in the preceding verse. In Vālakhilīya, iii. 1, Indra is said to have drunk Soma in Manu Sāvārāṇī's house. The connection of the words Sūrvasya and Sūvarṣī with the word manu, "man," in R.V. x. 68, 8 f. and 11, no doubt gave rise to the idea of a Manu Sāvārāṇī. See Wilson's Viṣṇu P. 4to. ed. pp. 266 ff., and Roth's remark in Journal Germ. Or. Soc. vi. 245 ff., and R.V. x. 17, 2.
(4.) It assigns to Manu the patronymic of Vaivasvata, but mentions no other Manu.
(5.) It represents the fish as coming to him when on the banks of the Chirīṅti river.
(6.) It describes the fish as thrown into the Ganges before it was taken to the sea.
(7.) It speaks of Manu as embarking on the ship with the seven rishis, and as taking with him all the seeds described by the Brāhmans.
(8.) It declares that the ship rested on the highest peak of the Himālaya, which was thence called Naubandhana.
(9.) It makes the fish reveal himself as Brāhma Prajāpati.
(10.) It describes Manu not as begetting offspring but as creating all sorts of living beings including men.

III. The Matsya Purāṇa agrees in some points, and differs in others from the above details.

(1.) It states that Manu, whom it styles the son of the Sun (Sahasrakirṣṇatmaja, and Ravi-nandana), i.e. Manu Vaivasvata, practised austerity after making over his kingdom to his son (v. 12). One might have supposed that he could only have done this in his own Manvantara; but it is said further on (v. 34 f.) that he was informed by the fish that when the dissolution should come to an end, he should become a Prajāpati and lord of the Manvantara; and he receives a promise that he should be preserved during the dissolution (ii. 12), which, as appears from v. 15, was to take place at the end of the Chākshusha Manvantara. After this he was to create the world anew. We must therefore suppose the writer to have regarded Manu Vaivasvata as existing during the period of his predecessor, but as then occupying the inferior position of a king. This difficulty is, as I have already remarked, avoided in the Bhāgavata, which makes King Satyavrata the hero of the story.

(2.) This Purāṇa speaks of a dissolution (pralaya) and yet (i. 15 ff.) represents Manu as asking and receiving from Brāhma as a boon that when that dissolution should arrive, he should be the preserver of all things stationary and moving.

(3.) It states that a hundred years and more would elapse before the dissolution, which was to be preceded by famine and various terrific phenomena.

(4.) It represents Manu as the son of the Sun. See under head (1.).
(5.) It mentions Malaya (Malabar) as the scene of Manu's austerity, and of the apparition of the fish.

(6.) It agrees with the Mahâbhârata in describing the fish as thrown into the Ganges, though at so great a distance from Malabar.

(7.) It is silent as to the seven rishis embarking on the ship, but speaks of Manu taking with him all sorts of creatures (living apparently) as well as seeds (chap. ii. v. 11).

(8.) It does not bring the narrative to a conclusion (see above, p. 207), and thus has no opportunity of saying anything of the place where the ship rested.

(9.) It speaks of Janârdana (Vishnû) as the god who was manifested in the Fish.

(10.) It refers to Manu as about to effect a creation (ii. 15), but also as preserving the existing animals and plants (ch. i. 15 ff., 31 f.; ii. 2, 19).

IV. According to the Bhâgavata Purââna:

(1.) The event described was an "occasional dissolution" (naimittiko layâh, see above, p. 45) at the end of a Kalpa (viii. 24, 7); and yet in contradiction with this it had previously been alluded to (i. 3, 15) as occurring at the close of the Châkshusha Manvantara.

(2.) See head (1.).

(3.) The dissolution was to take place after seven days (viii. 24, 32); and no premonitory calamities are referred to.

(4.) The hero of the story is Satyavrata, king of Dravida, who was born again in the present mahâkalpa as the son of Vivasvat (vv. 10, 11, 58).

(5.) The scene of the incidents, with which the narrative begins, was the river Kritamâlî, in the country of Dravida.

(6.) The fish is not thrown into any river after it had been once taken out of the Kritamâlî, and had grown large.

(7.) Satyavrata is commanded to take with him into the ship the seven rishis, as well as plants, seeds, and all beings (sarva-sattvopa-vrîṁhitâh).

(8.) Nothing is said of the place where the ship rested.

(9.) Vishnû is the deity who took the form of a fish with the view of recovering the Vedas carried away by the Dânava Hayagrîva (vv. 9, 57).

(10.) No mention is made in this chapter of any creation effected by Manu; but in ix. i. an account is given of his descendants.
V. The narrative in the Agni Purāṇa agrees with that in the Bhāgavata, except in its much greater conciseness, and in making Manu Vaivasvata, and not Satyavrata, the hero of the story.

SECT. IV.—Legendary Accounts of the Origin of Castes among the Descendants of Manu and Atri, according to the Purāṇas.

We have already seen that it is distinctly affirmed in a passage quoted above (p. 126) from the Ādiparvan of the Mahābhārata, verses 3138 ff., that men of all classes, Brāhmans, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Sūdras were descended from Manu, a statement which is clearly at variance with the notion of their having been separately created from different members of Brahmā. This tallies with the account of the origin of castes which is found in those parts of the Purāṇas which profess to record the history of the two royal races, the solar and the lunar, which are said to have sprung from Manu Vaivasvata and Atri.

The Vishṇu Purāṇa (which is here written in prose) makes the following statement regarding Manu’s descendants:

the Rik, Yajush, Sāman and Atharva-Vedas. From Brahmā's right thumb was born the Prajāpati Daksha; Daksha had a daughter Aditi; from her was born Vivasvat; and from him sprang Manu. Manu had sons called Ikshvāku, Nṛiga, Dhṛṣṭa, Saryāti, Narishyanta, Prāṁṣu, Nābhāganedīśtha, Karūsha, and Prishadhra. Desirous of a son, Manu sacrificed to Mitra and Varuṇa; but in consequence of a wrong invocation through an irregularity of the hotṛ-priest, a daughter called Ilā was born. Then through the favour of Mitra and Varuṇa she came to Manu a son called Sudyumna. But being again changed into a female through the wrath of Īśvara (Mahādeva) she wandered near the hermitage of Budha the son of Soma (the Moon); who becoming enamoured of her had by her a son called Purūravas. After his birth, the god who is formed of sacrifice, of the Rik, Yajush, Sāman, and Atharva Vedas, of all things, of mind, of nothing, he who is in the form of the sacrificial Male, was worshipped by the rishis of infinite splendour who desired that Sudyumna should recover his manhood. Through the favour of this god Ilā became again Sudyumna.”

Regarding the different sons of Manu the Purāṇas supply the following particulars:

(1.) Prishadhra.—The Vishṇu Purāṇa says:

Prishadhraḥ tu guru-go-badhāḥ chhūḍratevam āgamat |
“Prishadhra became a Śūdra in consequence of his having killed his religious preceptor's cow.”

On the same subject the Harivaṃśa tells us, verse 659:

Prishadhro hiṁsāyitvā tu guror gām Janamejaya | śāpāḥ chhūḍratevam apaṇnah |

“Prishadhra having killed his Guru’s cow, became a Śūdra in consequence of his curse.”

This story is variously amplified in the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, section cxii., and in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa ix. 2, 3–14. See Professor Wilson’s note, Vishṇu Purāṇa, 4to. edit. p. 351, where the author remarks that

72 See above, p. 72 f.
73 Compare with this the list of Manu’s sons given in the passage from the M. Bh. Ádip. quoted above, p. 126. Nābhānedīśtha (not Nābhāganedīśtha) is mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, and Taittirīya Sanhitā (see above, p. 191), and S’aryāta in the S. P. Br. iv. 1, 5, 1. See Journ. Roy. As. Soc. for 1866, p. 11 ff. The Mārk. P. exi. 3 ff., and the Bhāg. P. ix. 1, 11 ff. treat also of Manu’s sons and of the birth of Ilā. See Wilson’s Vishṇu P. 4to. ed. pp. 348–58, and Burnouf’s Bhāg. P. vol. iii. pref. lxx. ff. 74 Akiṁchānmatayḥ, “not consisting of anything.”
"the obvious purport of this legend, and of some that follow, is to account for the origin of the different castes from one common ancestor."

(2.) Karūsha.—The Vishṇu Purāṇa says, iv, 1, 13:
Karūshāt Karūshā mahābalaḥ Kṣatatriyā babhūveḥ |
"From Karūsha the Kārūshas, Kṣatatriyas of great power, were descended."

The Bhāgavata Purāṇa, ix, 2, says:
Karūshad Mānacād āsan Karūshāḥ Kṣattra-ñātyaḥ | uttarāpathagoptāro brahmanyā dharma-vatsalāh |
"From Karūsha, son of Manu, came the Kārūshas of the Kṣatatriya caste, protectors of the northern region, devout, and lovers of duty."

(3.) Nābhāga.—The Vishṇu Purāṇa says:
Nābhāgo Nedishta-putras tu vaiśyatām agamat |
"Nābhāga, the son of Nedīṣṭa, became a Vaiśya."

The Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa says he was the son of Dishtā, and relates how he became a Vaiśya, by marrying the daughter of a man of that class (section cxiii. and Wilson, p. 352, note). The Bhāgavata Purāṇa, ix, 2, 23, says he became a Vaiśya in consequence of his works (Nābhāgo Dishtā-putro 'nyah karmabhīr vaiśyatām gataḥ). And yet a long list of his descendants is given, and among them occurs Marutta who was a Chakravarttin, or universal monarch (Vishṇu P. iv. 1. 15–17; Bhāg. P. ix. 2, 23–28; Mārk. P. cxxviii.–cxxxii.). He had a grandson called Dama, of whom the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa relates that at a Sva-yamvara he was chosen by the daughter of the King of Daśārya for her husband (cxxxiv. 8), and that when the bride had been seized by three of his rejected rivals (verse 16) she was rescued by him after he had slain one of them and vanquished another (verse 53); that subsequently that same vanquished rival in revenge killed Dama’s father, who had retired into the wilderness as an ascetic (cxxxv. 18). The Purāṇa in one of its recensions ends with the following curious particulars:

Tataḥ chakāra tātasya ruktenivodaka-kriyām | aññinyam prāpya sa pūtah punah prāyat sav-mandiram | Vapushmataḥ cha māṁsena-piṅḍadānāṁ chakāra ha | brāhmaṇān bhūjyāmāsa rakṣasah-kula-samudbhavān | evaṁvidhā hi rājāno babhūveḥ sūrya-vaiśmā-jāḥ | anye 'pi sudhiyā hāra yajvānāḥ sāstra-kovidāḥ | vedāntam paṭhamānāṁ tāṁ na sankhyātum ihotāhe |

"Dama then (after tearing out the heart of Vapushmat) performed
with blood the rites to the manes of his father; and having thus discharged his debt to his parent, he returned home. With the flesh of Vapushmat he formed the oblation which he offered, and fed the Brāhmans who were of Rākshasa descent. Of such character were the kings of the Solar race. There were also others who were wise, brave, priests, and skilled in the scriptures. I am unable here to enumerate those of them who studied the Vedānta."

The Harivāmśa (section xi. verse 658) tells us that "two sons of Nābhāgārīshṭa, who were Vaiśyas, became Brāhmans" (Nābhāgārīshṭa-putrau deve vaiśyau brāhmaṇatām gatau).

(4.) Dhṛiṣṭa.—Of him the Vīṣṇu Purāṇa relates, iv. 2, 2:

Dhṛiṣṭasyāpi Dhāraḥtakam Kṣhattram samabhavat
"From Dhṛiṣṭa sprang the Dhāraḥtaka Kṣhattriyas."

The Bhāgavata Purāṇa says, ix. 2, 17:

Dhṛiṣṭād Dhāraḥtam abhūt Kṣhattram brahma-bhūyam gatam kshilau
"From Dhṛiṣṭa were descended the Dhāraḥtaka Kṣhattriyas, who obtained Brāhmānhood on earth."

(5.) The last-named Purāṇa enumerates in verses 19 ff. of the same section the descendants of Narishyanta, among whom was Agnivesya, verse 21:

Tato 'gnivesyo bhagavān Agniḥ swayam abhūt sutah | Kāṇīna iti vikhyāto Jātukarnyo mahān rishiḥ | tato brahma-kulaṁ jatam Āgniveśyāyanaṁ nripa | Narishyantāvayaḥ proktaḥ |

"From him (Devadatta) sprang a son Agnivesya, who was the lord Agni himself, and who was also called Kāṇīna and Jātukarna the great rishi. From him was descended the Agnivesyāyana race of..."

75 This quotation, which will be partly found in Prof. Wilson’s note 22, p. 353, is taken from the section given separately by Prof. Banerjea at the end of his edition of this Purāṇa from a Maithila MS. which differs from that followed in his text (see his Preface, p. 30). In verses 6 f. of section cxxxvi. however, of Prof. Banerjea’s text, Dama threatens to do something of the same sort as in the other recension he is described to have actually done: 6. Yād aham tasya raktena dehotthena Vapushmataḥ | na karomi guras triptiḥ tat pravekṣhya hūtāsānam | 7. Tuchchhoyitendaka-karma tasya tātasya saṅkhya viinīpūtatasya | māṁsena samyag ṛṣijā-bhojanaṁ cha na chet pravekṣhāyāmi hūtāsānam tat | 6. If I do not satiate my father with the blood from Vapushmat’s body, then I shall enter the fire. 7. If I do not celebrate with his blood the obsequial rites of my father prostrated in the fray, and feed the Brāhmans with (his) flesh, I shall enter the fire."

76 The Commentator explains brahma-bhūyam by brāhmaṇaṁvam, "the state of Brāhmans."
Brāhmans. The offspring of Narishyanta has been declared.” That of Dīhbṭa is next taken up.

Some of the names of Manu’s sons are repeated in the subsequent narrative. Thus we find a second Prāṇušu named among the descendants of Nābhāga (Wilson, 352). And in the Vishṇu Purāṇa, iv. 2, 2, a second Nābhāga is mentioned as follows:

_Nābhāgasyaṭmaṇo Nābhāgas tasya Ambarīṣah | Ambarīṣasyāpi Viśūpo bhavat Viśūpō Prishadaścvo jajne tataḥ cha Rathītaraḥ | tatrāyaṁ ślokah | “ete kṣhattrapraśatā vai punaḥ chāṅgirasaḥ amṛitāḥ | Rathītarāgāṁ pravararaḥ kṣhattropetā deivatayaḥ” |

“The son of Nābhāga was Nābhāga; his son was Ambarīṣha. From him sprang Viśūpa; from him Prishadaśva; and from him Rathītara; regarding whom this verse is current: ‘These persons sprung from a Kṣhattriya, and afterwards called Angiras, were the chief of the Rathītara, twice-born men (Brāhmans) of Kṣhattriya race.’”

The Bhāgaṅa thus explains the circumstance, ix. 6, 2:

_Rathītaraśyāiprajasya bhāryaṁ tantaevṛṣitāḥ | Angirā janayāmāsa brahmavarchasinaḥ sūtan | ete kṣhetre prasūtā vai punaḥ tv Angi-rasāḥ amṛitāḥ | Rathītaraśāṁ pravararāḥ kṣhattropetā deivatayaḥ |

“Angiras being solicited for progeny, begot sons possessing Brahmanical glory on the wife of Rathītara who was childless. These persons being born of a (Kṣhattriya’s) wife, but afterwards called descendants of Angiras, were the chief of the Rathītara, twice-born men (Brāhmans) of Kṣhattriya lineage.”

It will be observed that in this last verse the Bhāgaṅa reads kṣhetre prasūtāḥ “born of the wife (of a Kṣhattriya),” instead of kṣhattraprasūtāḥ, “sprung from a Kṣhattriya,” and thus brings this verse into a closer conformity with the one preceding it. Professor Wilson (p. 359, note) considers that the form given to the legend in the Bhāgaṅa “is an afterthought, not warranted by the memorial verse cited in our text.” It is difficult to determine whether or not this may be the case without knowing which of the two readings in that verse is the original one.

(6.) The Vishṇu Purāṇa next proceeds to enumerate the descendants of Ikṣhvāku son of Manu. The representative of his line in the twenty-first generation was Harita, of whom it is said, iv. 3, 5:

77 See Prof. Wilson’s note in p. 359 on this passage.
Ambarīshasya Māndhātus tanayasya Yuvanāsvaḥ putro 'bhūt | tasmād
Harito yato 'ngirosa Hāritāḥ |

"The son of Ambarīsha 78 son of Māndhātri was Yuvanāśva. From him sprang Harita, from whom the Hāritā Angirases were descended."

These words are thus paraphrased by the Commentator: "from him sprang the Hāritā Angirases, Brāhmans, chief of the family of Harita" (tasmād Hāritā Angirosa deijāḥ Harita-gotra-pravarāḥ).

The Linga Purāṇa, quoted by Prof. Wilson, states the same thing:

Harito Yuvanāsvaṣya Hāritā yato ātmajāḥ | ete hy Angirasaḥ pakshe
kshattropetā deijātayah |

"The son of Yuvanāśva was Harita, of whom the Hāritas were sons. They were on the side of Angiras, twice-born men (Brāhmans) of Kshattriya lineage."

And the Vāyu Purāṇa tells us with some variation:

Harito Yuvanāsvaṣya Hāritā bhūrayaḥ śmrītāḥ | ete hy Angirasaḥ
putrāḥ kshattropetā deijātayah |

"Harita was the son of Yuvanāśva: (after whom) many persons were called Hāritas. These were the sons of Angiras, twice-born men (Brāhmans) of Kshattriya race."

This may mean that they were begotten by Angiras, as is said by the Bhāgavata (see above) to have been the case with Rathitara's sons. In that case, however, as Nābhāga and Ikshvāku were brothers and Ra-
thitara was only the fifth in descent from Nābhāga, whilst Harita was the twenty-first after Ikshvāku,—Angiras (if we suppose one and the same person be meant in both cases) must have lived for sixteen generations!

Such are the remarkable notices given in the Purāṇas of the rise of different castes among the descendants of some of the sons of Manu Vaivasvata the legendary head of the solar line of kings. I shall now add some similar particulars connected with the lunar dynasty.

According to the Vishṇu Purāṇa (iv. 6, 2 ff.) Atri was the son of Brāhmaṇ, and the father of Soma (the moon), whom Brāhma installed as the sovereign of plants, Brāhmans and stars 79 (āśeṣhaushadhi-deviṣa-
naksṛtṛṇāṁ adhipatya 'bhayeṣeṣchatya). After celebrating the rūjasūya
sacrifice, Soma became intoxicated with pride, and carried off Tārā

78 We have already had a person of this name the son of Nābhāga. See above.
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(Star), the wife of Bṛhaspati the preceptor of the gods, whom, although admonished and entreated by Brahmā, the gods, and rishis, he refused to restore. Soma’s part was taken by Uśanas; and Rudra, who had studied under Angiras, aided Bṛhaspati (Angirasasācha sakāsopalabdha-vidyō bhagavān Rudro Bṛhaspatēḥ sāhāyyam akarot).

A fierce conflict ensued between the two sides, supported respectively by the gods and the Daityas, etc. Brahmā interposed, and compelled Soma to restore Tāra to her husband. She had, however, in the mean time become pregnant, and bore a son Budha (the planet Mercury), of whom, when strongly urged, she acknowledged Soma to be the father. Purūravas, as has been already mentioned, was the son of this Budha by Ilā, the daughter of Manu. The loves of Purūravas and the Apsaras Urvāśī are related in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, xi. 5, 1, 1; in the Vishnu Purāṇa, iv. 6, 19 ff.; in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, ix. 14; and in the Harivaṃśa, section 26. The Mahābhārata, Ādīp. sect. 75, alludes to Purūravas as having been engaged in a contest with the Brāhmans. This passage will be quoted hereafter. According to the Vishnu Purāṇa, iv. 7, 1, Purūravas had six sons, of whom the eldest was Āyu. Āyu had five sons: Nahusha, Kshattravriddha, Rambha, Raţi, and Anenas. The narrative proceeds (iv. 8, 1):


“Kṣatrarvridhha had a son Sunahotra, who had three sons, Kāsa, Leśa, and Gṛitsama. From the last sprang Saumaka, who originated the system of four castes.” Kāsa had a son Kāśirāja, of whom again Dirghatamas was the son, as Dhanvantari was of Dirghatamas.”

80 This is the only mention I have ever happened to encounter of the great Maḥādeva having been at school!
81 This passage is translated by Professor Müller in the Oxford Essays for 1856, pp. 62 f.; and the legend has been formed on the basis of the obscure hymn in the R.V. x. 95, in which the two names of Purūravas and Urvāśī occur as those of the interlocutors in a dialogue.
82 A short quotation has been already made from this narrative. See above, p. 158.
83 Both my MSS. read Sunahotra. Professor Wilson has Subhotra.
84 The Commentator explains the words cāturvarnyapravarttagītā by saying that the four castes were produced among his descendants (tad-vāṁsē cāturvarṇa abhāva). This explanation agrees with the statement of the Vāyu Purāṇa given in the text.
The Vayu Purāṇa, as quoted by Professor Wilson (V. P. 4to. ed. p. 406), expresses the matter differently, thus:

_Puto Gṛitamadasya cha Sunako yasya Saunakah | brāhmaṇāḥ kṣat-\_triyaś caiva vaisyaḥ śudrās tathaiva ca | etasya vaṁśe samudbhūtā vichitraḥ karmabhūr deijāḥ |

"The son of Gṛitamsa was Sunaka, from whom sprang Saunaka. In his family were born Brāhmans, Kṣatṛtyas, Vaiśyas, and Śudras, twice-born men with various functions." 85

In like manner the Harivaṁśa states in section 29, verse 1520:

_Puto Gṛitamadasyāpi Sunako yasya Saunakah | brāhmaṇāḥ kṣat-\_triyaś caiva vaisyaḥ śudrās tathaiva ca |

"The son of Gṛitamsa was Sunaka, from whom sprang the Saunakas, Brāhmans, Kṣatṛtyas, Vaiśyas, and Śudras."

Something similar is said of Gṛitamsati (who was the son of a Suhotra, although not the grandson of Kṣatattravṛiddha) in a following section, the 32nd of the same work, verse 1732:

_Sa chāpi Vitathāḥ putrān janayāṁśa panche vai | Suhotraṁ cha Su-\_hotāram Gayāṁ Gargaṁ tathaiva ca | Kapilaṁ cha mahātmānam Suhotrasya suta-dvayam | Kāśakaṣ ca mahāsattvas tathā Gṛitamatir nripaḥ | tathā Gṛitamateḥ putrā brāhmaṇāḥ kṣatṛtyāḥ viśaḥ |

"Vitatha was the father of five sons, Suhotra, Suhotṛi, Gayā, Garga, and the great Kapila. Suhotra had two sons, the exalted Kāśaka, and King Gṛitamsati. The sons of the latter were Brāhmans, Kṣatṛtyas, and Vaiśyas."

The Bhagavata Purāṇa, ix. 17, 2 f., has the following notice of Kṣatattravṛiddha’s descendants:

_Kṣatattravṛiddha-sutasasyaṇaḥ Suhotrasyāmajāḥ trayāḥ | Kāśyaḥ Kuśo Gṛitamadāḥ iti Gṛitamadād abhūt | Sunako Saunako yasya bheri-\_chaḥ pravaro muniḥ |

"Suhotra, son of Kṣatattravṛiddha, had three sons, Kāśya, Kuśa, and Gṛitamsadā. From the last sprang Sunaka, and from him Saunaka, the eminent Muni, versed in the Rig-veda."

85 On this Professor Wilson remarks, note, p. 406: "The existence of but one caste in the age of purity, however incompatible with the legend which ascribes the origin of the four tribes to Brāhma, is everywhere admitted. Their separation is assigned to different individuals, whether accurately to any one may be doubted; but the notion indicates that the distinction was of a social or political character."
It is to be observed that this Grītsamada, who is here described as belonging to the regal lineage of Purūravas, is the reputed rishi of many hymns in the second Maṇḍala of the Rig-veda. Regarding him the Commentator Sāyaṇa has the following remarks in his introduction to that Maṇḍala:

Maṇḍala-draṣṭā Grītsamadāḥ rishiḥ | sa cha pūrvam Āngirasā-kule
Sunahotrasya putraḥ san yajna-kāle 'surair grihītaḥ Indreya mochitaḥ |
pāṣeṭ tadd-vachanenaiva Bhrigu-kule Śunaka-patro Grītsamada-nāma
'bhūt | tathā chānukramaṇikā "Yaḥ Āngirasāḥ Saunahotro bhūtvā Bhārgavaḥ
Saunako 'bhavat sa Grītsamado devityam maṇḍalam apāsyad” iti |
tathā tasyaiva Śaunakasya vachanam rishy-anukramaṇe "teem Agne”
iti | "Grītsamadāḥ Śaunako Bhrigutāṁ gataḥ | Śaunahoto prakṛtyā tu
yaḥ Āngirasao uchyate” iti | tasmād maṇḍala-draṣṭā Saunako Grītsamadaḥ rishiḥ |

"The seer (i.e. he who received the revelation) of this Maṇḍala was the rishi Grītsamada. He, being formerly the son of Sunahotra in the family of the Āngirasas, was seized by the Asuras at the time of sacrifice and rescued by Indra. Afterwards, by the command of that god, he became the person named Grītsamada, son of Sunaka, in the family of Bhrigu. Thus the Anukramaṇikā (Index to the Rig-veda) says of him: ‘That Grītsamada, who, having been an Āngirasa, and son of Sunahotra, became a Bhārgava and son of Sunaka, saw the second Maṇḍala.’ So, too, the same Saunaka says in his Rishi-anukramaṇa regarding the Maṇḍala beginning with ‘Thou, o Agni’ :— ‘Grītsamada son of Sunaka who is declared to have been naturally an Āngirasa, and the son of Sunahotra, became a Bhrigu.’ Hence the seer of the Maṇḍala is the rishi Grītsamada son of Sunaka."

It will be noticed that (unless we are to suppose a different Grītsamada to be intended in each case) there is a discrepancy between the Purāṇas on the one hand, and Sāyaṇa and the Anukramaṇikā on the other; as the Purāṇas make Grītsamada the son of Sunahotra or Suhotra, and the father of Sunaka; whilst the Anukramaṇikā, followed by Sāyaṇa, represents the same personage as having been, indeed, originally the son of Sunahotra of the race of Angiras, but as having afterwards become, by what process does not appear, the son of Sunaka of the race of Bhrigu.

In his translation of the Rig-veda (ii. 207 f.) Professor Wilson refers
to a legend about King Vitahavya in the Anuśāsana-parvan of the Mahābhārata (verses 1944–2006) which gives a different account of Gritsamada’s parentage. It begins: 

*Sriṇu rājān yathā rājā Vitahavyo mahāyasāh | rājarṣhir durlabhah prāpto brāhmaṇyaṁ loka-satkriṇam |

"Hear, o king, how the renowned Vitahavya, the royal rishi, attained the condition of Brāhmaṇhood venerated by mankind, and so difficult to be acquired."

It happened that Divodāsa, King of Kāśi (Benares) was attacked by the sons of Vitahavya, and all his family slain by them in battle. The afflicted monarch thereupon resorted to the sage Bhāradvāja, who performed for him a sacrifice in consequence of which a son named Pratardana was born to him. Pratardana, becoming an accomplished warrior, was sent by his father to take vengeance on the Vitahavyas. They rained upon him showers of arrows and other missiles, “as clouds pour down upon the Himalaya” 86 (abhavārshanta rājānam hima-vantam ivāmbudāḥ); but he destroyed them all, and “they lay with their bodies besmeared with blood, like kinsuka-trees 87 cut down”, (apatan rudhirārdrāṅgā nikṛittā iea kiṃsukāḥ). Vitahavya himself had now to fly to another sage, Bhṛgu, who promised him protection. The avenger Pratardana, however, followed and demanded that the refugee should be delivered up:

Ausyadānti badhād adya bhavishyāmy anṝṇaḥ pituḥ | tam uchācha kri-pāvishto Bhṛgur dharma-bhiritāṁ varaḥ | “nehāsti kṣhatriyaḥ kaśchit sārce hime dvijātayaḥ” | etat tu vachanaṁ śrutvā Bhṛgos tathāya Pratardanaḥ | pādāc āpasprīṣya śañāḥ prahṛṣhto vākyaṁ abravīt | evam apy asmi bhagavan kṛitakṛtyo na saṃśayaḥ | . . . . tyājito hi mayā jātīm esha rājā Bhṛgūvedaḥ | tatas tenābhyanujñāto yayau rājā Pratardanaḥ | yathā-gatam mahārāja muktva viṣhām ivoragah | Bhṛgor vachana-mātreṇa sa cha brahmaṇarhitāṁ gataḥ | Vitahavyo mahārāja brahma-māḍitvam eva cha | tasya Gṛtśamadāḥ putro rūpenendra iṅāparah | "Sakras tvam” iti yo daityaṁ nigrihitāḥ kilābhavat | rigveda cattvāt cāygyā śrutir yasya mahātmanaḥ | yatra Gṛtśamado “brahmaḥ” brahmaṇaṁ sa mahiyate | sa brahmacārī viprvarshīḥ śrīmān Gṛtśamado 'bhavat |

"Pratardana says: 'By the slaughter of this (Vitahavya) I shall

86 This simile seems to indicate a familiarity with the manner in which the clouds collect, and discharge their contents on the outer range of the Himalaya.
87 The Kinsukā is a tree bearing a red blossom (Butea frondosa)."
now, to-day, be acquitted of my debt to my father.’ Bhṛigu, the most eminent of religious men, filled with compassion, answered: ‘There is no Kshattriya here: all these are Brāhmans.’ Hearing this true assertion of Bhṛigu, Pratardana was glad, and gently touching the sage’s feet, rejoined: ‘Even thus, o glorious saint, I have gained my object . . . . for I have compelled this King (i.e. Rājanya) to relinquish his caste.’ King Pratardana then, after receiving the sage’s salutations, departed, as he came, like a serpent which has discharged its poison: while Vitahavya by the mere word of Bhṛigu became a Brāhma-rishi, and an utterer of the Veda. Gritsamada, in form like a second Indra, was his son; he was seized by the Daityas, who said to him, ‘Thou art Sakra’ (Indra). In the Rig-veda the texts (śruti) of this great rishi stand first.89 There Gritsamada is honoured by the Brāhmans (with the title of) ‘Brāhmān.’ This illustrious personage was a Brahmachārin, and a Brāhman-rishi.”

According to the enumeration of Gritsamada’s family, which follows here, Sunaka was his descendant in the twelfth generation, and Saunaka in the thirteenth. The story concludes with these words:

_Evam vipratvam agamad Vitahavyo narādhipaḥ | Bhṛigoḥ prasūdaśād rājendra kṣhattriyah kṣhattriyarshabha |

“Thus did King Vitahavya, a Kshattriya, enter into the condition of Brāhmanhood by the favour of Bhṛigu.”

In the next chapter we shall again notice Vitahavya among the Kshattriyas who are declared by tradition to have been the authors of Vedic hymns.

King Divodāsa was the sixth in descent from Kāśa brother of Gritsamada. Of him the Harivaṃśa states, section 32, verse 789 f.:

_Divodāsasya dayāda brahmaśīrḥ Mitrāyur nripaḥ | Mitrāyaṇas tataḥ Somo Maitreyās tu tataḥ smṛitaḥ | ekt vai saṁśritaḥ pakṣham kṣhattropetās tu Bhārgavāḥ |

“The son of Divodāsa was the King Mitrāyu a Brāhman-rishi. From him sprang Soma Maitreyāṇa, from whom the Maitreyas received their name. They, being of Kshattriya lineage, adhered as Bhārgavas to the side (of the latter).”

89 If I have correctly interpreted this verse, and if by “first” we are to understand first in order, it does not accurately represent the state of the case: as the hymns of Gritsamada only appear in the second Maṇḍala.
The twentieth in descent from the same Kāśa, brother of Gṛtsamada, was Bhārgabhūmi, of whom the Vishṇu Purāṇa says, iv. 8, 9:

\[ \text{Bhārgasya Bhārgabhūmiḥ | tataḥ chāturearṇya-pravṛttiḥ | ity ete Kaśaye bhūpatayah kathitāḥ} \]

"The son of Bhārga was Bhārgabhūmi, from whom the four castes originated. Thus have the kings called Kāśis been declared."

In two passages of the Harivaṁśa, names identical, or nearly so, are found, but with a different progenitor in each case, in reference to which a similar statement is made. The first is in section 29, verse 1596:

\[ \text{Veṇuhotra-sutaḥ cāpi Bhargo nāma prajēṣvaraḥ | Vatsasya Vatsabhūmis tu Bhṛgubhūmis tu Bhārgavāt | ete hy Angirasah putrā jātā vaṁśe 'tha Bhārgave | brāhmaṇāḥ kṣhattriyā vaisyās trayāḥ putrāḥ sahasraśaḥ} \]

"The son of Veṇuhotra was King Bharga. From Vatsa sprang Vatsabhūmi, and Bhṛgubhūmi from Bhārgava. These descendants of Angiras were then born in the family of Bhṛgu, Brāhmans, Kṣhattriyas, and Vaiśyas three (classes of) descendants in thousands."

The second passage is in the 32nd section, verse 1752:

\[ \text{Sukumārasya putras tu Satyaketur mahārathaḥ | suto 'bhavaḥ mahā-tejā rājā parama-dhārmikāḥ | Vatsasya Vatsabhūmis tu Bhārgabhūmis tu Bhārgavāt | ete hy Angirasah putrā jātā vaṁśe 'tha Bhārgave | brāhmaṇāḥ kṣhattriyā vaisyāḥ śudrās cha Bharatarśabhā} \]

"The warrior Satyaketu was the son of Sukumāra, and a prince of great lustre and virtue. From Vatsa sprang Vatsabhūmi, and Bhārgabhūmi from Bhārgava. These descendants of Angiras were then born in the family of Bhṛgu, Brāhmans, Kṣhattriyas, Vaiśyas and Śudras."

The parallel passage in the Vāyu Purāṇa, as quoted by Professor Wilson, p 409, has names which are mostly different:

\[ \text{Veṇuhotra-sutaḥ cāpi Gārgyo vai nāma viśrutaḥ | Gārgyasya Gārgabhūmis tu Vatso Vatsasya dhīmataḥ | brāhmaṇāḥ kṣhattriyāś chaiva tayoḥ putrāḥ udbhārmikāḥ} \]

"The son of Veṇuhotra was the renowned Gārgya. Gargabhūmi was the son of Gārgya; and Vatsa of the wise Vatsa. Brāhmans and Kṣhattriyas were the virtuous sons of these two."

99 Professor Wilson, p. 410, note, gives tejayuktāḥ, "glorious," instead of trayāḥ putrāḥ, as the reading either of the Brāhma Purāṇa, or of the Harivaṁśa, or both.

90 In regard to these passages the reader may consult the remarks of Professor
Another son of Āyus (son of Purūravas) was Rambha, of whom the Bhāgavata Purāṇa says, ix. 17, 10:

Rambhasya Rabhasaḥ putro Gabhiraś chākriyas tataḥ | tasya kṣhetre brahma jayā śrīnu vāṁsam Anenasah |

“The son of Rambha was Rabhasa, from whom sprang Gabhira and Akriya. From his wife Brāhmans were born: here now the race of Anenas” (another son of Āyus).

Of the same Rambha the Vishnū Purāṇa says (iv. 9, 8), Rambhas tv anapatya 'bhavat | “Rambha was childless.”

Another son of Āyus, as we have seen, Vishnū Purāṇa, iv. 8, 1, was Nahusha. He had six sons (V. P. iv. 10, 1), of whom one was Yayāti. The sons of the latter were Yadu, Turvasu, Druhyu, Anu, and Pūru (Ibid. iv. 10, 2). 91 One of these five, Anu, had, as we are told, in the twelfth generation a son called Bali, of whom the Vishnū Purāṇa, iv. 18, 1, relates:

Hemāt Sutapās tasmād Balir yasya kṣhetre Dirghatamasā Anga-Banga-Kalinga-Suhma-Punḍrákhyam Bāleyaṁ kṣattram ajanyata |

“From Hema sprang Sutapas; and from him Bali, on whose wife 92 Bāleya Khattriyanas (i.e. Khattriyas of the race of Bali), called Anga, Banga, Kalinga, Suhma, and Punḍra were begotten by Dirghatamas.”

Professor Wilson (p. 445, note 12) quotes from the Vāyu Purāṇa a statement regarding the same person that he had “sons who founded the four castes” (putrān chāturvarnya-karān); and refers to a passage in the Matsya Purāṇa, in which Bali is said to have obtained from

Wilson, p. 409, note 16, where a commentator (on the Brāhma Purāṇa, or the Hara-vāmaṇa) is quoted, who says that in the passage from these works “another son o' Vatsa the father of Alarka is specified, viz., Vatsabhūmi; while Bhārgava is the brother of Vatsa; and that (the persons referred to were) Angirases because Gālava belonged to that family, and (were born in the family) of Bhṛigu, because Visvāmitra belonged to it” (Vatsasaḥ Alarka-pituh putrotāram āha “Vatsabhūmi” iti | “Bhārgavāḥ” Vatsa-bhrūtuh | “Angirasaḥ” Gālavaḥsaḥ Angirasatevāḥ | “Bhārgavaḥ” Visvāmitrasya Bhārgava-atevāḥ). The Vishnū Purāṇa, iv. 8, 6, says that Vatsa was one of the names of Pratardana, son of Divodāsa, a descendant of Kaśa, and a remote ancestor of Bhārgabhūmi. See however Professor Wilson’s note 13, p. 408. It is possible that the resemblance of the word Bhārga to Bhārgava may have occasioned the descendants of the former to be connected with the family of Bhṛigu.

91 These five names occur together in the plural in a verse of the Rig-veda, i. 109, quoted above, p. 179.

92 Kṣhetre bhāryaṁ jātateva Bāleyaḥ | “They were called descendants of Bali because they were born of his wife.”
Brahmā the boon that he should "establish the four fixed castes" (chaturopiyattan varṇāṁ tvam sthāpayeti).

The Harivaṃśa gives the following account of Bali, in the course of which the same thing is stated; section 31, verses 1682 ff.:

Phenāt tu Sutapa jñēna sutaḥ Sutapasso Balī | jāto mānusya-yonau tu sa rājā kāñcaneśhuddhiḥ | mahāyogī sa tu Balīr babhūva nṛpatiḥ purā | putrān utpadyāmāsa pancha vaṁśa-karān bhūvi | Angaḥ-prathamato jajne Vangaḥ Suhmaḥ taṭhaiva cha | Pundrāḥ Kalingaḥ cha taṭhā Bāleyaḥ kshattram uchyate | Bāleyaḥ brāhmaṇaḥ chaiva taṃya vaṃśakarā bhūvi | Bales tu Brahmanā datto varāḥ prītena Bhārataḥ | mahāyogitvam āyuḥ cha kalpaśya parimāṇataḥ | sangrame chāpy ajeyatvāṁ dharme chaiva pradhānataḥ | trailokyā-darśanaṁ chāpi prādhānayam prasave tathā | bale chāpratimatvāṁ vai dharma-tattvārtha-dārśanam | chaturo niyatān varṇāṁs tvam cha sthāpayīte cha | ity ukto vibhūna rājā Balīḥ sāntim parāṁ yayaḥ | tasyai te tanayāḥ sarve khettrapāḥ muni-pangavāt | sambhitā Dirghatapasaḥ Sudeshṇāyaṁ mahaujausah |

"From Phena sprang Sutapas; and the son of Sutapas was Bali. He was born of a human mother, this prince with the golden quiver; but King Bali was of old a great yogin. He begot five sons, who were the heads of races upon the earth. Anga was first born, then Vanga, Suhma, Pundra and Kalinga; such are the names of the Kshattriyas descended from Bali (Bāleyāḥ). There were also Bāleya Brāhmans, founders of his race upon the earth. By Brahmagini, who was pleased, the boon was granted to Bali that he should be a great yogin, should live the entire length of a Kalpa, should be invincible in battle, should have pre-eminence in virtue, should have the power of beholding the whole three worlds, should have a superiority in begetting progeny, should be unequalled in strength, and should comprehend the essential principles of duty. And being thus addressed by the Lord in these words, 'Thou shalt establish the four regulated castes,' King Bali attained supreme tranquillity. All these sons, the offspring of his wife, were begotten on Sudeshṇā by the glorious muni Dirghatapasah."

\[92\] M. Langlois must have found in his MS. a different reading of the last line, as he renders it otherwise. Professor Wilson remarks (V.P. pp. 444, note 12): "The Matsya calls Bali the son of Virochana, and āyu-kalpa-pramāṇikāṁ, 'existing for a whole Kalpa;' identifying him, therefore, only in a different period and form, with the Bali of the Vāmana Avatāra" (Dwarf-incarnation). (See Wilson's Vishnu P. p. 265, note, and the Bhāgavata P. ix. sects. 15–23, and other works quoted in the 4th vol. of this work, pp. 116 ff.)
Apratiratha is recorded as being a descendant of Pūru (another of Yāyāti’s sons), in the thirteenth generation (Wilson, p. 448). Of him it is related, Vishnu Purāṇa, iv. 19, 2:

Riteyoh Rantināraḥ purtro ’bhuṭ | Taṁsum Apratirathah Dhruvah cha Rantināraḥ putrān avāpa | Apratirathat Kayvah | taśyāpi Medhātithih | yataḥ Kānvayana deījā babhābhuḥ | Taṁsa Anilas tato Dushyantādyāś chatvāraḥ putrā babhāvuvah | Dushyantāḥ chakravartī Bharato ’bhavat |

“Riteyu had a son Rantināra, who had Tansu, Apratiratha and Dhrusa for his sons. From Apratiratha sprang Kauṇḍa. His son was Medhātithi; from whom the Kānvayana Brahmans were descended. From Tansu sprang Anila, who had four sons, Dushyanta, and others. From Dushyanta sprang the emperor Bharata.”

With some variations the Bhāgavata Purāṇa says, ix. 20, 1:

Pūror vaṁśam pravakhyāmi yatra jāto ’si Bhārata | yatra rājarshayo vaṁśyaḥ brahma-vāṁśyaḥ cha jañire | . . . 6. Riteyoh Rantibhāro ’bhuṭ trayas tasyātmajā nripa | Sumatir Dhruvo ’pratirathah Kayavo ’pratirathāḥ | tasya Medhātithih tasmāt Prakṣaṇādyāḥ deījātayah | putro ’bhuṭ Sumater Raibhyo Dushyantas tat-suto mataḥ |

“I shall declare the race of Pūru from which thou hast sprung, o Bhārata; and in which there have been born royal rishis, and men of Brahmanical family . . . 6. From Riteyu sprang Rantibhāra; who had three sons, Sumati, Dhrusa, and Apratiratha. Kauṇḍa was the son of the last; and the son of Kauṇḍa was Medhātithi, from whom the Prakṣaṇvas and other Brahmans were descended.”

A little further on, in the chapter of the Vishnu Purāṇa just quoted (iv. 19, 10), Kauṇḍa and Medhātithi are mentioned as having had a different parentage from that before assigned, viz., as being the son and grandson of Ajamiḍha, who was a descendant in the ninth generation of Tansu, the brother of Apratiratha:

Ajamiḍhaṭ Kauṇḍa | Kauṇḍad Medhātithir yataḥ Kānvayana deījāḥ | Ajamiḍhasyānyah putro Bhrihadiṣhvah |

“From Ajamiḍha sprang Kauṇḍa: from Kauṇḍa Medhātithi, from whom were descended the Kānvayana Brahmans. Ajamiḍha had another son Bhrihadiṣhu.”94

94 On this the Commentator remarks: Ajamiḍhasya Kauṇḍadīr eko vaṁśo Bhriha-
dishṣvāṣit aparvo vaṁśo Nilādur aparva Rikhādiṣ chāparva | “Ajamiḍha had one set of descendants, consisting of Kauṇḍa, etc., a second consisting of Bhrihadiṣhu, etc.,
On this last passage Professor Wilson observes, p. 452, note: "The copies agree in this reading, yet it can scarcely be correct. Kaṇva has already been noticed as the son of Apratiratha." But the compiler of the Purāṇa may here be merely repeating the discordant accounts which he found in the older authorities which he had before him.

Regarding Ajamīḏha the Bhāgavata says, ix. 21, 21:

Ajamīḏhasya vaṁśyāḥ syuḥ Priyamedhādayo dvijāḥ | Ajamīḏhad Brihadishtuḥ |

"Priyamedha and other Brāhmans were descendants of Ajamīḏha. From Ajamīḏha sprang Brihadishu."

The Vishnu Purāṇa (iv. 19, 16) gives the following account of Mudgala, a descendant of Ajamīḏha in the seventh generation:

Mudgalāḥ cha Maudgalyaḥ kshattropetā dvijātayo babhūvuh | Mudgalāḥ Bhavaśevo Bahvaśvād Divodāso 'halyāḥ cha mithunam abhūt | Saradvato 'halyāyāṁ Satānando 'bhavat |

"From Mudgala were descended the Maudgalya Brāhmans of Kshatriya stock. From Mudgala sprang Bahvaśva; from him again twins, Divodāsa and Ahalyā. Satānanda was born to Saradvata56 by Ahalyā."

Similarly the Bhāgavata Purāṇa says, iv. 21, 33 f.:

Mudgalāḥ brāhma nirvṛttaṁ gotram Maudgalya-sanjnitam | mithunam Mudgalāḥ Bhārmyaḥ Divodāṣaḥ pumān abhūt | Ahalyā kanyākā yasyāṁ Satānandā tu Gautamāt |

"From Mudgala sprang Brāhmans, the family called Maudgalyas. To the same father, who was son of Bharmyaśva, were born twins, Divodāsa, a male, and Ahalyā, a female child, who bore Satānanda to Gautama."

The words of the Matsya Purāṇa on the same subject, as quoted by Professor Wilson, p. 454, note 50, are:

Mudgalasyāpi Maudgalyaḥ kshattropetā dvijatāyah | ete hy Angirasāḥ pakshe samśhitāḥ Kaṇva-Mudgalāḥ |

"From Mudgala sprang the Maudgalyas, Brāhmans of Kshatriya stock. These Kaṇva and Mudgalas stood on the side of Angiras."

a third consisting of Nila, etc., and a fourth consisting of Riksha, etc." The last two sons of Ajamīḏha are mentioned further on, Nila in v. 15, and Riksha in v. 18, of the same chapter of the V. P.

56 The Commentator says this is a name of Gautama. Regarding Ahalyā and Gautama see the story extracted above, p. 121, from the Rāmāyaṇa.
The Harivamśa, section 32, verse 1781, thus notices the same family:

**Mudgalasya tu dāyādo Maudgalayāḥ sumahāyasāḥ | ete sarve mahātmāno kshattropetā dvijātayāḥ | ete hy Angirasāḥ pakṣhaṁ saṁśrītāḥ Kāṇva-Mudgalāḥ | Maudgalasya suto jyeshṭho brahmārśiḥ sumahāyasāḥ |**

"The renowned Maudgalya was the son of Mudgala. All these great personages were Brāhmans of Kshatriya descent. These Kāṇvas and Mudgalas adhered to the side of Angiras. Maudgalya's eldest son was a celebrated Brahman-rishi."

Regarding Kshemaka, a future descendant of Ajamīḍha in the 31st generation, the Vishnu Purāṇa says, iv. 21, 4:

**Tato Niramitra tasamāḥ cha Kṣhemakāḥ | tatirāyaṁ slokaḥ | "brahma-kshattvasya yo yonir" vāṁśo rājarshi-satkṛitaḥ | Kṣhemakām prāpya rājanaṁ sa saṁsthām prāpsyate kalau |**

"From him (Khaṇḍapāṇi) shall spring Niramitra; and from him Kshemaka; regarding whom this verse (is current): 'The race, consecrated by royal rishis, which gave birth to Brāhmans and Kshatriyas, shall terminate in the Kali age, after reaching King Kshemaka.'"

The corresponding verse quoted by Professor Wilson (p. 462, note 24) from the Matsya and Vāyu Purāṇas substitutes devarshi, "divine rishis," or "gods and rishis," for the rājarshi, "royal rishis," of the Vishnu Purāṇa. The verse in question is there described as anuvaṁśa-sloko'yam gīto vipraṁ puratanaṁ, "a genealogical verse sung by ancient Brāhmans."

According to the details given from the Purāṇas in this section several persons, Gṛītsamada, Kāṇva, Medhātithi, and Priyamedha, to whom hymns of the Rig-veda are ascribed by Indian tradition as their rishis, were of Kshatriya descent.

In the line of the same Tansu, brother of Apratiratha, we find in the sixth generation a person named Garga, of whom the Vishnu Purāṇa relates, iv. 19, 9:

**Gargāt Sīníḥ | tato Gāryāḥ Sainyāḥ kṣhattropetā dvijātayo babhūvah |**

"From Garga sprang Sini; from them were descended the Gāryas and Sainyas, Brāhmans of Kshatriya race." 97

96 On this words the Commentator has this note: **Brahmaṇāḥ brāhmaṇasya Kṣattvasya kṣattvīrasya cha yonil kāraṇam pūrvaṁ yathoktateit | "Brahma" and 'Kshattra' stand for Brāhma and Kshatriya. This race is the 'source,' cause (of these), as has been declared above."

97 On this the Commentator only remarks: **Tatas tābhyāṁ Gāryāḥ Sainyāḥ cha**
Similarly the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, ix. 21, 19, says:

Gargāt S'inis tato Gārgyaḥ kshattrād brahma hy avarttata

"From Garga sprang Sini; from them Gārgya, who from a Kshattriya became a Brāhman."

The Vishnu Purāṇa records a similar circumstance regarding the family of Mahāvīryya, the brother of Garga (iv. 19, 10):

Mahāvīryyād Urukshayo nāma putro 'bhūt | tasya Trayyaruna-Pushkarināu Kapiḥ cha putra-trayam abhūt | tuch cha tritayam api paśchād vipratām upajugāma |

"Mahāvīryya had a son named Urukshaya; who again had three sons, Trayyaruna, Pushkarin, and Kapi; and these three afterwards entered into the state of Brāhmans (i.e. became such)."

The Bhāgavata states, ix. 21, 19 f.:

Duritakshaya Mahāvīryyat tasya Trayyarunīḥ Kaviḥ | Pushkararunīr ity atra ye brāhmaṇa-gatiṁ gatāḥ |

"From Mahāvīryya sprang Duritakshaya. From him were descended Trayyaruni, Kavi, and Pushkararuni, who attained to the destination of Brāhmans."

According to the Matsya Purāṇa also, as quoted by Professor Wilson (451, note 22), "all these sons of Uruksa (sic) attained the state of Brāhmans" (Urukshataḥ sutā hy ete sarve brāhmaṇatāṁ gatāḥ); and in another verse of the same Purāṇa, cited in the same note, it is added:

Kavyānāṁ tu varā ṣe ṭe trayāḥ prakta maharshayaḥ | Gargāḥ Sankritayaḥ Kavyāḥ kshattropetā dvijetayaḥ |

"These three classes of great rishis, viz. the Gargas, Sankritis, and Kavyas, Brāhmans of Kshattriya race, are declared to be the most eminent of the Kavyas, or descendants of Kavi." The original Garga was, as we have seen, the brother of Mahāvīryya, the father of Kavi, or Kapi; while, according to the

Garga-vaiññyateit S'ini-vaiñiyatevāḥ cha samākhyaṭāḥ | kshattriyā eva kenachit kāraṇena brāhmaṇāḥ cha bahūvah | "They were called Gārgyas and S'ainyas because they were of the race of Garga and S'ini. Being indeed Kshattriyas they became Brāhmans from some cause or other."

98 The Commentator does not say how this happened.
99 Unless Professor Wilson's MSS. had a different reading from mine, it must have been by an oversight that he has translated here, "The last of whom became a Brāhman."
100 On this the Commentator annotates: Ye atra kshattrā-vaiñye brāhmaṇa-gatiṁ brāhmaṇa-rūpatāṁ gatīs te | "Who in this Kshattriya race attained the destination of Brāhmans,—the form of Brāhmans."
Vishnu Purana (iv. 19, 9), and Bhagavata Purana (ix. 21, 1), Sankrīti was the son of Nara, another brother of Mahaviryya.

The series of passages just quoted is amply sufficient to prove that according to the traditions received by the compilers of the ancient legendary history of India (traditions so general and undisputed as to prevail over even their strong hierarchical prepossessions), Brāhmans, Kshattriyas, and even Vaiśyas and Śūdras, were, at least in many cases, originally descended from one and the same stock. The European critic can have no difficulty in receiving these obscure accounts as true in their literal sense; though the absence of precise historical data may leave him without any other guide than speculation to assist him in determining the process by which a community originally composed for the most part of one uniform element, was broken up into different classes and professions, separated from each other by impassable barriers. On the other hand, the possibility of this common origin of the different castes, though firmly based on tradition, appeared in later times so incredible, or so unpalatable, to some of the compilers of the Puranas, that we find them occasionally attempting to explain away the facts which they record, by statements such as we have encountered in the case of the Kings Rathitara and Bāli, that their progeny was begotten upon their wives by the sages Angiras and Dirghatamas, or Dirghatapas; or by the introduction of a miraculous element into the story, as we have already seen in one of the legends regarding Gritsamada, and as we shall have occasion to notice in a future chapter in the account of Viśvāmitra.
CHAPTER III.

ON THE MUTUAL RELATIONS OF THE DIFFERENT CLASSES OF INDIAN SOCIETY ACCORDING TO THE HYMNS OF THE RIG- AND ATHARVA-VEDAS.

In the last chapter I have attempted to shew that in general the authors of the hymns of the Rig-veda regarded the whole of the Aryan people, embracing not only the priests and chiefs, but the middle classes also of the population, as descended from one common father, or ancestor, whom they designate by the name of Manu. This reference to a common progenitor excludes, of course, the supposition that the writers by whom it is made could have had any belief in the myth which became afterwards current among their countrymen, that their nation consisted of four castes, differing naturally in dignity, and separately created by Brahmā.

In that chapter I proposed to leave for further consideration any specific notices which the Rig-veda might contain regarding the different classes of which the society contemporary with its composition was made up. On this consideration I now enter. As that great collection of hymns embodies numerous references, both to the authors themselves and to the other agents in the celebration of divine worship, it may be expected to supply, incidentally or indirectly, at least, some information respecting the opinion which these ministers of religion entertained of themselves, and of the ecclesiastical and civil relations in which they stood to the other sections of the community. I shall now endeavour to shew how far this expectation is justified by an examination of the Rig-veda.

It will be understood, from what I have already (pp. 7 and 11 ff.) written on the subject of that one hymn of the Rig-veda in which the
four castes are distinctly specified, i.e. the Purusha Sukta, that in the enquiry, which I am now about to undertake, I confine myself in the first instance to those hymns which for any reason (see p. 4, above) appear to be the most ancient, leaving out of account until afterwards, all those compositions which, like the one just mentioned, are presumably of a later age.

It will, I think, be found on investigation that not only the older hymns, but the great bulk of the hymns, supply no distinct evidence of the existence of a well defined and developed caste-system at the time when they were composed.

Sect. I.—On the signification of the words brähman, brähmana, etc., in the Rig-veda.

As the Rig-veda Sanhitā is made up almost entirely of hymns in praise of the gods, it was not to be anticipated that it should furnish any systematic or detailed explanations on the points which form the object of our enquiry. But as was natural in compositions of the early and simple age to which these hymns belong, they do not always confine themselves to matters strictly connected with their principal subject, but indulge in occasional references to the names, families, personal merits, qualifications, relations, circumstances, and fortunes of the poets by whom they were produced, or of their patrons or other contemporaries, or of their predecessors.

I have, in another volume of this work, enquired into the views which the authors of the hymns appear to have held on the subject of their own authorship. The conclusion at which I arrived was, that they did not in general look upon their compositions as divinely inspired, since they frequently speak of them as the productions of their own minds (vol. iii. pp. 128-140). But although this is most commonly the case (and especially, as we may conjecture, in regard to the older hymns), there is no doubt that they also attached a high value to these productions, which they describe as being acceptable to the gods (R.V. v. 45, 4; v. 85, 1; vii. 26, 1, 2; x. 23, 6; x. 54, 6; x. 105,

8), whose activity they stimulated (iii. 34, 1; vii. 19, 11), and whose blessing they drew down. In some of the hymns a supernatural character or insight is claimed for the rishis (i. 179, 2; vii. 76, 4; iii. 53, 9; vii. 33, 11 ff.; vii. 87, 4; vii. 88, 3 ff.; x. 14, 15; x. 62, 4, 5), and a mysterious efficacy is ascribed to their compositions (vol. iii. pp. 173 f.) The rishis called their hymns by various names, as arka, uktha, rich, gir, diñ, nitha, nivid, mantra, mati, sūkta, stoma, vāch, vachas, etc. etc.; and the also applied to them the appellation of brahma in numerous passages. That in the passages in question brahma has generally the sense of hymn or prayer is clear from the context of some of them (as in i. 37, 4; viii. 32, 27, where the word is joined with the verb gāyata, "sing," and in vi. 69, 7, where the gods are supplicated to hear the brahma), as well as from the fact that the poets are said (in i. 62, 13; v. 73, 10; vii. 22, 9; vii. 31, 11; x. 80, 7) to have fashioned or generated the prayer, in the same way as they are said to have fashioned or generated hymns in other texts (as i. 109, 1; v. 2, 11; vii. 15, 4; viii. 77, 4; x. 23, 6; x. 39, 14), where the sense is indisputable; while in other places (iv. 16, 21; v. 29, 15; vi. 17, 13; vi. 50, 6; vii. 61, 6; x. 89, 3) new productions of the poets are spoken of under the appellation of brahma.

That brahma has the sense of hymn or prayer is also shown by the two following passages. In vii. 26, 1, it is said: Na somaḥ Indram asuto mamāda na abrahmāno maghavanāṁ sutāsaḥ | tasmai ukthaṁ janaye yaj juvoshad nriyad naviyāḥ śrīnāvad yathā naḥ | 2. Ukte ukthe somaḥ Indram mamāda nīthe nīthe maghavanāṁ sutāsaḥ | yad tīn sabābhāḥ pitarasaḥ na putrāḥ samāna-dakshāḥ avasam havante | "Soma unless poured out does not exhilarate Indra; nor do libations without hymns (abrahmānaḥ). I generate for him a hymn (uktha) which he will love, so that like a man he may hear our new (production). 2. At each hymn (uktha) the soma exhilarates Indra, at each psalm (nītha) the libations (exhilarate) Maghavat, when the worshippers united, with one effort, invoke him for help, as sons do a father." Again in x. 105, 8, it is

2 For a list of these texts and other details which are here omitted, I refer to my article "On the relations of the priests to the other classes of Indian Society in the Vedic age," in the Journal of the Roy, As. Soc. for 1866 (from which this section is mostly borrowed).

3 It is clear from the context of this passage that abrahmānaḥ means "unattended by hymns," and not "without a priest." After saying that soma-libations without
said: *Ava no vṛijinā śīthi rīchā vanema anrīchāḥ | na abrahmā yajnāḥ rūdhag joshati tve | “Drive away our calamities. With a hymn (rīchā) may we slay the men who are hymnless (anrīchāḥ). A sacrifice without prayer (abrahmā) does not please thee well.”*

I have said that great virtue is occasionally attributed by the poets to their hymns and prayers; and this is true of those sacred texts when called by the name of brahma, as well as when they receive other appellations, such as mantra. Thus it is said, iii. 53, 12, *Viśvāmitrasya rakshati brahma idam Bhārataṁ janam | “This prayer (brahma) of Viśvāmitra protects the tribe of Bharata;”* v. 40, 6, *Gūlham sūryaṁ tāmasā apavrataena turyeṇa brahmaṇā avindad Atriḥ | “Atri with the fourth prayer (brahmaṇā) discovered the sun concealed by unholy darkness;”* vi. 75, 19, *Brahma varma mama antaram | “Prayer (brahma) is my protecting armour;”* vii. 33, 3, *Eva id na kam dāsarājne Sudāsam prāvad Indro brahmaṇā vo Vasishṭhāḥ | “Indra preserved Sudās in the battle of the ten kings through your prayer, o Vasishṭhas.”* In ii. 23, 1, Brahmanaspati is said to be the “great king of prayers” (*jyeshṭha-rājam brahmaṇām*) (compare vii. 97, 3), and in verse 2, to be the “generator of prayers” (*janitā brahmaṇām*); whilst in x. 61, 7, prayer is declared to have been generated by the gods (*svādhyo ajanayan brahma devāḥ*). Compare vii. 35, 7.

Brāhmān in the masculine is no doubt derived from the same root as brāhmān neuter, and though differing from it in accent⁴ as well as gender, must be presumed to be closely connected with it in signification, just as the English “prayer” in the sense of a petition would be with “prayer,” a petitioner, if the word were used in the latter sense. As, then, brāhmān in the neuter means a hymn or prayer, brāhmān in the masculine must naturally be taken to denote the person who composes or repeats a hymn or prayer. We do not, however, find that the composers of the hymns are in general designated by the word hymns are unacceptable to Indra, the poet does not add that he is himself a priest, or that he is attended by one, but that he generates a hymn; and the same sense is required by what follows in the second verse. Accordingly we find that Śāyaṇa explains abrahmōṇah by *stotra-hāṁah,* “destitute of hymns.” The same sense is equally appropriate in the next passage cited, x. 105, 8. On iv. 16, 9, where abrahmōṇ is an epithet of *dasyu,* “demon,” Śāyaṇa understands it to mean “without a priest,” but it may mean equally well or better, “without devotion, or prayer.”

⁴ In brāhmān neuter the accent is on the first syllable; in brāhmān masculine on the last.
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brähman, the name most commonly applied to them being rishi, though they are also called vipra, vedhas, kavi, etc. (see vol. iii. of this work, pp. 116 ff.). There are, however, a few texts, such as i. 80, 1; i. 164, 35; ii. 12, 6; ii. 39, 1; v. 31, 4; v. 40, 8; ix. 113, 6, etc., in which the brähman may or must be understood as referred to in the capacity of author of the hymn he utters. So, too, in ii. 20, 4, and vi. 21, 8, a new composer of hymns seems to be spoken of under the appellation of nutānasya brāhmānyataḥ; and in ii. 19, 8, the Grītsamadas are referred to both as the fabricators of a new hymn (manma naviyah) and as (brāhmānyantaḥ) performing devotion. In three passages, vii. 28, 2; vii. 70, 5, and x. 89, 16, the brāhmā and brāhmāni, "prayer" and "prayers," or "hymn" and "hymns," of the rishis are spoken of; and in vii. 22, 9, it is said, "that both the ancient and the recent rishis have generated prayers" (ye cha pūrve rishayo ye cha nūtnāḥ Indra brahmāni janayanta viprāh). In i. 177, 5, we find brahmāni kāroḥ, "the prayers of the poet." The fact that in various hymns the authors speak of themselves as having received valuable gifts from the princes their patrons, and that they do not there allude to any class of officiating priests as separate from themselves, would also seem to indicate an identity of the poet and priest at that early period.

The term brahman must therefore, as we may conclude, have been originally applied (1) to the same persons who are spoken of elsewhere in the hymns as rishi, kavi, etc., and have denoted devout worshippers and contemplative sages who composed prayers and hymns which they themselves recited in praise of the gods. Afterwards when the ceremonial gradually became more complicated, and a division of sacred functions took place, the word was more ordinarily employed (2) for a minister of public worship, and at length came to signify (3) one particular kind of priest with special duties. I subjoin a translation of the different passages in which the word occurs in the Rig-veda, and I have attempted to classify them according as it seems to bear, in each case, the first, second, or third of the senses just indicated. This, however, is not always an easy task, as in many of these texts there is nothing to fix the meaning of the term with precision, and one signi-

5 In another place (x. 96, 5) Indra is said to have been lauded by former worshippers, pürvebhīr yuj̄vabhīḥ, a term usually confined (as brāhmān was frequently applied) in after times to the offerers of sacrifice.
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ification easily runs into another, and the same person may be at once the author and the reciter of the hymn.

I. Passages in which brāhmān may signify "contemplator, sage, or poet."

(In all these texts I shall leave the word untranslated.)

i. 80, 1. Itthā hi some id made brahmaḥ chakāra vardāhanam |
"Thus in his exhilaration from soma juice the brāhmān has made (or uttered) a magnifying (hymn)."

i. 164, 34. Prichhāmi teṇa param antam prithivyāḥ prichhāmi yatra bhucanasya nābhiḥ | prichhāmi teṇa vrishno aśvasya retaḥ prichhāmi vācaḥ pāramaṁ vyoma | 35. Iyaṁ vedih paro antaḥ prithivyāḥ ayaṁ yayno bhucanasya nābhiḥ ayaṁ sorno vrishno aśvasya reto brahmaḥ ayaṁ vācaḥ pāramaṁ vyoma |
"I ask thee (what is) the remotest end of the earth; I ask where is the central point of the world; I ask thee (what is) the seed of the vigorous horse; I ask (what is) the highest heaven of speech. 35. This altar is the remotest end of the earth; this sacrifice is the central point of the world; this soma is the seed of the vigorous horse; this brāhmān is the highest heaven of speech."

ii. 12, 6. Yo radhrasya choditā yaḥ kriṣasya yo brahmaṇo nādhānānaya kīreḥ |
"He (Indra) who is the quickener of the sluggish, of the emaciated, of the suppliant brāhmān who praises him," etc.

vi. 45, 7. Brahmaṇam brahma-vāhasaṁ girbhiḥ sakhāyam īgmiyam | gāṁ na dhaṅ ṣakte hree |
"With hymns I call Indra, the brāhmān,—the carrier of prayers (brāhma-vāhasam), the friend who is worthy of praise,—as men do a cow which is to be milked."

vii. 33, 11. Utā asi Maitrāvarunyo Vaisiṣṭhā Ūrvasīyaḥ brahman manaso 'dhī jātaḥ | drspaṁ skannam brahmaṇa daivyena viśve devaḥ pushkare teva 'dadanta |
"And thou, o Vaisiṣṭha, art a son of Mitra and Varuṇa (or a Maitrāvaruṇa-priest), born, o brāhmān, from the soul of Urvaśī. All the

6 Varďđhanam = vṛiddhi-karaṁ stotram (Sāyaṇa).
7 Compare R.V. iii. 32, 10; x. 109, 4, below, and the words, the highest heaven of invention."
8 Compare R.V. x. 71 and x. 125.
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gods placed in the vessel thee, the drop which had fallen through
divine contemplation.”

viii. 16, 7. Indro brahmā Indrah rishir Indrah puru puruhūtaḥ | ma-
hān mahībhīḥ śachībhīḥ |

“Indra is a brāhmān, Indra is a rishi,” Indra is much and often in-
voked, great through his mighty powers.”

x. 71, 11. (See the translation of the entire hymn below. The sense
of brāhmān in verse 11 will depend on the meaning assigned to jātā-
vidyā.)

x. 77, 1. (In this passage, the sense of which is not very clear, the
word brāhmān appears to be an epithet of the host of Maruts.)

x. 85, 3. Somam manyate papīvān yat sampiṁshanti oshadhim | somāṁ
yam brahmāyo vidur na tasya aśnāti kaśchana | 16. Dece te chakre Sūrye
brahmāno ritutāh viduh | atha ekaṁ chakraṁ yad guhā tad addhātayaḥ
id viduh | 34. . . . . Sūryāṁ yo brahmā vidyāt sa id vādhyām
arthāḥ |

“A man thinks he has drunk soma when they crush the plant (so
called). But no one tastes of that which the brāhmāns know to be
soma (the moon). 16. The brāhmāns rightly know, Sūryā, that thou
hast two wheels; but it is sages (addhātayaḥ) alone who know the one
wheel which is hidden. 34. The brāhmān who knows Sūryā deserves
the bride’s garment.”

x. 107, 6. Tam eca rishiṁ tam u brahmānam āhur yajnanyaṁ sāma-gāṁ
uktha-sāsam | sa śukrasya tano veda tiṣraḥ yaḥ prathamo dakṣinayaṁ
varādha |

“They call him a rishi, him a brāhmān, reverend, a chanter of
Sāma verses (sāma-gāṁ), and reciter of ukthas,—he knows the three
forms of the brilliant (Agni)—the man who first worshipped with a
largess.”

Even in later times a man belonging to the Kshattriya and Vaiśya
castes may perform all the Vedic rites. Any such person, therefore,
and consequently a person not a Brāhman might, according to this
verse, have been called, though, no doubt, figuratively, a priest
(brahmā).

9 Different deities are called rishi, kavi, etc., in the following texts: v. 29, 1; vi.
14, 2; viii. 6, 41; ix. 96, 18; ix. 107, 7; x. 27, 22; x. 112, 9.
10 See Dr. Haug’s Ait. Br. vol. i. Introduction, p. 20.
x. 117, 7. ... Vadan brāhma avadāto vaniyān priṇann āpir aprīṇan-
tam abhi syāt |

"A brāhma 11 who speaks is more acceptable than one who does not
speak: a friend who is liberal excels one who is illiberal." 12

x. 125, 5. Yaṁ kāmaye taṁ tam ugrāṁ kriṇomi tam brāhmaṁ taṁ
rishiṁ taṁ su-medhāṁ |

"I (says Vāch) make him whom I love formidable, him a brāhma, him a
rishi, him a sage."

This would seem to prove that sometimes, at least, the brāhmaṁ was
such not by birth or nature, but by special favour and inspiration of
the goddess. In this passage, therefore, the word cannot denote the
member of a caste, who would not be dependent on the good will of
Vāch for his position.

II. In the passages which follow the word brāhmaṁ does not seem to
 signify so much a "sage or poet," as a "worshipper or priest."

i. 10, 1. Gāyanti te ā gāyatriṁo archanti arkaṁ arkiṇaḥ | brāhmaṅga
 te ā S’atakrato ud vaṁśam iva yemīre |

"The singers sing thee, the hymners recite a hymn, the-brāhmaṁs,
o Satakratu, have raised thee up like a pole." 13

i. 33, 9. Amanyamānān abhi manyamānāir nir brāhmaṁhir adhamo
dasyum Indra |

"Thou, Indra, with the believers, didst blow against the unbelievers,
with the brāhmaṁs thou didst blow away the Dasyu." 14

i. 101, 5. Yo viśvasya jagataḥ prāṇatas patir yo brāhmaṁ prathamo
gāṁ avindat | Indro yo dasyaṁ adhārān avātirat . . .

"Indra, who is lord of all that moves and breathes, who first found
the cows for the brāhmaṁ, who hurled down the Dasyu."

i. 108, 7. Yād Indrāgni madatāhaṁ sve durone yad brāhmaṁi rājani vā
yajatra | atāḥ pari krishanāv ā hi yātām athā somasya pibataṁ sutasya |

"When, o adorable Indra and Agni, ye are exhilarated in your own

11 The word here seems clearly to indicate an order or profession, as the silent
priest is still a priest.

12 See Dr. Haug's remark on this verse, Ait. Br. Introd. p. 20. The contexts of
the two last passages are given in my article "Miscellaneous Hymns from the R. and

13 Compare i. 5, 8; i. 7, 1; viii. 16, 9. See Dr. Haug’s remark on this verse,

14 See on this verse the remarks of M. Bréa, Hereule et Cacus, etc. p. 152.
abode, or with a brāhmāṇ or a rājan,¹³ come thence, ye vigorous (deities), and then drink of the poured out soma.”¹⁶

i. 158, 6. Dirghatamāḥ Mamateya jujurvan daśane yuge | apām arthaṁ yatināṁ brahmā brahavi sārathiḥ |

“Dirghatamāḥ, son of Mamata, being decrepit in his tenth lustre, (though) a brāhmāṇ, becomes the charioteer of (or is borne upon) the waters which are hastening to their goal.”

(Professor Aufrecht understands this to mean that Dirghatamas is verging towards his end, and thinks there is a play on the word “charioteer” as an employment not befitting a priest.)

ii. 39, 1. . . . Gridhrā āva vrikshaṁ nidhīmantam acha | brahmāṇ āva vidathe ukhaśāsā . . . |

“Ye (Aśvins) (cry) like two vultures on a tree which contains their nest; like two brāhmāṇs singing a hymn at a sacrifice.”

iv. 50, 7. Sa id rājā pratijayāni viścā susheṇa tasāhāv abhi viryaṇa | Brīhaspatiṁ yaḥ subhrītam bibharti vālgūyatir vandate pūrva-bhājam |

8. Sa it kṣeti sudhītaḥ okasi sve tasmai īlā pincave viśeṇāṃ | tasmai viśaṁ svayam eva namante yasmin brahmā rājāṇi pūrvaḥ eti | 9. Apratītya jayati soṁ dhanāṁi pratijayāni ute yā sajanyā | avasyave yo varicaḥ kriṇoti brahmaṁ rājā tam avanti decāḥ |

“That king overcomes all hostile powers in force and valour who maintains Brīhaspati in abundance, who praisest and magnifies him as (a deity) enjoying the first distinction. 8. He dwells prosperous in his own palace, to him the earth always yields her increase,¹⁷ to him the

¹³ A distinction of orders or professions appears to be here recognised. But in v. 54, 7, a rishi and a rājan are distinguished much in the same way as a brāhmāṇ and rājan are in i. 108, 7: Sa na jiyate Maruto na hanyate na sritisati na vyathate na riskhati | na asya rāyaḥ upa dasyanti na utayaḥ rishim vā yāṁ rājunaṁ vā sushūdatha | “That man, whether rishi or prince, whom ye, o Maruts, support, is neither conquered nor killed, he neither decays nor is distressed, nor is injured; his riches do not decline, nor his supports.” Compare v. 14, where it is said: Yugaṁ rāyaṁ maruṭaṁ spīrhaṁ vīrāṁ yuyam rishim avatha sāma-vipram | yuyam avantam Bharatōya vājaṁ yuyāṁ dhattha rājanaṁ ārushtīmantam | “Ye, o Maruts, give riches with desirable men, ye protect a rishi who is skilled in hymns; ye give a horse and food to Bharata, ye make a king prosperous.” In iii. 43, 6, reference is found to Viśvāmitra, or the author, being made by Indra both a prince and a rishi (kuvid mā gopōṁ karase janasya kuvid rājānam mahavarn rājīshin | kuvid mā rishin pāpōṁśaṁ sutasya).

¹⁶ See on this verse Prof. Benfey’s note, Orient und Occident, 3, 142.

¹⁷ Compare R.V. v. 37, 4 f.: Na sa rājā vyathate yasmin Indras evam somam pīvati go-saḥkōyam | “That king suffers no distress in whose house Indra drinks the pungent soma mixed with milk,” etc.
people bow down of themselves,—that king in whose house a brāhmaṇ walks first.\(^{18}\) Unrivalled, he conquers the riches both of his enemies and his kinsmen—the gods preserve the king who bestows wealth on the brāhmaṇ who asks his assistance.”\(^{19}\)

iv. 58, 2. *Vayaṁ nāma pra bravāma ghrītasya asmin yajne dhārayāma namobhiḥ | upa brāhma śrīnavat śasyamānaṁ chatuḥ-śrīngo avamid gaurah etat |

“Let us proclaim the name of butter; let us at this sacrifice hold it (in mind) with prostrations. May the brāhmaṇ (Agni?) hear the praise which is chanted. The four-horned bright-coloured (god) has sent this forth.”

v. 29, 3. *Uta brāhmaṇo Maruto me anya Indraḥ somasya sushtubasya peyāḥ |

“And, ye Maruts, brāhmaṇs, may Indra drink of this my soma which has been poured out,” etc.

v. 31, 4. *Anacvas te ratham aśvāya takshan Tvastṛa vajram puruhūta dyumantam | brāhmaṇaṁ Indram mahayanto arkaṁ avardāhayann Ahaṁ hantarvai u |

“The men\(^{20}\) have fashioned a car for thy (Indra’s) horse, and Tvastṛi a gleaming thunderbolt, o god greatly invoked. The brāhmaṇs, magnifying Indra, have strengthened him for the slaughter of Ahi.”

v. 32, 12. *Eva hi teṁ rituthā yatayantam magha viprebbhyo dadataṁ śrīnomi | kīṁ te brahmaṇo grihate sakhayo ye tvāyāh nidadhuk kāmam Indra |

“I hear of thee thus rightly prospering, and bestowing wealth on, the sages (viprebbhyaḥ). What, o Indra, do the brāhmaṇs, thy friends, who have reposed their wishes on thee, obtain?”

v. 40, 8. *Grāṇo brahma yuyujanaḥ saparyan kirinā devān namaṁ upāsikshan | Atriś sūryasya divi chaṭāṣu adhāt Svarbhānor apa māyāḥ aghukahat |

“Applying the stones (for pressing soma), performing worship, honouring the gods with praise and obeisance, the brāhmaṇ Atri placed

---

\(^{18}\) Compare viii. 69, 4; x. 39, 11; x. 107, 5; and the word *purohita*, used of a ministering priest as one placed in front. Prof. Aufrecht, however, would translate the last words, “under whose rule the priest receives the first or principal portion.”

\(^{19}\) See on this passage Roth’s article, “On Brahma and the Brāhmans,” Journ. Germ. Or. Sec. i. 77 ff. See also Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, viii. 26.

\(^{20}\) Are the Ribhus intended?
the eye of the sun in the sky, and swept away the magical arts of Svarbhaunu."

vii. 7, 5. Asadi vrito vahir ajanavan Agnir brahma nri-shadane vidharta |

"The chosen bearer (of oblations), Agni, the brahmān, having arrived, has sat down in a mortal’s abode, the upholder."

vii. 42, 1. Prā brahmaṇa Angiraso nakshanta |

"The brahmāns, the Angirases, have arrived," etc.

viii. 7, 20. Kea nanaṁ sudānavo madatha vrikta-barhishaḥ | brahma ko vaha saparyati |

"Where now, bountiful (Maruts), are ye exhilarated, with the sacrificial grass spread beneath you? What brahmān is serving you?"

viii. 17, 2. Ā tvā brahma-yujā hari vahatām Indra keśinā | upa brahmaṇi naḥ śriṇu |

3. Brahmaṇas tvā vayaṁ yujā somapām Indra somināḥ | sutāvanto havamahē |

"Thy tawny steeds with flowing manes, yoked by prayer (brahma-yujā), bring thee hither, Indra; listen to our prayers (brahmaṇi). 3. We brahmāns, offerers of soma, bringing oblations, continually invoke the drinker of soma."

viii. 31, 1. Yo yajāti yajāte it sunavach cha pachāti cha | brahmaḥ id Indrasya chākanat |

"That brahmān is beloved of Indra who worships, sacrifices, pours out libations, and cooks offerings."

viii. 32, 16. Na nunaṁ brahmaṇaṁ riṣam prāśuṇāṁ asti sunvatām | na soma apratā pape |

"There is not now any debt due by the active brahmāns who pour out libations. Soma has not been drunk without an equivalent."

viii. 33, 19. Adhaṁ paśyaveva maṁ upari santaram pādakau hara | ma te kaśa-plakau drīṣan stri hi brahma babhucitha |

"Look downward, not upward; keep thy feet close together; let them not see those parts which should be covered; thou, a brahmān, hast become a woman."

viii. 45, 39. Ā te etā vacho-yujā hari gribhno sumadrathā | yad im brahmabhyāḥ id dadaḥ |

23 Compare viii. 45, 39, below: brahma-yuj occurs also in i. 177, 2; iii. 35, 4; viii. 1, 24; viii. 2, 27.
"I seize these thy tawny steeds, yoked by our hymn (vacho-yujā) to a splendid chariot, since thou didst give (wealth) to the brāhmāns.

viii. 53, 7. Ke a sya vrīshabho yuvā tuvi-grivo anānataḥ | brāhma kasa tam saparyati |

"Where is that vigorous, youthful, large-necked, unconquered (Indra)? What brāhmān serves him?

viii. 66, 5. Abhi Gandharvam atriṇad abudhneshu rajassu ā | Indro brahmabhyaḥ id vṛdho |

"Indra clove the Gandharva in the bottomless mists, for the prosperity of the brāhmāns."

viii. 81, 30. Mo su brahmā iva tandasyur bhuvau vājānam pate | matsya sutasya gomataḥ |

"Be not, o lord of riches (Indra), sluggish like a brāhmān." Be exhilarated by the libation mixed with milk."

viii. 85, 5. Ā yad vajram bāhvar Indra dhatse māda-chyutam Ahave hantavai u | pra parvatāḥ anavanta pra brahmāgo abhinakshanta Indram |

"When, Indra, thou seizest in thine arms the thunderbolt which brings down pride, in order to slay Ahi, the (aerial) hills and the cows utter their voice, and the brāhmāns draw near to thee."

ix. 96, 6. Brahmā devānām padavah kavināṁ rishirviprāṇām māhisho mrigānām | sveno gridhranāṁ svaditra vanānāṁ somaḥ pavitraṁ ati eti rēhan |

"Soma, resounding, overflows the filter, he who is a brāhmān among the gods, a leader among poets, a rishi among the wise, a buffalo among wild beasts, a falcon among kites, an axe among the woods."

ix. 112, 1. Nānānām vai u no dhiyo vi vrātāni jananām | takṣāḥ rish- tavan rutam bhishag brahma suvantam ichhati |

"Various are the thoughts and endeavours of us different men. The carpenter seeks something broken, the doctor a patient, the brāhmān some one to offer libations."

22 Compare viii. 87, 9, yunjanti hariḥ ishiranyā gāthayā urau rathe urugye | Indra-vāhā vac hoyajā na i 7, 2, vac hoyajā na i 14, 6, man hoyajā | vi. 49, 5, rathe . . . manānā yujōnāḥ.

23 Dr. Heng (Introd. to Ait. Br. p. 20) refers to Ait. Br. v. 34, as illustrating this reproach. See p. 376 of his translation. This verse clearly shows that the priests formed a professional body.

24 This verse also distinctly proves that the priesthood already formed a profession. Verse 3 of the same hymn is as follows: "I am a poet, my father a physician, my
ix. 113, 6. Yatra brahmā pavamānā ēhādayām vāchaṁ vadan |
grāvā some mahiyate somena ānandaṁ janayann Īndrāya Īndo pari
svaṁ |

"O pure Soma, in the place where the brāhmān, uttering a metrical
hymn, is exalted at the soma sacrifice through (the sound of) the
crushing-stone, producing pleasure with soma, o Indu (Soma) flow for Indra."

x. 28, 11. Tebhya godhā ayathām karahad etad ye brahmaṇaḥ pratipiyanti annaiḥ |
sime ukṣṇāh avasṛiṣṭān adanti svayam balāni tanvaḥ 
śriṇānāḥ | (The word brahmaṇaḥ occurs in this verse, but I am unable
to offer any translation, as the sense is not clear.)

x. 71, 11. (See translation of this verse below, where the entire
hymn is given.)

x. 85, 29. Para dehi śāmulyam brahmabhya vi bhaja vasu | . . . 35.
Śuryaṁ paśya rūpāṇi tani brahmā tu śundhati |

"Put away that which requires expiation (?) Distribute money to
the brahmāns. . . . 35. Behold the forms of Śurya. But the brahmān
purifies them."

x. 141, 3. Somaṁ rājānam avase Agniṁ giriḥbir havāmahe | Ādityān
Vishnūṁ Śuryaṁ brahmaṇaṁ cha Bṛihaspatim |

"With hymns we invoke to our aid king Soma, Agni, the Ādityas,
Vishnū, Śurya, and Bṛihaspati, the brahmān.

III. In the following passages the word brahmān appears to designate
the special class of priest so called, in contradistinction to hotri, udgātri,
and adhvaryu.

ii. 1, 2 (= x. 91, 10). Tava Agne hotraṁ tava potram riteviyaṁ tava
neshṭraṁ tvam ēd agniḥ ritāyataḥ | tava praśāstraṁ tvam adhvariyasi
brahmā cha asi gṛihapatiḥ cha no dame | 2. Tvam Agne Īndro vrishabhaḥ
satām asi tvam Viṣṇuṁ urugāyo namasyaḥ | tvam brahmā rayivid Brah-
manaspatte tvam vidhartaḥ sachase purandhya |

"Thine, Agni, is the office of hotri, thine the regulated function of
potri, thine the office of neshṭri, thou art the agnīdh of the pious man,
thine is the function of praśāstri, thou actest as adhvaryu, thou art the
brahmān, and the lord of the house in our abode. 2. Thou, Agni, art
Indra, the chief of the holy, thou art Viṣṇu, the wide-stepping, the
mother a grinder of corn" (kūrur ahāṁ tato bhīṣagya upala-prakṣiṇī mūnī). Unfortunately there is nothing further said which could throw light on the relations in
which the different professions and classes of society stood to each other.
adorable, thou, o Brahmanaspati, art the brāhmaṇ, the possessor of wealth, thou, o sustainer, art associated with the ceremonial."

iv. 9, 3. Sa sadma pari niyate hotā mandro deviṣṭiṣkhu | uta potā ni shidati | 4. Uta gnā Agnir ādhvare uta āgrihapatir dame | uta brahmā ni shidati |

"He (Agni) is led round the house, a joyous hotṛi at the ceremonies, and sits a potri. 4. And Agni is a wife (i.e. a mistress of the house) at the sacrifice, and the master of the house in our abode, and he sits a brāhmaṇ."

x. 52, 2. Ahaṁ hotā ni aśīdaṁ yaśīyaṁ viśve devaḥ maruto mā junaṁti | ahar ahar Aśvinā ādhvarya vāṁ vāṁ brahmā samīd bhatati śā ahutīr vāṁ | (Agni says) "I have sat down an adorable hotṛi; all the gods, the Maruts, stimulate me. Day by day, ye Aśvins, I have acted as your ādhvaryu; the brāhmaṇ is he who kindles the fire: this is your invocation."

I shall now bring forward the whole of the texts in which the word brāhmaṇa, which, no doubt, originally meant a son, or descendant, of a brāhmaṇ, occurs in the Rig-veda. They are the following:

i. 164, 45. Chatvāri vāk parimitā padāni tāṇī vidur brāhmaṇaḥ ye maniśinaḥ | guhā trīṇi nihīnaṁ na ingaṇiṁ turīyaṁ vācāḥ maṇiṣyāḥ vadanti |

"Speech consists of four defined grades. These are known by those brāhmaṇs who are wise. They do not reveal the three which are esoteric. Men speak the fourth grade of speech."

This text is quoted and commented upon in Nirukta xiii. 9.

vi. 75, 10. Brāhmaṇaśaḥ pitarah somyaśaḥ śīve no dyācāḥ-prithivi ane- hasā | Pūṣaṁ naṁ pātu duritād ritvāviridhaṁ . . . . . |

"May the brāhmaṇ fathers, drinkers of soma, may the auspicious, the sinless, heaven and earth, may Pūshan, preserve us, who prosper by righteousness, from evil, etc."

25 There are two more texts in which the word brāhmaṇa is found, viz. i. 15, 5, and ii. 36, 5, on which see the following note. The word brāhmaṇaputra (compare Aśv. S'. S. ii. 18, 13) "son of a brahman," is found in ii. 43, 2: Udgītā ita sakune sūma gāyasi brāhmaṇaputraḥ ita suvanesu saṁvasi | "Thou, o bird, singest a sūma verse like an udgītri; thou singest praises like the son of a brāhmaṇ at the libations." (Ind. Stud. ix. 342 ff.) Viṣṇu, used in later Sanskrit as synonymous with Brāhmaṇ, has in the R.V. the sense of "wise," "sage" assigned by Nigh. 8, 15 (=medhāvi-nāma), and in Nir. 10, 19, =medhāvināḥ. It is often applied as an epithet to the gods.
vii. 103, 1 (= Nirukta 9, 6). Samvatsaram sakayanaḥ brähmanah vrata-chārīṇaḥ | vācham Parjanya-jinvitam pra maṇḍakāḥ avādishuḥ . . . . | 7. Brähmanāso atiratre na some saro na pūnām abhito vadantaḥ | samvatsarasya tad ahaḥ pari sṛṣṭaḥ yad maṇḍakāḥ praṇiṣṭhaṃ babhūca | 8. Brähmanyāsah somino vācham akrata brahma kriṣṇavatāḥ pariṣvatāraṇaṃ | adhvaryavo gharminah sishvidanah āvir bhavanti guhyā na ke chit |

"After lying quiet for a year, those rite-fulfilling brāhmans 28 the frogs have (now) uttered their voice, which has been inspired by Parjanya . . . . 7. Like brāhmans at the Atirātra soma rite, like (those brāhmans) speaking round about the full pond (or soma-bowl 27), you, frogs, surround (the pond) on this day of the year, which is that of the autumnal rains. 8. These soma-offering brāhmans (the frogs) have uttered their voice, performing their annual devotion (brahma); these adhvaryu priests sweating with their boiled oblations (or in the hot season) come forth from their retreats like persons who have been concealed."

x. 16, 6. Yat te kṛṣṇaḥ sakunāh ātutoda pipīlāh sarpah ute va śvā- padah | Agnis tad viṣvād agadāṃ karotu Somaḥ cha yo brāhmaṇān āviveṣā |

"Whatever part of thee any black bird, or ant, or serpent, or wild beast has mutilated, may Agni cure thee of all that, and Soma who has entered into the brāhmans." 28

26 In the Nighantas, iii. 13, these words brāhmaṇaḥ vrata-chārīnaḥ are referred to as conveying the sense of a simile, though they are unaccompanied by a particle of similitude. In his Illustrations of the Nirukta, p. 126, Roth thus remarks on this passage: "This is the only place in the first nine mandalas of the R.V., in which the word Brāhmaṇa is found with its later sense, whilst the tenth mandala offers a number of instances. This is one of the proofs that many of the hymns in this book were composed considerably later (than the rest of the R.V.). The word brāhmaṇa has another signification in i. 15, 5; ii. 36, 5; and vi. 75, 10." (In the first of these texts, Roth assigns to the word the sense of the Brāhmaṇa's soma-vessel. See his Lexicon, s.v.) It does not appear what meaning he would give to the word in vi. 75, 10. He has in this passage overlooked R.V. i. 164, 45, which, however, is duly added in his Lexicon). See Wilson's translation of the hymn; as also Müller's, in his Anc. Sansk. Lit. p. 494 f.

27 Sarus. See R.V. viii. 66, 4, quoted in Nirukta, v. 11, where Yāsaka says, "The ritualists inform us that at the mid-day oblation there are thirty uktha platters destined for deity, which are then drunk at one draught. These are here called sarus." (Compare Roth's Illustrations on the passage. See also R.V. vi. 17, 11, and viii. 7, 10, with Sāyaṇa's explanations of all three passages).

28 Compare A.V. vii. 115, 1 f.; xii. 5, 6.
x. 71, 1. 29 Brihaspati prathamam vacho agraṃ yat prairata namadheyaṃ dadhānāḥ | yad esahāṃ śreṣṭhaṃ yad aripram asit preṇā tad esahāṃ nihitaṃ guhā āviḥ | 2. (= Nirukta iv. 10) Saktum iva titavān punanta yatra dhīrāḥ manassā vāchar ākṛta | atra sakhyāḥ sakhyāṇi jānate bhadraḥ esahāṃ lakshmīḥ nihitaḥ adhi vācī | 3. Yajnena vācāḥ padaviyam āyan tāṃ am avindann rishishv pravishītām | tāṃ ādhritya vi adadhūḥ purutrā tāṃ sapta rebhāḥ abhi saṃ navante | 4. (= Nir. i. 19) Uta tevaḥ paśyan na dadarśa vāchar uta tevaḥ śriṇvan na śriṇoti enāṃ | uto teasmai tanvaṃ vī saśre jāya iva pātyo uṣati svāsāḥ | 5. (= Nir. i. 20) Uta tevaṃ sakhye sthīrapitam āhur na enāṃ hirvanta api vājinēshu | adhēnāḥ charati māṇyāḥ esha vācharaṃ suśruvāṃ aphālam apushpām | 6. Yas tītyajā sachi-vīdaṃ sakhyāṃ na tasya vācī api bhāgo asti | yad ēṃ śriṇoti alakaṃ śriṇoti na hi praveda sukṛitasya panthāḥ | 7. Akshaṇvantāḥ karṇavantāḥ sakhyo manojaṃvē asaṃḥ babhūvaḥ | ādahnaṃ upakakshāsah utv hṛdadā iva mātevah utv dadārṣe | 8. (= Nir. xiii. 13) Hridā tashtēshu manaso jaśceha yad brahmāṇāḥ saṁyajante sakhyāḥ | atra aha tevaṃ vī jahur vedyābhīr ohabrahmāṇo vī charanti utv | 9. Ime ye na arvāṇa na pāraḥ charanti na brahmāṇaṃ na sute-karāṣaḥ | te ēte vācharaṃ abhipadya pāpayāśiśir śātraṃ tancate aprajajnayāḥ | 10. Sace nandanta yāsasā āgataṇa sahā-sahena sakhyā sakhyāḥ | kilbisha-sprit pitu-shaṅhir hi esahā arañ hito bhavati vājinayā | 11. (= Nir. i. 8) Ṛchām tevaḥ posham āste puspahvān gṛya- 

"When, o Brihaspati, men first sent forth the earliest utterance of speech, giving a name (to things), then all that was treasured within them, most excellent and pure, was disclosed through love. 2. Wherever the wise,—as if cleansing meal with a sieve,—have uttered speech with intelligence, there friends recognize acts of friendliness; good fortune dwells in their speech.30 3. Through sacrifice they came upon

29 I cannot pretend that I am satisfied with some parts of the translation I have attempted of this very difficult hymn; but I give it such as it is, as the interpretation of the Vedic poems is still to a certain extent tentative. Verses 4 and 5 are explained in Sāyāna's Introduction to the Rig-veda, pp. 30 f. of Müller's edition. I am indebted here, as elsewhere, to Prof. Aufrecht for his suggestions.

30 I quote here, somewhat akin to this hymn, another from the A.V. vi. 108, being a prayer for wisdom or intelligence: 1. Tevaṁ no medhe prathamam go bhūr aśvebhīr ā gahi | tevaṁ sūryasya raṃśibhis tevaṁ na asi yajnīyā | 2. Medhām aham prathamām
the track of speech, and found her entered into the rishis. Taking, they divided her into many parts: the seven poets celebrate her in concert. 4. And one man, seeing, sees not speech, and another, hearing, hears her not; while to a third she discloses her form, as a loving well-dressed wife does to her husband. 5. They say that one man has a sure defence in (her) friendship; he is not overcome even in the conflicts (of discussion). But that person consorts with a barren delusion who has listened to speech without fruit or flower. 6. He who abandons a friend who appreciates friendship, has no portion whatever in speech. All that he hears, he hears in vain, for he knows not the path of righteousness. 7. Friends gifted both with eyes and ears have proved unequal in mental efforts. Some have been (as waters) reaching to the face or armpit, while others have been seen like ponds in which one might bathe. 8. When brāhmans who are friends strive (?) together in efforts of the mind produced by the heart, they leave one man behind through their acquirements, whilst others walk about boasting to be brāhmans. (This is the sense Professor Aufrecht suggests for the word ohabrāhmāṇaḥ. Professor Roth s.v. thinks it may mean “real priests.” The author of Nirukta xiii. 13., explains it as meaning “reasoning priests,” or “those of whom reasoning is the sacred science.”) 9. The men who range neither near nor far, who are neither (reflecting) brāhmans nor yet pious worshippers at libations,—these, having acquired speech, frame their web imperfectly, (like) female

brāhmāṇeṣvāṁ brahma-jūtām rishiḥṣūtām | propitām brahmachārīḥ ber devānām avase kave | 3. Yām medhām Rībhavo vidūr yām medhām asūrāḥ vidūḥ | rishayo bhadrām medhām yām vidūs tām mayaḥ ā veṣāyūmāṇaḥ | 4. Yām rishayo bhūta-kṛito medhām medhāvino vidūḥ | tayā mām adya medhayā Agne medhāvināṁ kriyā | 5. Medhāṁ sūyam medhāṁ prātar medhāṁ madhyandinam pari | medhāṁ sūryasya rāmībhīr vachaśi “veṣāyūmāṇaḥ 1. “Come to us, wisdom, the first, with cows and horses; (come) thou with the rays of the sun; thou art to us an object of worship. 2. To (obtain) the succour of the gods, I invoke wisdom the first, full of prayer, inspired by prayer, praised by rishis, imbibed by Brahmachārins. 3. We introduce within me that wisdom which Ribhus know, that wisdom which divine beings (asūrāḥ) know, that excellent wisdom which rishis know. 4. Make me, O Agni, wise to-day with that wisdom which the wise rishis — the makers of things existing — know. 5. We introduce wisdom in the evening, wisdom in the morning, wisdom at noon, wisdom with the rays of the sun, and with speech ” (vachasī). Regarding the rishayo bhūta-kṛitaḥ see above, p. 37, note.

33 Compare x. 125, 3; i. 164, 45; (x. 90, 11); and A.V. xii. 1, 45.
34 Compare Isaiah vi. 9, 10; and St. Matthew xiii. 14, 15.
35 Vāk-sakhye, Yāska.
36 Compare i. 171, 2; ii. 35, 2; vi. 16, 47.
weavers, being destitute of skill. 10. All friends rejoice at the arrival of a renowned friend who rules the assembly; for such a one, repelling evil, and bestowing nourishment upon them, is thoroughly prepared for the conflict (of discussion). 11. One man possesses a store of verses (richām); a second sings a hymn (gāyatra) during (the chanting of) the sakvars; one who is a brāhmaṇ declares the science of being (jāta-vidyām), whilst another prescribes the order of the ceremonial."

R.V. x. 88, 19 (= Nir. vii. 31). Yāvan-mātram ushaso na pratkāṁ suparnyo vasate Mātariśvāḥ | tācav dadhāti upa yajnam āyan brāhmaṇaṁ hotur avaro nishidān | "As long as the fair-winged Dawns do not array themselves in light, o Mātariśvan, so long the brāhmaṇ coming to the sacrifice, keeps (the fire), sitting below the hōtri-priest."

(See Professor Roth's translation of this verse in his Illustrations of the Nirukta, p. 113).

x. 90, 11 (= A.V. xix. 5, 6; Vaj. S. xxxi.). See above, pp. 8–15.

x. 97, 22. Oshadhayāṁ saṁvadante Somena saha rājā | yasmā kiṁoti brāhmaṇas tam rājan parayāmasi |

"The plants converse with king Soma, (and say), for whomsoever a brāhmaṇ acts (kiṁoti, officiates), him, o king, we deliver."

x. 109, 1. Te 'vadan prathamāḥ brahma-kilbishe akūparāḥ salito Mātariśvāḥ | viñlabhās tapa ugra mayobhūr āpo devir prathamaṁ ritena | Soma rājā prathamo brahma-jāyām punaḥ prāyaḥcadh ahriniyamanaḥ | anvartī Varuṇa Mitraḥ āsīd Aghir ēhatā hastagrihyā nīnāya | 3. Hastaṇa eva grāhyād adhir asyāḥ "brahma-jāyā iyam" iti cha id avocan | na dātāya prahye tasthe esā tathā rāshtram gupitaṁ kshattriyasya | 4. Devāḥ etasyām avadanta pūrve sapta rishayas tapase ye nisheduḥ | bhimā jayā brāhmaṇasasya upanitā dūrāhām dadhāti parame vyoman |

25 Such is the sense which Prof. Aufrecht thinks may, with probability, be assigned to sīris, a word which occurs only here.

26 According to Yāska (Nir. i. 8), these four persons are respectively the hōtri, udgātri, brahmaṇ, and adheāryuṇ priests. The brahmaṇ, he says, being possessed of all science, ought to know everything; and gives utterance to his knowledge as occasion arises for it (jāte jāte). See Dr. Haug's remarks on this verse, Ait. Br. Introd. p. 20.

27 Compare oshadhiḥ Soma-rājñēḥ, "the plants whose king is Soma," in verses 18 and 19 of this hymn.
5. Brahmachārī charati veṣhīṣad viṣaḥ śa devānām bhavati ekam angam |
   tena jāyam avve avindad Brihaspatiḥ Somena niṭām juhvaṃ na devaḥ |
6. Punar vai devaḥ adaduḥ punar manushyaḥ uta | rājaṇāḥ satyaṃ |
   kriṣṇaṇaḥ brahma-jāyāṃ punar daduḥ 7. Punardāya brahma-jāyāṃ |
   kriṭe devair nikibisham | ārjam prīthivyāḥ bhaktvāya urugāyaṃ upāsate |

"These (deities), the boundless, liquid Mātariśvan (Air), the fiercely-
flaming, ardently-burning, beneficent (Fire), and the divine primeval
Waters, first through righteousness exclaimed against the outrage on
a brahmān. 2. King Soma, unenvious, first gave back the brahmān’s
wife; Varuṇa and Mitra were the inviters; Agni, the invoker, brought
her, taking her hand. 3. When restored, she had to be received back
by the hand, and they then proclaimed aloud, ‘This is the brahmān’s
wife;’ she was not committed to a messenger to be sent: — in this way
it is that the kingdom of a ruler (or Kshattryiya) remains secured to
him. 4. Those ancient deities, the Rishis, who sat down to perform
austerities, spoke thus of her, ‘Terrible is the wife of the brahmān;
when approached, she plants confusion in the highest heaven.’ 5. The
Brahmachārīn (religious student) continues to perform observances.
He becomes one member of the gods. Through him Brihaspati obtained
his wife, as the gods obtained the ladle which was brought by Soma.
6. The gods gave her back, and men gave her back; kings, performing
righteousness, gave back the brahmān’s wife. 7. Giving back the brah-
mān’s wife, delivering themselves from sin against the gods, (these
kings) enjoy the abundance of the earth, and possess a free range of
movement."

28 Compare R.V. x. 85, 39 ff. (=A.V. xiv. 2, 2 ff.) Punah patnīm Agnir adād
āyushā saha vachcāś | dirghāyuḥ aṣṭāḥ yah patir jivāti savadāḥ satam | 40. Somāḥ
prathamo vivide Gandharvō vividē uttarāh (the A.V. reads: Somavya jāyū prathamaṃ
Gandharvas te 'parāḥ patiḥ) | tīrītipo Agnish te pats turīyas te manushyaṃ | Somo
dadād Gandharvōya Gandharavo dadād Agyaye | rayum cha putraṁ chadhād Agnir
mahyum atho imām | "Agni gave back the wife with life and splendour: may he who
is her husband live to an old age of 100 years! Soma was thy first, the Gandharva
was thy second, Agni thy third, husband; thy fourth is one of human birth. Soma
gave her to the Gandharva, the Gandharva to Agni, Agni gave me wealth and sons,
and then this woman.” The idea contained in this passage may possibly be referred
to in the verse before us (x. 109, 2).
29 I am indebted to Prof. Aufrecht for this explanation of the verse.
30 See R.V. i. 164, 34, 35, above.
31 See my paper on the Progress of the Vedic Religion, in the Journal of the Royal
Asiatic Society for 1865, pp. 374 ff.
32 See A.V. x. 7, 1 ff.; 9, 26.
This hymn is repeated in the Atharva-veda with the addition of ten more verses which I shall quote in the next section.

I shall here state summarily the remarks suggested by a perusal of the texts which I have quoted, and the conclusions which they appear to authorize regarding the relation of the Vedic poets and priests to the other classes of the Indian community at the time when the earlier hymns of the Rig-veda were composed.

First: Except in the Purusha Sūkta (translated above in pp. 9 ff.) there is no distinct reference in the hymns to any recognised system of four castes.

Second: In one text (iii. 34, 9, see p. 176) where mention is made of the Āryan “colour,” or “race,” all the upper classes of the Indian community are comprehended under one designation, as the Kshattriyas and Vaiśyas as well as the Brāhmans were always in after-times regarded as Āryas (see above, p. 176.)

Third: The term brāhmāṇa occurs only in eight hymns of the Rigveda, besides the Purusha Sūkta, whilst brāhmān occurs in forty-six. The former of these words could not therefore have been in common use at the time when the greater part of the hymns were composed. The term rājanya is found only in the Purusha Sūkta; and kshattriya in the sense of a person belonging to a royal family, a noble, occurs only in a few places, such as x. 109, 3. The terms Vaiśya and Sudra are only found in the Purusha Sūkta, although viś, from which the former is derived, is of frequent occurrence in the sense of “people” (see p. 14, above).

Fourth: The word brāhmān, as we have seen, appears to have had at first the sense of “sage,” “poet;” next, that of “officiating priest;” and ultimately that of a “special description of priest.”

Fifth: In some of the texts which have been quoted (particularly i. 108, 7; iv. 50, 8 ff.; viii. 7, 20; viii. 45, 39; viii. 53, 7; viii. 81, 30; ix. 112, 1; x. 85, 29) brāhmān seems to designate a “priest by profession.”

Sixth: In other places the word seems rather to imply something peculiar to the individual, and to denote a person distinguished for

43 This text is quoted above. In viii. 104, 13, Kshattriya is perhaps a neuter substantive: Na vai u soma vṛjīnām hīnō na kṣatātriyaṁ mithyā dharāyantam | “Soma does not prosper the sinner, nor the man who yields royal power deceitfully.”
genius or virtue (x. 107, 6), or elected by special divine favour to receive the gift of inspiration (x. 125, 5).

Seventh: *Brāhmaṇa* appears to be equivalent to *brāhmā-putra*, "the son of a *brāhmān*" (which, as we have seen, occurs in ii. 43, 2), and the employment of such a term seems necessarily to presuppose that, at the time when it began to become current, the function of a *brāhmān*, the priesthood, had already become a profession.

The Rig-veda Sanhitā contains a considerable number of texts in which the large gifts of different kinds bestowed by different princes on the authors of the hymns are specified, and these instances of bounty are eulogized.

Of these passages R.V. i. 125; i. 126; v. 27; v. 30, 12 ff.; v. 61, 10; vi. 27, 8; vi. 45, 31 ff.; vi. 47, 22 ff. may be consulted in Prof. Wilson’s translation; and a version of R.V. x. 107, which contains a general encomium on liberality will be found in the article entitled "Miscellaneous Hymns from the Rig- and Atharva-vedas," in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1866, p. 32 ff. The following further texts, which describe the presents given by different princes to the rishis, viz. vii. 18, 22 ff.; viii. 3, 21 ff.; viii. 4, 19 ff.; viii. 5, 37 ff.; viii. 6, 46 ff.; viii. 19, 36 f.; viii. 21, 17 f.; viii. 24, 29 f.; viii. 46, 21 ff.; viii. 54, 10 ff.; viii. 57, 14 ff.; x. 33, 4 ff.; x. 62, 6 ff.; x. 93, 14 f. are translated in the article "On the relations of the priests to the other classes of Indian Society in the Vedic age" in the same Journal for 1866, pp. 272 ff., to which I refer.

On the other hand the hymns of the Rig-veda contain numerous references to persons who, if not hostile, were at least indifferent and inattentive to the system of worship which the rishis professed and inculcated; and niggardly in their offerings to the gods and their gifts to the priests. The article to which I have just referred contains (pp. 286 ff.) a long list of such passages, from which I extract the following:

i. 84, 7. Yāh erekād id vidayate vasu marattaya dasushe | 1sāno apratiskutaḥ Indro anga | 8. Kadā martyam arādhasam padā kshumpam iev sphurat | kadā naḥ śurwad girah Indro anga |

"Indra, who alone distributes riches to the sacrificing mortal, is lord and irresistible. 8. When will Indra crush the illiberal man like a bush with his foot? when will he hear our hymns?"
i. 101, 4. \ldots viloś chid Indro yo asuvvato vadhaḥ \ldots |
"Indra, who is the slayer of him, however strong, who offers no libations."

i. 122, 9. Jano yo Mitra-varuṇaḥ abhidhruṣ apo na vām sunoti akṣhṇa-yādhruk \| svayaṁ sa yakṣmaṁ hṛdaye ni dhatte āpa yad iṁ hotṛabhīr ritavā \|
"The hostile man, the malicious enemy, who pours out no libations to you, o Mitra and Varuṇa, plants fever in his own heart, when the pious man has by his offerings obtained (your blessing)."

i. 125, 7. Mā priṇanto duritam evaḥ ā aran mā jārīshuḥ sūrayāḥ suvratāsaḥ \| anyas teshāṁ paridhir astu kaś chid aprīṇantam abhi saṁ yantu sukāḥ \|
"Let not the liberal suffer evil or calamity; let not devout sages decay; let them have some further term; let griefs befall the illiberal (aprīṇantam).

i. 182, 3. Kim atra dasrā kriṇuṭhāḥ kim āsāthe jano yaḥ kaśchid haḥvir mahīyate \| ati kramishṭam juratam pāner asum jyotir viprāya kriṇutāṁ vachasyaye \|
"What do ye here, o powerful (Āśvins)? why do ye sit (in the house of) a man who offers no oblation, and (yet) is honoured? Assail, wear away the breath of the niggard, and create light for the sage who desires to extol you."

ii. 23, 4. Sunttibhir nayasi trāyase janaṁ yas tubhyaṁ dāsad na tam aṁho aśnavaṭ | brahma-deviḥas tapano manyumār asi Bhīṣpati mahi tat te mahitveṇam |
"By thy wise leadings thou guidest and protectest the man who worships thee; no calamity can assail him. Thou art the vexer of him who hates devotion (brahma-deviḥaḥ), and the queller of his wrath: this, o Bhīṣpati, is thy great glory."

iv. 25, 6. \ldots na asusheer āpir na sakha na jāmīr dashprāvyo ava-\| hantā id avācaḥ \| 7. Na revatā paṇīṇā sakhyam Indro asuvvāta suta-\| pāḥ saṁ grinīte \| ā asya vedāḥ khidati hanti nagnasvi sushvaye paktaye kevalo 'bhūt |
"Indra is not the relation or friend or kinsman of the man who offers no libations; he is the destroyer of the prostrate irreligious man.
7. Indra, the soma-drinker, accepts not friendship with the wealthy niggard who makes no soma-libations; but robs him of his riches, and
slays him when stripped bare, whilst he is the exclusive patron of the
man who pours out soma and cooks oblations.”

vi. 44, 11. . . . jahi asushvin pra vriha aprinataḥ |

“Slay (o Indra) those who offer no libations; root out the illiberal.”
viii. 53, 1. Ut tēvā mandantu stomah kriṣuṣeva rādha adricaḥ | ava
brahma-devīsah jahi | pāḍa paṇān arādhaso ni badhasca mahān asi | na hi
tvā kaśchana prati |

“Let our hymns gladden thee; give us wealth, o thunderer. Slay
the haters of devotion. 2. Crush with thy foot the niggards who
bestow nothing. Thou art great; no one is comparable to thee.”

It seems evident, then, from these texts (and there are many more
of the same tenor), that the irreligious man, the parcus deorum cultor
et infrequens, was by no means a rare character among the Āryas of
the Vedic age, and that the priests often found no little difficulty in
drawing forth the liberality of their contemporaries towards themselves
and in enforcing a due regard to the ceremonials of devotion. And if
we consider, on the other hand, that the encomiums on the liberality of
different princes to the poets and priests which are contained in the
passages to which I before adverted, are the production of the class
whose pretensions they represent, and whose dignity they exalt, we
shall, no doubt, see reason to conclude that the value of the presents
bestowed has been enormously exaggerated, and make some deduction
from the impression which these texts are calculated to convey of the
estimation in which the priests were held at the time when they were
composed. But after every allowance has been made for such consider-
ations, and for the state of feeling indicated by the complaints of irrel-
igion and illiberality of which I have cited specimens, it will remain
certain that the brāhmān, whether we look upon him as a sage and poet,
or as an officiating priest, or in both capacities, was regarded with
respect and reverence, and even that his presence had begun to be con-
sidered as an important condition of the efficacy of the ceremonial.
Thus, as we have already seen, in i. 164, 35, the brāhmān is described
as the highest heaven of “speech;” in x. 107, 6, a liberal patron is
called a rishi and a brāhmān, as epithets expressive of the most dis-
tinguished eulogy; in x. 125, 5, the goddess Vāch is said to make the man
who is the object of her special affection a brāhmān and a rishi; in vi. 45
7; vii. 7, 5; viii. 16, 7; and ix. 96, 6, the term brāhmān is applied
honourifically to the gods Indra, Agni, and Soma; in iv. 50, 8, 9, great prosperity is declared to attend the prince by whom a brāhmaṇa is employed, honoured, and succoured; and in iii. 53, 9, 12; v. 2, 6; vii. 33, 2, 3, 5; and vii. 83, 4, the highest efficacy is ascribed to the intervention and intercession of this class of functionaries.

Again, whatever exaggeration we may suppose in the texts which eulogize the liberality of princely patrons, in regard to the value of the presents bestowed, there is no reason to doubt that the ministers of public worship, who possessed the gift of expression and of poetry, who were the depositaries of all sacred science, and who were regarded as the channels of access to the gods, would be largely rewarded and honoured.46

46 It is to be observed that, in these eulogies of liberality, mention is nowhere made of Brāhmaṇas as the recipients of the gifts. In two places, viii. 4, 20, and x. 33, 4, a rishi is mentioned as the receiver. In later works, such as the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, on the contrary, the presents are distinctly connected with Brāhmaṇas. Thus it is said in that work, ii. 2, 2, 6: Devyāḥ vai devāḥ devāḥ aha eva devāḥ atha ye brāhmaṇāḥ suṣrūṣāṁ tu manushya-devāḥ | te kshāhī devāḥ vibhaktāḥ eva yajña āhutavāḥ eva devānām dakṣaḥyāḥ manuṣya-devānām brāhmaṇānām suṣrūṣāṁ anuṣchānānām | āhutibhir eva devān prīṇāti dakṣiṇābhīr manuṣya-devān brāhmaṇān suṣrūṣauḥ 'nīchānān | te enam ubhaya devāḥ prītāḥ suṣrūṣānām dadhāti |

"Two kinds of gods are gods, viz. the gods (proper), whilst those Brāhmaṇas who have the Vedic tradition, and are learned, are the human gods. The worship (yajña) of these is divided into two kinds. Oblations constitute the worship offered to the gods, and presents (dakṣiṇā) that offered to the human gods, the Brāhmaṇas, who possess the Vedic tradition and are learned. It is with obligations that a man gratifies the gods, and with presents that he gratifies the human gods, the Brāhmaṇas, who possess the Vedic tradition, and are learned. Both these two kinds of gods, when gratified, place him in a state of happiness" (sudhāyām); or "convey him to the heavenly world," as the expression is varied in the parallel passage of the same work, iv. 3, 4, 4). It is similarly said in the Taitt. Sanh. i. 7, 3, 1: Parokshaṁ vai anye devāḥ iyante pratyakṣham anye | yad yajate ye eva devāḥ parokshaṁ iyante tāṁ eva tad yajati | yad anvāhāryam āharati ete vai devāḥ pratyakṣham yad brāhmaṇās tāṁ eva tena prīṇāti | atho dakṣiṇā eva asya evāh | atho yajnasya eva ehīdram api dadhāti yad vai yajnasya kriyam yad vilishṭaṃ tad anvāhāryaṃ anvāhārati | tad anvāhārasya anvāhāryatevaṃ | devadātāḥ vai ete yad riteṣo yad anvāhāryam āharati devadātāṁ eva prīṇāti | "Some gods are worshipped in their absence, and others in their presence. It is to those gods who are worshipped in their absence that the sacrificer offers the oblation which he presents. And it is these gods who are visible, i.e. the Brāhmaṇas, whom he gratifies with the anvāhārya (present of cooked rice) which he afterwards brings. Now this anvāhārya is the present (dakṣiṇā) connected with it (the sacrifice). Then he covers over the faults of the sacrifice. Whatever in it is excessive or defective, that he removes by means of the anvāhārya. In this consists the nature of that offering. These officiating priests are the messengers of the gods; and it is the messengers of the gods whom the sacrificer gratifies with this anvāhārya gift which he presents."
It is further clear, from some of the texts quoted above (ii. 1, 2; iv. 9, 8; x. 52, 2), as well as i. 162, 5, and from the contents of hymns ii. 36; ii. 37; ii. 43; and x. 124, 1, that in the later part of the Vedic era, to which these productions are probably to be assigned, the ceremonial of worship had become highly developed and complicated, and that different classes of priests were required for its proper celebration. It is manifest that considerable skill must have been required for the due performance of these several functions; and as such skill could only be acquired by early instruction and by practice, there can be little doubt that the priesthood must at that period have become a regular profession. The distinction of king or noble and priest appears to be recognized in i. 108, 7, as well as in iv. 50, 8, 9; whilst in v. 47, 7, 14, a similar distinction is made between king and rishi; and it is noticeable that the verse, in other respects nearly identical, with which the 36th and 37th hymns of the eight mandala respectively conclude, ends in the one hymn with the words, “Thou alone, Indra, didst deliver Trasadasyu in the conflict of men, magnifying prayers” (brahma-vardhayan); whilst in the other the last words are, “magnifying (royal) powers” (kshattraya vardhayan), as if the former contained a reference to the functions of the priest, and the latter to those of the prince. (Compare viii. 35, 16, 17.)

While, however, there thus appears to be every reason for supposing that towards the close of the Vedic period the priesthood had become a profession, the texts which have been quoted, with the exception of the verse in the Purusha Sūkta (x. 90, 12), do not contain anything which necessarily implies that the priests formed an exclusive caste, or, at least, a caste separated from all others by insurmountable barriers, as in later times. There is a wide difference between a profession, or even a hereditary order, and a caste in the fully developed Brahmanical sense.

46 See also i. 94, 6, where it is said: “Thou (Agni) art an adhegya, and the earliest hōtri, a pradāśtri, a potri, and by nature a purohita. Knowing all the priestly functions (ārtegya) wise, thou nourishest us,” etc. (tevam adhegyur uṭa hōṭā 'si pūryaḥ prāśastā potā janushā purohitah | viśva viśva ārtegyā dhira puskasya Agne ity ud).  
47 See Prof. Müller’s remarks on this subject, Anc. Sansk. Lit. pp. 485 ff.; and Dr. Haug’s somewhat different view of the same matter in his Introd. to Ait. Br. pp. 11 ff.  
48 In regard to the great importance and influence of the priests, see Müller’s Anc. Sansk. Lit. pp. 485 ff.
Even in countries where the dignity and exclusive prerogatives of the priesthood are most fully recognized (as in Roman Catholic Europe), the clergy form only a profession, and their ranks may be recruited from all sections of the community. So, too, is it in most countries, even with a hereditary nobility. Plebeians may be ennobled at the will of the sovereign. There is, therefore, no difficulty in supposing that in the Vedic era the Indian priesthood—even if we suppose its members to have been for the most part sprung from priestly families—may have often admitted aspirants to the sacerdotal character from other classes of their countrymen. Even the employment of the word brāhmaṇa in the Rig-veda does not disprove this. This term, derived from brahmaṇ, "priest," need not, as already intimated, signify anything further than the son or descendant of a priest (the word brahmaṇaputra, "son of a priest," is, as we have seen, actually used in one text),—just as the rājanyā means nothing more than the descendant of a king or chief (rājan), a member of the royal family, or of the nobility.

The paucity of the texts (and those, too, probably of a date comparatively recent) in which the word brāhmaṇa occurs, when contrasted with the large number of those in which brāhmān is found, seems, as I have already observed, to prove conclusively that the former word was but little employed in the earlier part of the Vedic era, and only came into common use towards its close. In some of these passages (as in vii. 103, 1, 7, 8; x. 88, 19) there is nothing to shew that the Brāhman is alluded to as anything more than a professional priest, and in vii. 103, the comparison of frogs to Brāhmans may seem even to imply a want of respect for the latter and their office.48 In other places (i. 164, 45, and x. 71, 8, 9) a distinction appears to be drawn between intelligent and unintelligent Brāhmans, between such as were thoughtful and others who were mere mechanical instruments in carrying on the ceremonial of worship,49 which, certainly points to the existence of a sacerdotal class. In another passage (x. 97, 22) the importance of a Brāhman to the proper performance of religious rites appears to be clearly expressed. In x. 109, where the words brāhmān (passim) and brāh-

48 See Müller’s remarks on this hymn in his Aoe. Sansk. Lit. p. 494.
49 In R.V. viii. 50, 9, it is said: "Whether an unwise or a wise man, o Indra, has offered to thee a hymn, he has gladdened (thee) through his devotion to thee (avipro vā yad avidhad vipro vā Indra te vachah | sa pra mamandat te vāyā ity ādat)."
mana (in verse 4) seem to be used interchangeably—the inviolability of Brāhman’s wives, the peril of interfering with them, and the blessing attendant on reparation for any outrage committed against them, are referred to in such a way as to shew at once the loftiness of the claim set up by the Brāhmans on their own behalf, and to prove that these pretensions were frequently disregarded by the nobles. In x. 16, 6, the Brāhmans are spoken of as inspired by Soma, and in vi. 75, 10, the manes of earlier Brāhmans are reckoned among those divine beings who have power to protect the suppliant. But in none of these texts is any clear reference made to the Brāhmans as constituting an exclusive caste or race, and nothing whatever is said about their being descended from an ancestor distinct from those of the other classes of their countrymen.

Sect. II.—Quotations from the Rig-veda, the Nirukta, the Mahābhārata, and other works, to shew that according to ancient Indian tradition, persons not of priestly families were authors of Vedic hymns, and exercised priestly functions.

But in addition to the negative evidence adduced in the preceding section, that during the age to which the greater part of the hymns of the Rig-veda are referable, the system of castes had, to say the least, not yet attained its full development, we find also a considerable amount of proof in the hymns themselves, or in later works, or from a comparison of both, that many of the hymns either were, or from a remote antiquity were believed to be, the productions of authors not of sacerdotal descent; and that some of these persons also acted as priests. The most signal instance of this kind is that of Viśvāmitra; but from the abundance of the materials which exist for its illustration I shall reserve it for the next chapter, where I shall treat of the contests between the Brāhmans and the Kāhattriyas.

In later times, when none but Brāhman priests were known, it seemed to be an unaccountable, and—as contradicting the exclusive sacerdotal pretensions of the Brāhmans—an inconvenient circumstance, that priestly functions should have been recorded as exercised by persons whom tradition represented as Rājanyas; and it therefore became necessary to explain away the historical facts, by inventing miraculous legends to make it appear that these men of the royal order had been
in reality transformed into Brāhmans, as the reward of their super-
human merits and austerities—an idea of which we shall meet with
various illustrations in the sequel. The very existence, however, of such
a word as rājarshi, or "royal rishi," proves that Indian tradition re-
cognized as rishis or authors of Vedic hymns persons who were con-
sidered to belong to Rājanya families. A number of such are named
(though without the epithet of rājarshi) in the Anukramaṇikā or index
to the Rig-veda; but Sāyaṇa, who quotes that old document, gives them
this title. Thus, in the introduction to hymn i. 100, he says: Atra
anukramyate "sa yo vṛishā 'ekonā Vṛṣaḥgirāh Rījrāścāmbarisha-Saha-
deva-Bhayamāna-Surādhaṣaḥ" iti | Vṛṣaḥgirī vahārājasya putrabhātāh
Rījrāścādatvā ypanca rājarshayaḥ sadhāraṇa saktaih dadrśaḥ | atas ite asya
saktasyā rishayaḥ | uktaih hy ärśanukramaṇyām "saktaih sa yo vṛishety
etat pancha Vṛṣaḥgirāh viduh | niyuktāh nāmadheyaih svair api 'chaitat
tyad' iti richi" iti | "It is said in the Anukramaṇikā, 'Of this hymn
(the rishis) are Rījrāśva, Ambarisha, Sahadeva, Bhayamāna, and Surā-
dhas, sons of Vṛṣaḥgirī.' Rījrāśva and others, sons of King Vṛṣaḥgirī,
in all five rājarshis, saw this hymn in a bodily form. Hence they are
its rishis (or seers). For it is declared in the Ārsha Anukramaṇi:
'The five sons of Vṛṣaḥgirī, who are mentioned by name in the verse
beginning "this praise" (the 17th), know this hymn.'" The 17th verse
is as follows: ātāt tyat te Indra vṛishāḥ uktah Vṛṣaḥgirāh abhi gri-
ganti rādhāh | Rījrāścāvaṇ prashtibhir Ambarishah Sahadeva Bhayamā-
naḥ Surādhaḥ | "This hymn the Vṛṣaḥgirīs, Rījrāśva, with his at-
tendants, and Ambarīsha, Sahadeva, Bhayamāna, and Surādhas, utter
unto thee, the vigorous, o Indra, as their homage;" on which Sāyaṇa
repeats the remark that these persons were rājarshis (etad uktah stot-
traṁ rādhāḥ saṃrādhaśaṁ te-at-priti-hevaṁ Vṛṣaḥgirāḥ Vṛṣaḥgirī
cīnāḥ putram Rījrāścādatyā bhi grihanti abhimukhyena sadanti | . . . .
Rījrāścāvaṇ etat-sañjno rājarshīḥ prashtibhiḥ pārśva-thair anyair rishibhiḥ
sahā Indram astaut | ke to pārśva-thāḥ | Ambarīshadāyaḥ chaturvāro rā-
jarshayaḥ). Ambarīsha is also said to be the rishi of i.x. 98. Again,
"Trasadasyu, son of Purukutsa, a Rājarshi," is said by Sāyaṇa on R.V.
iv. 42, to be the rishi of that hymn (Purukutsasya putras Trasadasyaḥ
rājarshīḥ | . . . . atrānukramaṇikā 'mama devita' dasa Trasadasyaḥ Puruk-
utsyaḥ). In the 8th and 9th verses Trasadasyu is thus mentioned:
Asmākam atra pitaras te āsan sapta rishayo Daungahe badhyamāne | te ā
ayajanta Trasadasyum asyāḥ Indraṁ na vritttraturam arddhādevam | 9.

Purukutsanī hi vām adāsād havyeḥhir Indrā-varunā namobhiḥ | atha rā-
jānaṁ Trasadasyum asyāḥ vritttrahaṇaṁ dadathur arddhādevam | 8.

"These seven rishis were our fathers. When the son of Durgaha was
bound they gained by sacrifice for her (Purukutsanī) a son Trasadasyu, a
slayer of foes, like Indra, a demigod. 9. Purukutsanī worshipped you, o
Indra and Varuṇa, with salutations and obeisances; then ye gave her king
Trasadasyu, a slayer of enemies, a demigod."

I give Sāyaṇa’s note on
these verses: "Purukutsasya mahishī Daurgence bandhana-sthite | pattyāv
arājake dṛṣṭvā rāṣṭram putrasya lipsayā | yadṛṣṭhaya samayatān
saptarshiṁ paryapūjayat | te cha pritāḥ punaḥ prochur ‘yajendra-varunau
bhīsām’ | sā chendra-varunav isītvā Trasadasyum ajjñat | itihāsan
imaṁ jānann rishir brūte rīchāv iha | atha asmākan atra asminn arājake
deśe asyāṁ prīthiviyaṁ vā pitarāḥ pālayitāraḥ utpādakas te āsann abha-
van | ete saptarshayaḥ prasiddhāḥ Daurgence Durgahasya putre Purukut-
sebadhyamāne dṛṣṭam pāsair yasmād asyāḥ asyai Purukutsayai Trasa-
dasyum ayajanta prādur Indrā-Varunayor anugrahāt | “’The queen of
Purukutsa, when her husband, the son of Durgaha, was imprisoned,
seeing the kingdom to be destitute of a ruler, and desirous of a son, of
her own accord paid honour to the seven rishis who had arrived. And
they, again, being pleased told her to sacrifice to Indra and Varuṇa.
Having done so she bore Trasadasyu. Knowing this story, the rishi utters
these two verses;”’ which Sāyaṇa then explains. Similarly Sāyaṇa says
on v. 27: “Tryarūṇa son of Trivṛṣiṇa, Trasadasyu son of Purukutsa,
and Aśvamedha son of Bharata, these three kings conjoined, are the
rishis of this hymn; or Atri is the rishi” (Atrānukramaṇīkā | “Anas-
vantā sāt Trayarūṣha-paurukutsaya deau Tryarūṇa-Trasadasyu rājānau
Bharataḥ cha Aśvamedhaḥ | . . . ‘na ātmā ātmānā dādāt’ iti varvāve
Atrīṁ kechīt . . . Tryarūṣhaṣya putras Tryarūṇaḥ Purukutsasya putras
Trasadasyur Bharatasya putro’svamedhaḥ ete trayo’pi rājānaḥ sambhūya
asya sūktasya rishayah | yadva Atrī eva rishih). The Anukramaṇīkā,
however, adds that according to some, as “no one would give gifts to
himself, none of the princes mentioned as donors could be the author; but
Atri must be the rishi.” As the hymn is spoken by a fourth person, in
praise of the liberality of these kings, it is clear they cannot well be its
authors. And a similar remark applies to iv. 42, 8 f. However, the
Hindu tradition, being such as it is, is good proof that kings could, in
conformity with ancient opinion, be rishis. Trasadasyu and Trayaruna are also mentioned as the rishis of ix. 110.\textsuperscript{50} The rishis of iv. 43 and iv. 44 are declared by Saiva, and by the Anukramanikas, to be Purumilha, and Ajamilha, sons or descendants of Suhotra (iv. 43, Aтраумукраманику ‘कह u šāśvat’ sapta Purumilhājamilhaup Suhotrau tv Āśvinān hi | iv. 44, Purumilhājamilhāv eva rishi). Though these persons are not said by either of these authorities to be kings, yet in the Vishnu and Bhagavata Puranas the latter is mentioned as being of royal race, and a tribe of Brhmans is said to have been descended from him (see above p. 227).

In the sixth verse of iv. 44, the descendants of Ajamilha are said to have come to the worship of the Āsvins (naːro yaːd vām Āśvinā stomam āvān sadhastutin Ajamīlham aːgo aːgmān). The following hymns, also, are said by tradition to have had the undermentioned kings for their rishis, viz.: vi. 15, Vitahavya (or Bharadvja); x. 9, Sindhuvipa, son of Ambarisha (or Triśiras, son of Tvashti); x. 75, Sindhukshit, son of Priyamedha; x. 133, Sudās, son of Pijavana; x. 134, Mndhtr, son of Yuvanśva (see above, p. 225); x. 179, Sibi, son of Usinaratrandana, son of Divodāsa and king of Kāsi (see above, p. 229), and Vasumanas, son of Rohidasva; and x. 148 is declared to have had Prthi Vainya\textsuperscript{21} as its rishi. In the fifth verse of that hymn it is said: Srudhi havam Indra śara Pṛthyāh uta stavase Venasya arkaib | “Hear, o heroic Indra, the invocation of Prthi; and thou art praised by the hymn of Venya.” In viii. 9, 10, also, Prthi Vainya is mentioned at the same time with three rishis: Yad vām Kakshivān uta yad Vyaśvaḥ rishir yad vām Dirghatamāḥ jahāva | Prthi yad vām Vainyaḥ sadanesha eva id ato Āśvinā chetayethām | “Whatever oblation (or invocation) Kakshivat has made to you, or the rishi Vyaśva, or Dirghatamas, or Prthi, son of Vena, in the places of

\textsuperscript{50} In the Vishnu Purāna, as we have seen above, p. 237, Trayaruna, Pushkarin, and Kap are said to have been sons of Urukshaya, and all of them to have become Brhmans; and in the Bhagavata Purāna, Trayaruni, Pushkararuni, and Kap are said to have all become Brhmans.

\textsuperscript{21} The S. P. Br. v. 3, 5, 4, refers to Prthi as “first of men who was installed as a king” (Pṛthi ha vai Vainya manushyāṃ prathama bhiṣhakhēche). I extract from Dr. Hall’s edition of Prof. Wilson’s Vishnu Purāna, vol. iii. the following verse, adduced by the editor from the Vayu Purāna about royal rishis: Mānase Vainave (?) vanīte Aide vaṁśēcha ye nripāḥ | Aide Aikshvākā Nabhāgā jñeyā rūjavaḥ tu te | “Kings in the race of Manu, Vena (?), and Ida, the descendants of Ida, Ikshvāku, and Nabhāga are to be known as having been rūjavaḥ.”
sacrifice, take notice of that, o Aśvins." Here Sāyaṇa refers to Prithī as "the royal rishi of that name."

From the details I have supplied it is clear that in many cases the evidence is against the supposition that the princes to whom the hymns are ascribed were in reality their authors. The only instances in which the authorship seems to be established by the tenor of the hymns themselves are those of the Vārshagiras, or, at all events, that of Prithī. But, as has been already remarked, the fact that ancient Hindu tradition recognizes royal rishis as the authors of hymns is sufficient to prove that such cases were not unknown. Even if we were to suppose that flattery had any share in the creation of these traditions, it no doubt proceeded upon the belief of those who put them into circulation, that in earlier times the distinction between the priests and other classes was not so sharply defined as in their own day.

I proceed, however, to the case of Devāpi, in which the materials for forming a judgment are more adequate and satisfactory, and prove that he was not merely a rishi but an officiating priest.

In the Anukramaṇikā, R.V. x. 98 is ascribed to him as its author; and Yāska states as follows in the Nirukta, ii. 10:

Tatra itihāsam āchakshate | Devāpiḥ cha Ārṣhtisheṇaḥ S’antanuḥ cha Kauravyau bhūtārau ṃabhāvatuh | sa S’antanuḥ kanīyau abhishechayān chakre | Devāpiḥ tapāḥ pratipede | tataḥ S’antanoḥ rājye dvādaśa varśhāṇi devo na varvarsha | tam uĉur brāhmaṇāh "adharmas tvayā charito jyestham bhūtāram antaritya abhishehitam | tasmāt te devo na varśati” iti | sa S’antanur Devāpiṇu śiśiksha rājyena | tam uvācha Devāpiḥ "purohitas te ’sāni yājnāṇi cha tvā” iti | tasya etad varsha-kāmavāktam | tasyā esā bhavati |

"Here they relate a story. Devāpi son of Rishṭiṣheṇa, and Santanu, belonged to the race of Kuru and were brothers. Santanu, who was the younger, caused himself to be installed as king, whilst Devāpi betook himself to austere fervour. Then the god did not rain for twelve years of Santanu’s reign. The Brāhmans said to him: ‘Thou hast practised unrighteousness in that, passing by thy elder brother, thou hast caused thyself to be installed as king. It is for this reason that the god does not rain.’ Santanu then sought to invest Devāpi with the sovereignty; but the latter said to him: ‘Let me be thy
purohita and perform sacrifice for thee.' This hymn, expressing a desire of rain, is his. The following verse is part of it.'"

Yāska then quotes a verse of R.V. x. 98, the whole of which is as follows:

Bṛhaspati pratirm devatāṁ  
ihi Mitra  
va  
yad Varuṇa  
va  
asi Pūṣā  
|  
Ādityaṁ  
va  
yad Vasubhīr  
Marutāṁ  
sa  
Parjanyaṁ  
S'antanave  
vrishāya  
|  
2. Ā devo dātu ajirās  
chikīvāṁ  
tead  
Devāpa  
abhi  
mām  
āgachhat  
|  
prati- 

chīnāḥ  
prati  
mām  
ā  
avrītva  
dadhāmi  
tev  
dyumatiṁ  
vāccham  
āsaṁ  
|  
3. Asme  
dhe  
dyumatiṁ  
vāccham  
āsaṁ  
Bṛhaspati  
anamīvām  
ihirām  
|  

yayā  
vrishītān  
S'antanave  
vāccham  
dīvo  
trapo  
madhumān  
ā  
viveśa  
|  
4. Ā  
do  
trapo  
madhumān  
tiśantu  
Indra  
dehi  
adhirathāṁ  
śahasram  
|  

niśāda  
hotram  
|  
rituṁ  

dvāsa  
Devāpa  
havishā  
saparya  
|  
5. Ārāh- 

śieko  
hotram  
vrishīr  
nishidant  
Devāpi  
deva-śumatiṁ  
chikīvāṁ  
|  

sa  
uttarāmād  
adharān  
samudrama  
opo  
diyāh  
asrījād  
varshāyāh  
ābhi  
|  
6. Asmin  

samatā  
adhi  
uttaraśmin  
opo  
devebhir  
nirvītāṁ  
ātishtan  
|  

tāṁ  
adrvānam  
Ārāhṛṣieko  
vrishītā  
Devāpinā  
preshitāḥ  
mṛkṣingishu  
|  
7. Yad Devā- 

piṁ  
S'antanave  
purohito  
hotrāya  
vrītāṁ  
kripayām  
adidhet  
|  

deva-śrutaṁ  

vrishī-ramiṁ  
Varuṇo  
Bṛhaspati  
vāccham  
āsmi  
āyachhat  
|  
8. Yaśa  
tvā  
Devāpiṁ  
śusechāno  
Agni  
Ārāhṛṣieko  
manushyaḥ  
śamīdeḥ  
|  

viśeṣebhir  
devar  

ārunadyamānāṁ  
pra  
Parjanyam  
iraya  
vrishītīantām  
|  
9. Tvām  
pārce  

vrishīya  
gīrbhir  
āyan  

tvām  
adhvareśu  
purukāta  
viśe  
|  

śahasrān; 

adhirathāṁ  
asme  
ā  
no  
vaṁ  
rahidāsava  
upa  
vaḥ  
|  
10. 

Etāni  
Agni  
nacatīr  
nave  

te  
āhutāmi  
adhirathā  
śahasrā  
|  

tebhir  

varahasa  

tanaḥ  
śura  
pūrvir  
divo  

vrishīm  
iṣhita  

vīrthi  
|  
11. 

Etāni  
Agni  
nacatiṁ  
śahasrā  

sam  

pra  

yachha  

vrishne  

Indrāya  

bhāgam  
|  

videvān  

paṭhaḥ  

rituṣko  

devayānān  

apya  

aulānaṁ  
die  

deveshu  

dehe  
|  

12. 

Agni  

bhādhasa  

vi  

mṛdho  

vi  

durgaha  

apa  

amīvaṁ  

apa  

rakṣaṁ  

śiti  

sedha  
|  

asmāt  

samudrād  

brīhato  

divo  

no  

apāṁ  

bhūmanām  

upa  

naḥ  

vrīja  

aha  

"Approach, Bṛhaspati," to my worship of the gods, whether thou art Mitra, Varuṇa, Pūshan, or art attended by the Ādityas, Vasus, or Maruts: cause Parjanya to rain for Santamu. 2. The god, a rapid messenger, has become aware, and has come from thee, o Devāpi, to me, (saying) ‘approach towards me; I will place a brilliant hymn 

32. Compare R.V. ii. 1, 2.
33. It looks as if Agni were here to be understood by Bṛhaspati, see verses 9–12. In R.V. ii. 1, 4 ff. Agni is identified with Varuṇa, Mitra, Aryaman, Aūśā, Tvashtri, Rudra, Pūshan, Savitri, Bhaga.
in thy mouth." 3. Place in our mouth, o Br̥haspati, a brilliant hymn, powerful, and spirited, whereby we two may solicit rain for Santanu. The drop full of sweetness has descended on us from the sky. 4. May the drops full of sweetness come down upon us: give us, o Indra, a thousand waggons-loads (of them?). Perform the function of a hotṛi, sacrifice in due form, worship the gods with an oblation, o Devāpi. 5. The rishi Devāpi, son of Rishṭisheṇa, performing the function of a hotṛi, knowing (how to gain) the goodwill of the gods, has discharged from the upper to the lower ocean those waters of the sky which fall in rain. 6. The waters remained shut up by the gods in this upper ocean: they rushed forth when released by the son of Rishṭisheṇa, when discharged by Devāpi into the torrents. 7. When Devāpi, placed in front of Santanu (as his purohita), chosen for the office of hotṛi, fulfilling his function, kindled (the fire),—then, granting the prayer for rain which was heard by the gods, Br̥haspati gave him a hymn. 8. Do thou, o Agni, whom the man Devāpi the son of Rishṭisheṇa has inflamed and kindled,—do thou, delighted, with all the gods, send hither the rain-bearing Parjanya. 9. Former rishis have approached thee with their hymns; and all (approach) thee, o god, much-invoked, in their sacrifices: give us thousands of waggon-loads: come, thou who art borne by red horses, to our sacrifice. 10. These ninety-nine thousands of waggon-loads (of wood and butter?) have been thrown into thee, o Agni, as oblations. Through them grow, hero, to (the bulk of) thy former bodies; and stimulated, grant us rain from the sky. 11. (Of) these ninety thousands give, o Agni, a share to the vigorous Indra. Knowing the paths which rightly lead to the gods, convey the oblation (?) to the deities in the sky. 12. Overcome, o Agni, our enemies, our calamities; drive away sickness, and rakshases. From this great ocean of the sky discharge upon us an abundance of waters."

The fact of Devāpi being reputed as the author of this hymn, and as the purohita and hotṛi of his brother, seems to have led the legendary writers to invent the story of his becoming a Br̥hman, which (as men-

---

54 So the word mṛikāhūṣṭi is explained in Bächtlingk and Roth's Lexicon.
55 Or, "descendant of Manuś" (manusāya).
56 This is a common epithet of Agni.
57 This means, I suppose, "burst forth into vast flames."
tioned by Professor Weber, Indische Studien, i. p. 203) is recorded in the Salya-parvan of the Mahābhārata, verses 2281 ff. where he is there said to have attained this distinction at a certain place of pilgrimage called Prithūdaka; where Sindhudvīpa and Viśvāmitra also were received into the higher caste:

Tatrārṣṭisheṇaḥ Kauravaḥ brāhmaṇyaṁ saṁśita-prataḥ | tapasā maḥaṭārajan prāptavān rishi-sattamaḥ | Sindhudvīpaḥ cha rājarśhir Devāpiḥ cha mahātapaḥ | brāhmaṇyaṁ labdhavān yatra Viśvāmitras tathā munih | mahātaposvī bhagavān ugra-tejāḥ mahātapaḥ | . . . . 2287. Purā krita-vyute rajann Ārṣṭiṣheṇa devijottamaḥ | vasan guru-kule nityaṁ nityam adhyayane rataḥ | tasya rājan guru-kule vasato nityam eva cha | samāptīṁ nāgamad vidyā nāpi vedāḥ viśāmpate | sa nireṇṇas tato rājāṁ tapas tepe mahātapaḥ | tato vai tapasā tena prāpya vedān anuttamanān | sa videṇa veda-yuktas cha siddhāḥ chāpy rishi-sattamaḥ | . . . . evam siddhāḥ sa bhagavān Ārṣṭiṣheṇaḥ pratāpavān | tasminn eva tadā tिरthe Sindhudvīpaḥ pratāpavān | Devāpiḥ cha mahārāja brāhmaṇyam prāpatut mahat |

2281. “There the most excellent rishi Ārṣṭiṣheṇa, constant in his observances, obtained Brāhmaṇhood by great austere fervour; as did also the royal rishi Sindhudvīpa,53 and Devāpi great in austere fervour, and the glorious muni Viśvāmitra, of great austere fervour and fiery vigour.” Some other particulars of Ārṣṭiṣheṇa are given further on:

2287. “Formerly in the Kṛita age the most excellent Brāhmaṇ Ārṣṭiṣheṇa dwelt constantly in his preceptor’s family, devoted to incessant study; but could not complete his mastery of science or of the Vedas.59 Being in consequence discouraged, he betook himself to intense austere fervour. By this means he acquired the incomparable Vedas, and became learned and perfect. . . . . At the same place of pilgrimage the majestic Sindhudvīpa and Devāpi obtained the great distinction of Brāhmaṇhood.”

It will be observed that here Ārṣṭiṣheṇa is, in opposition to the authority of the Nirukta, made a distinct person from Devāpi.

53 This prince also, as we have seen above, is mentioned among those Rājanyas who composed Vedic hymns.
59 The Vedas are here spoken of in the plural, although Ārṣṭiṣheṇa is said to have lived in the Kṛita age. But the M. Bh. itself says elsewhere (see above, p. 145) that there was then but one Veda.
In a note to his (French) translation of the Rig-veda, M. Langlois (vol. iv. 502) supposes that the hymn above translated (x. 98), like the Purusha Sūkta, is very much posterior in date to the other hymns in the collection. The names of Devāpi and Sāntanu indicate, he thinks, as the date of its composition, a period not far preceding that of the great war of the Mahābhārata. Professor Weber, on the other hand, considers (Indische Studien, i. 203) that the Sāntanu and Devāpi mentioned in that work (Ādi-parvan, 3750 f.) cannot be the same as the persons alluded to in the Rigveda, because their father was Pratīpa, not Rishṭisheṇa; and because he thinks it doubtful whether a prince who preceded the Pāṇḍavas by only two generations could have been named in the Rig-veda, and appear there as an author of hymns.

The verses of the Ādi-parvan just referred to are as follows:

Pratīpasya trayāḥ putrāḥ jānīre Bharatarshabhaḥ | Devāpiḥ S’āntanuś chaiva Vāhlikāḥ mahārathaḥ | Devāpiḥ cha pravavrāja teshāṁ dharmahitepsayā | S’āntanuś cha mahīṁ lebe Vāhlikāḥ cha mahārathaḥ |

"Three sons were born to Pratīpa, viz. Devāpi, Sāntanu, and Vāhlikā the charioteer. Of these Devāpi, desiring the benefits of religious excellence, became an ascetic; whilst Sāntanu and Vāhlikā obtained (the rule of) the earth."

The Harivaṃśa gives a different story about the same Devāpi, verse 1819:

Pratīpiḥ Bhīmasenāt tu Pratīpasya tu S’āntanuḥ | Devāpiḥ Vāhlikāḥ chaiva trayāḥ eca mahārathaḥ | . . . . . . 1822. Upādhyāyas tu devānaṁ Devāpiḥ abhavaḍ muniḥ | Chyavanasya kriṭaḥ putraḥ iṣṭaḥ chāṣid māhātmāḥ |

"Pratīpa sprang from Bhīmasena; and Sāntanu, Devāpi, and Vāhlikā were the three chariot-driving sons of Pratīpa. . . . . . 1822. Devāpi became a muni, and preceptor of the gods, being the adopted son of Chyavana, by whom he was beloved."

The Vishnu Purāṇa (iv. 20, 7ff.) concurs with the preceding authorities in making Devāpi and Sāntanu to be sons of Pratīpa, and descendants of Kuru, and his son Jahn. It repeats the legend given in the Nirukta of the country of Sāntanu being visited by a drought of twelve years duration, in consequence of his having assumed the royal authority while his elder brother lived. And although, as will be seen, the sequel of the story is widely different from that recorded by the
Nirukta, the earlier incidents in the two narratives are so similar, that it would appear to have been the intention of the Puranic writer to identify the Devāpi and Śāntanu whose history he relates with the persons of the same names, although of different parentage, mentioned in Yāska's work. He may, however, possibly have transferred an older legend to more recent personages. The passage of the Vishnū Purāṇa is as follows:

Rikšhayā Bhāmasenas tatas cha Dilipāḥ | Dilipāt Pratipās tasyāpi Devāpi Śāntanu-Vāhlika-sanjuānas trayah putrāḥ babhūvah | Devāpir bālaḥ eva aranyāṃ viveśa | Śāntanur avanipatir abhacat | ayanā cha tasya ślokaḥ prithivyām giyate "yaṁ yaṁ karābhyaṁ spriṣati jirnāṁ yauvanam eti saḥ | śāntiḥ chāḥpoṭī yenāgayāṁ karmāṇā tena Śāntanah" | tasya Śāntanoh rāṣṭre devādaśa varshāṇi devo na vavarsah | tatasāca aśeṣa-rāṣṭra-vināśas aveskhya asau rāja brāhmaṇān aprīchhad "bhoḥ kasmād asmin rāṣṭre devo na varṣati | ko mama aparādaḥ" iti | te tam uchhir "agrajasya te'rha iyam avanis tvāya bhujyate parivettā tevam" | ity uktāḥ sa punaṁ tān aprīchhat "kim mayā vīdhayam" iti | tena tam uchhir "yayad Devāpir na pataṇādiḥbhir doshair abhiḥpīrā̄ya tāvah tasya arhaṁ rājyam | tad alam etena tasmān diyathām" | ity uktā tasya mantri-pravācreṇa Aśmasārīṇā tatra aranye tapasvin veda-vāda-virodhā-vaktāraḥ prayaṅitāḥ | tair ati-pitu-mate mahāpati-puṭrasya buddhir veda-virodhā-mārgāṇasūrīṇy abhivyata | rāja cha Śāntanur devīa-vachanōtpanna-parivedana-śokas tān brāhmaṇān agrāṅkritoṣya agrāja-rājya-pradāṇāya aranyāṁ jagāma | tad-ākramam upagatāḥ cha tām avanipati-puṭraṁ Devāpir upatsthāḥ | te brāhmaṇāḥ veda-vādamuṛiddhāṇi vačāṃśi "rājya agrajena karttavyam" ity arthavanti tam uchhir | asāv api veda-vāda-virodhā-yukti-dāshitam aneka-prakāram tān āha | tatus te brāhmaṇāḥ Śāntanum uchhir "āgaḥcha bho rājām alam atra ati-nir-bandhena | prāśāntaḥ eva asāv anāṛpiṣhti-doshaḥ | patito 'yam anādi-kāla-mahita-veda-vachana-dāshayotchārāṇāt | patito cha agraja naica parīvatṛtyam bhavati" | ity uktāḥ Śāntanah eva-puram āgatyā rājyam akarot | veda-vāda-virodhā-vachanochucaḥ dāshīte cha jyeshiḥ 'śmin bhrātari tishtḥaty api Devāpāv akhila-sasya-niṣkappaye vavarsa bhagavān Purjanyah |

"From Riksha sprang Bhāmasena; from him Dilipa; from him Pratipa, who again had three sons called Devāpi, Śāntanu, and Vāhlika. Devāpi while yet a boy retired to the forest; and Śāntanu became
king. Regarding him this verse is current in the world: ‘Every decrepit man whom he touches with his hands becomes young. He is called Sántanu from that work whereby he obtains supreme tranquility (śánti).’ The god did not rain on the country of this Sántanu for twelve years. Beholding then the ruin of his entire realm, the king enquired of the Brāhmans: ‘Why does not the god rain on this country; what is my offence?’ The Brāhmans replied: ‘This earth, which is the right of thy elder brother, is now enjoyed by thee; thou art a parivettṛi (one married before his elder brother).’ Receiving this reply, he again asked them: ‘What must I do?’ They then answered: ‘So long as Devāpi does not succumb to declension from orthodoxy and other offences, the royal authority is his by right; to him therefore let it be given without further question.’ When they had so said, the king’s principal minister Aśmasārin employed certain ascetics propounding doctrines contrary to the declarations of the Vedas to proceed into the forest, by whom the understanding of the very simple-minded prince (Devāpi) was led to adopt a system at variance with those sacred books. King Sántanu being distressed for his offence in consequence of what the Brāhmans had said to him, went, preceded by those Brāhmans, to the forest in order to deliver over the kingdom to his elder brother. Arriving at the hermitage, they came to prince Devāpi. The Brāhmans addressed to him statements founded on the declarations of the Veda, to the effect that the royal authority should be exercised by the elder brother. He, on his part, expressed to them many things that were vitiated by reasonings contrary to the tenor of the Veda. The Brāhmans then said to Sántanu, ‘Come hither, o king: there is no occasion for any excessive hesitation in this affair: the offence which led to the drought is now removed. Your brother has fallen by uttering a contradiction of the words of the Veda which

---

69 This is illustrated by Manu iii, 171 f.: Dūrāgnihirotva-saṁyogaṁ kurute yo 'grose sthitā parivettṛa sa vijnehaṁ parivettṛa tu pūrvajah | 172. Parivettiḥ parivettṛa yogā cha parividyate | sarve te narakaṁ yanti dātiṁ-yājaka-panchamah | “171. He who, while his elder brother is unwedded, marries a wife with the nuptial fires, is to be known as a parivettṛi, and his elder brother as a parivetti. 172. The parivetti, the parivettṛi, the female by whom the offence is committed, he who gives her away, and fifthly the officiating priest, all go to hell.” The Indian writers regard the relation of a king to his realm as analogous to that of a husband to his wife. The earth is the king’s bride.
have been revered from time without beginning; and when the elder brother has fallen, the younger is no longer chargeable with the offence of pārīvettya (i.e. of marrying before his elder brother).” When he had been so addressed, Sāntanu returned to his capital, and exercised the royal authority. And although his eldest brother Devāpi continued to be degraded by having uttered words opposed to the doctrines of the Veda, the god Parjanya rained in order to produce a harvest of all sorts of grain.’

Can the compiler of the Purāṇa have deviated from the conclusion of this history as found in the Nirukta, and given it a new turn, in order to escape from the conclusion that a Rājanya could officiate as a purohita?

The same story is briefly told in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, ix. 22, 14–17.

In the Udyogaparvan of the Mahābhārata, on the other hand, Devāpi’s virtues and orthodoxy are extolled in the highest terms, and his exclusion from the throne is ascribed solely to his being a leper, v. 5054:

Devāpiṣ tu mahātejās tevag-doshī rāja-sattamaḥ | dhārmīkāḥ satya-vādi cha pituḥ šuśrūṣhaṃ rataḥ | paurā-jānapadānām cha sammataḥ sādhu-satkritāḥ | sarveshām bāla-vriddhānaṁ Devāpir hridayamagamaḥ | vadāṇ-yāḥ satyasandhaś cha sarva-bhūta-hite rataḥ | varttamānaḥ pituḥ śaśre brāhmaṇānāṁ tathaiva cha | . . . . | tam brāhmaṇāṁ cha vriddhaś cha paurā-jānapadoḥ saha | sarve nivārayāmāsur. Devāper abhishekanam | sa tach chhunte tu nripatir abhisheka-nivāranaṁ | aśru-kānthaḥ bhavad rājā paryaśocataḥ chātmajan | evaṁ vadaṇyo dharmajñāḥ satyasaṇdhaś cha sa 'bhavat | priyaḥ prajānām api sa tevag-doshaṇa praṇā أحمد | “hināṅgam prithivīpalaṁ nābhinnandanti devataḥ” | iti kriyā nripa-brihṣṭham pratyagheśhan devajarshabhāḥ | . . . | nivāritaṁ nripaṁ drīṣṭvā Devāpiḥ saṁśrīto vanam |

“But the glorious Devāpi, a most excellent prince, righteous, veracious, and obedient to his father, was a leper. He was esteemed by the inhabitants both of town and country, honoured by the good, beloved by all, both young and old, eloquent, true to his engagements, devoted to the welfare of all creatures, and conformed to the commands of his father, and of the Brāhmans.” [The king his father grew old and was making preparations for the investiture of his successor; but public opinion was opposed to the devolution of the royal authority on
a leper, however virtuous]. "The Brahmins and aged men, together with the dwellers both in town and country, all restrained him from the investiture of Devāpi. The king, learning their opposition, was choked with tears, and bewailed his son's fate. Thus Devāpi was eloquent, acquainted with duty, true to his promise, and beloved by the people, but vitiated by leprosy. The Brahmins forbade the king (to make Devāpi his successor), saying, 'the gods do not approve a king who labours under any corporeal defect.' . . . Perceiving that the king (his father) was hindered (from carrying out his wishes) Devāpi retired to the forest."

On the same subject, the Matsya Purāṇa, 49, v. 39 ff., states as follows:

Dilipasya Pratipastu tasya putrās trayāḥ smṛtīḥ | Devāpiḥ Sāntamū chaiva Bāhlika chaiva te trayāḥ | Bāhlikasya tu dayādāḥ sapta Bāhliśvarāḥ nṛpāḥ | Devāpiś tu apadhvastaḥ prajābhīḥ abhavād muniḥ | rishayāḥ uchchāḥ | prajābhīs tu kimarthāṁ vai apadhvasto janesvarāḥ | ke doshāḥ rājaputrasya prajābhīḥ samudāhritāḥ | Sūta uvācha | kilāsid rājaputras tu kauḥī tuṁ nābhayāpijayan | ko'rthāṁ vai atra (? vetty atra) devanāṁ ksattram prati devijottamaḥ |

"The son of Dilipa was Pratipa, of whom three sons are recorded, Devāpi, Sāntanu, and Bāhlika. The sons of the last were the seven Bāhliśvara kings. But the Muni Devāpi was rejected by the people. The rishis enquired: 'why was that prince rejected by the people? what faults were alleged against him?' Sūta replied: 'the prince was leprous, and they paid him no respect. Who knows the designs of the gods towards the Kshatriya race? '"

No more is said of Devāpi in this passage.61 The Vishnu Purāṇa has the following further curious particulars regarding him, iv. 24, 44 ff.:

Devāpiḥ Pauravo rāja Maruḥ chekshvāku-vaināśajāḥ | mahāyoge-balopetau Kalopgra-ṛṣoṃ-saṃśrayau | krite yugo ihāgatyā kṣhattro-prācavit takau hi tau | bhavishyato Manor vaṁśe vija-bhūtau vyavasthitau | etena krama-yogena Manu-puttair vasundhara | kṛta-tretādi-saṃjñāṇi yugāni triṇī bhuyate | Kalau tu vija-bhūtās te kechit tishthanti bhūtale | yathāvica Devāpi-Maru sāṃpraṇāṃ samavasthitau |

"King Devāpi of the race of Puru,62 and Maru of the family of

61 See Prof. Wilson's note, 4to, ed. p. 458.
62 In the twentieth chapter, as we have seen, he is said to be of the race of Kuru.
Ikshvāku, filled with the power of intense contemplation (mahāyoga) are abiding in the village of Kalāpa, continuing to exist as seeds in the family of Manu; they shall come hither in the (next) Kṛita age, and re-establish the Kshattriya race. According to this order the earth is enjoyed by the sons of Manu throughout the three ages called Kṛita, Treta, and Dvāpara. But during the Kali certain persons remain upon earth as seeds (of a future race), as Devāpi and Maru now exist."

According to the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, ix. 22, 17, it is the lunar race, which had perished in the Kali age, that Devāpi is to restore in the future Kṛita (soma-vāṃśe kālaṁ nashto kṛitādaṁ sthāpayishyati).

I shall quote here from the 132nd section of the Matsya Purāṇa, entitled Manvantara-varṇanam (a description of the Manvantaras) some of the particulars about the rishi with which it concludes:

98. Bhṛigu Kāśyāḥ Prachetāś cha Dadhīcho hy Atmacān api  |
99. Aurovṝtha Jamadagniś cha Kripha Śūrdevatas tathā  | Arañjīṣhena
Yudhajīch chā Vidhayaya-Suwachasau  | 100. Vaiṇaḥ Prithur Divodāso
Brahmāśvo Gṛita-Saunakau  | ekavaṃśaṁsatir hy ete Bhṛigavo mantrā-
| krittamaṁ  | 101. Angirāḥ Vedaśaṁ chaiva Bharadējō Īhalaṇāṅhaḥ |
| Ritarādhā tato Gṛaṣa Sīthi Sankritir eva cha  | 102. Gurudhīraś cha Māndhātā Ambarishas tathaiva cha  
| Yuvanāśvaḥ Puruḥ Kutsaḥ Purāyumnaḥ Sravanasya cha  | 103. Ajamīdhō 'tha Haravas Tukshapāhaṁ 
| Kavir eva cha  | Prishadāso Virupaś cha Kandaśa chaivaūṭha Mudgalaḥ |
| 104. Utadhyaś cha Śurdevanāṁ cha tathā Vījuśrávā īti  | Apasya 'tha Swīttaś a Vāmadevas tathaiva cha  |
| 105. Ajito Bhrihadukthośa cha  | 106. Ete mantra-kṛitaṁ sarve Kāśyapāṁs tu nibodhata  |
| rīshir Dīrghatām api  | 111. Viśvāmitraś cha Gādheyo Devarājas tathā Balaḥ  |
| 112. Ashtako Lohitaś  | 113. Mithilaś cha mahātejāḥ Śalankāyaṇa eva cha  |
| chaiva Bhṛitaśiśa cha tāv uhbhaḥ  | yodasāite vijeyah brahmishthāḥ Kaushikāḥ varāḥ  |
| Vedāśravāḥ Devarātah Purāṇaśvo  | 114. Manur Vaivasvatos chaiva Ido rāja Purāravāḥ |
| Dhananjayaḥ  | Kshattriyanāṁ varāḥ hy eto vijeyāḥ mantra-vādinaḥ  |
| chaiva te trayāḥ  | 117. Ity eka-navaṭiḥ proktāḥ mantrāḥ yaiṣ cha bahiḥ kriṭāḥ |

Various readings—Bhalaṁdāsa cha Vasyaśa cha Sankulaśiha.
brāhmaṇaḥ kṣatriyaḥ vaisyaḥ rishiputraṁ nibodhataḥ | 118. Rishikāṇāṁ
sutaḥ hy ete rishi-putraṁ śrutarśhayāḥ | 64

"98. Bhṛgus, Kaśyapa, Prachetas, Daṁdha, Ātmavat, (99) Aurora,
Jamadagni, Kṛpa, Sāradvata, Arṣṭiṣheṇa, Yudhājīt, Vītabhaṇya,
Suvrata, (100) Vaiṅga, Prīthu, Divodāsa, Brahmāśva, Grīṣṭa, Saunaka,
these are the nineteen 63 Bhṛgus, composers of hymns. 101. Angiras,
Vedhasa, Bharadvāja, Bhālandana, 66 Ritabādha, Garga, Siti, Sankṛiti,
Gurudhīra, 67 Māndhāṭri, Ambarishā, Yuvanāśva, Purukutsa, 68 Prad-
yumna, Sṛavaṇasya, 69 Ajamīḍha, Haryaśva, Takshapa, Kavi, Prisha-
daśva, Virūpa, Kāṇva, Mudgala, Utathya, Sāradvata, Vājaśravas,
Apaśya, Suvittra, Vāmadeva, Ajita, Brīhadukṣha, Divṛghatama, Kaksi-
vat, are recorded as the thirty-three eminent Angirases. These were
all composers of hymns. Now learn the Kaśyapasa.  . . . 111. Viśva-
mitra, son of Gāḍhi, Devarāja, Bala, the wise Madhuḥchhandas, Rishabhā,
Aghamarṣaṇa, (112) Asaṭaka, Lohita, Bhṛtakīla, Vedaśravas, Deva-
rāta, Purāṇaśva, Dhananjaya, the glorious (113) Mithila, Sālankayana,
these are to be known as the thirteen devout and eminent Kusīkasa. 70
. . . . . 115. Mānu Vaiśavasata, Ida, king Purūravas, these are to be
known as the eminent utterers of hymns among the Kṣattriyas.
116. Bhālanda, Vandyā, and Sankṛitti, 71 these are always to be known
as the three eminent persons among the Vaśyas who were composers
of hymns. 117. Thus ninety-one persons have been declared, by
whom hymns have been given forth, Brāhmans, Kṣattriyas, and
Vaiśyas. Learn the sons of the rishis. 118. These are the offspring
of the rishikas, sons of rishis, secondary rishis (śrutarśhis)."

The section ends here.

64 I am indebted for an additional copy of this section of the Mātsya Purāṇa (of which
some account is given by Prof. Aufrrecht in his Catalogue, p. 41), to the kindness of Mr.
Griffith, Principal of Queen's College, Benares, who, at my request, has caused it to
be collated with various other MSS. existing in Benares. I have not thought it
necessary to exhibit all the various readings in the part I have quoted.
66 The number of nineteen is only obtained by making Vaiṅga and Prīthu two
persons.
68 Instead of this word, one Benares MS. has Lakṣhmaṇa.
67 Two MSS. have Turavita. 69 This word is divided into two in the MS.
69 Two MSS. have, instead, Vaśravas and Tamasyavat.
70 Unless some of the words I have taken as names are really epithets, fifteen per-
sons are enumerated here.
71 Some MSS. have Bhālandaka, Vandyā or Vāsas, and Sankāla or Sankirna.
72 This is the total of several lists, some of which I have omitted.
It will be observed from a comparison of this extract with the details previously given, that some of the rājarṣis, or rishis of royal blood, such as Āraḥṭiṣeṇa, Vitahavya, Prithu (the same as Prithī) are spoken of as belonging to the family of Bhrigu, while others of the same class, such as Māndhāṭri, Ambarīṣa, Yuvanāśva, Purukutsa, are reckoned among the Angirases. Viśvāmitra and his descendants are merely designated as Kusikas without any specific allusion to their Rājanya descent; but Manu, Īḍa, and Purūravas, are distinctly recognized as being as once authors of hymns and Kshattriyas; and, what is more remarkable, three Vaiśyas are also declared to have been sacred poets. These traditions of an earlier age, though scanty in amount, are yet sufficient to show that in the Vedic times the capacity for poetical composition, and the prerogative of officiating at the service of the gods, was not regarded as entirely confined to men of priestly families.

Sect. III.—Texts from the Atharva-veda illustrating the progress of Brāhmanical pretensions.

I have already quoted (in pp. 21 and 22) three short passages from the Atharva-veda regarding the origin of the Brāhman and Kshattriya castes. I shall now bring forward some other texts from the same collection which show a much greater development of the pretensions of the priests to a sacred and inviolable character than we meet in any part of the Rig-veda, if the 109th hymn of the tenth book (cited above) be excepted.

I shall first adduce the 17th hymn of the fifth book, to which I have already alluded, as an expansion of R.V. x. 109.

According to the Rig- and Atharva-Vedas.


"... 4. That calamity which falls upon the village, of which they say, 'this is a star with dishevelled hair,' is in truth the brāhmaṇ’s wife, who ruins the kingdom; (and the same is the case) wherever (a country) is visited by a bare attended with meteors. ...
7. Whenever any miscarriages take place, or any moving things are destroyed, whenever men slay each other, it is the brāhmaṇ’s wife who kills them. 8. And when a woman has had ten former husbands not brāhmaṇs, if a brāhmaṇ take her hand (i.e. marry her), it is he alone who is her husband. 9. It is a Brāhman only that is a husband, and not a Rājanya or a Vaiśya. That (truth) the Sun goes forward proclaiming to the five classes of men (panchabhya mānavebhyaḥ), ...
12. His (the king’s) wife does not repose opulent (satavāḥ) and handsome upon her bed in that kingdom where a brāhmaṇ’s wife is foolishly shut up. 13. A son with large ears (vikarṇaḥ) and broad head is not born in the house in that kingdom, etc. 14. A charioteer with golden neckchain does not march before the king’s hosts in that kingdom, etc. 15. A white horse with black ears does not make a show yoked to his (the king’s) chariot in that kingdom, etc. 16. There is no pond with blossoming lotuses in his (the king’s) grounds in that kingdom where, etc. 17. His (the king’s) brindled cow is not milked by his milkmen in that kingdom, etc. 18. His (the king’s) milch cow does not thrive, nor does his ox endure the yoke, in that country where a Brāhman passes the night wretchedly without his wife."

This hymn appears to show that, however extravagant the pretensions of the Brāhmans were in other respects, they had, even at the comparatively late period when it was composed, but little regard to

---

72 The word here in the original is sūnaṇām, with which it is difficult to make any sense. Should we not read sevaṇām? 74 Compare R.V. x. 107, 10.
the purity of the sacerdotal blood, as they not only intermarried with women of their own order, or even with women who had previously lived single, but were in the habit of forming unions with the widows of Rājanyas or Vaiśyas, if they did not even take possession of the wives of such men while they were alive. Even if we suppose these women to have belonged to priestly families, this would only show that it was no uncommon thing for females of that class to be married to Rājanyas or Vaiśyas—a fact which would, of course, imply that the caste system was either laxly observed, or only beginning to be introduced among the Indians of the earlier Vedic age. That, agreeably to ancient tradition, Brāhmans intermarried with Rājanya women at the period in question, is also distinctly shewn

75 That the remarriage of women was customary among the Hindus of those days is also shewn by A.V. ix. 5, 27 f., quoted in my paper on Yama, Jour. R. A. S. for 1885, p. 299.

76 This latter supposition derives a certain support from the emphasis with which the two verses in question (A. V. v. 17, 8, 9) assert that the Brāhman was the only true husband. Whence, it may be asked, the necessity for this strong and repeated asseveration, if the Rājanya and Vaiśya husbands were not still alive, and prepared to claim the restoration of their wives? The verses are, however, explicable without this supposition.

It is to be observed, however, that no mention is here made of Sūdras as a class with which Brāhmans intermarried. Sūdras were not Áryas, like the three upper classes. This distinction is recognised in the following verse of the A.V. xix. 62, 1: "Make me dear to gods, dear to princes, dear to every one who beholds me, both to Sūdra and to Árya." (Unless we are to suppose that both here and in xix. 32, 8; árya=a Vaiśya, and not árya, is the word). In Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, Kāvyā Sákha (Adhvara Kāyda, i. 6), the same thing is clearly stated in these words (already partially quoted above, p. 176), for a copy of which I am indebted to Prof. Müller: Tan na sara eva propadyeta na hi devāh saranayaiva sangahante | árya eva brāhmaṇo vā kṣattriya vā vaiśya vā te hi yajnīyaḥ | no eva saranayaiva samevadeta na hi devāh saranayaiva samadante árya eva brāhmaṇena vā kṣattriyena vā vaiśyaena vā te hi yajnīyaḥ | yady enam śudṛṣya samevad iti itthama evan niḥchakhaḥ ity anyam brūṣud eha dikṣitasyopachāraḥ. "Every one cannot obtain this (for the gods do not associate with every man), but only an Árya, a Brāhman, or a Kṣattriya, or a Vaiśya, for these can sacrifice. Nor should one talk with everybody (for the gods do not talk with every body), but only with an Árya, a Brāhman, or a Kṣattriya, or a Vaiśya, for these can sacrifice. If any one have occasion to speak to a Sūdra, let him say to another person, 'Tell this man so and so.' This is the rule for an initiated man."

In the corresponding passage of the Mādhyandina Sākha (p. 224 of Weber's edition) this passage is differently worded.

From Manu (ix. 149–167; x. 7 ff.) it is clear that Brāhmans intermarried with Sūdra women, though the offspring of those marriages was degraded.
by the story of the rishi Chyavana and Sukanyā, daughter of king Saryāta, narrated in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, and quoted in my paper entitled "Contributions to a Knowledge of Vedic Mythology," No. ii., in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1866, pp. 11 ff. See also the stories of the rishi Syāvāśva, who married the daughter of king Rathaviti, as told by the commentator on Rig-veda, v. 61, and given in Professor Wilson’s translation, vol. iii. p. 344.

The next hymn, from the same work, sets forth with great liveliness and vigour the advantages accruing to princes from the employment of a domestic priest.


"1. May this prayer of mine be successful; may the vigour and strength be complete, may the power be perfect, undecaying, and victorious of those of whom I am the priest (purohita). 2. I fortify their kingdom, and augment their energy, valour, and force. I break the arms of their enemies with this oblation. 3. May all those who fight against our wise and prosperous (prince) sink downward, and be prostrated. With my prayer I destroy his enemies and raise up his friends. 4. May those of whom I am the priest be sharper than an axe, sharper than fire, sharper than Indra’s thunderbolt. 5. I strengthen their weapons; I prosper their kingdom rich in heroes. May their power be undecaying and victorious. May all the gods foster their designs."
6. May their valorous deeds, o Maghavat, burst forth; may the noise of the conquering heroes arise; may their distinct shouts, their clear yells, go up; may the gods, the Maruts, with Indra as their chief, march forward with their host. 7. Go, conquer, ye warriors; may your arms be impetuous. Ye with the sharp arrows, smite those whose bows are powerless; ye whose weapons and arms are terrible (smite) the feeble. 8. When discharged, fly forth, o arrow, sped by prayer. Vanquish the foes, assault, slay all the choicest of them; let not one escape.”

The two following hymns from the same collection declare the guilt, the peril, and disastrous consequences of oppressing Brāhmans, and robbing them of their property. The threats and imprecations of haughty sacerdotal insolence could scarcely be expressed more energetically.

1. King, the gods have not given thee (this cow) to eat. Do not, o Rājanya (man of royal descent), seek to devour the Brāhmaṇ’s cow, which is not to be eaten. 2. The wretched Rājanya, unlucky in play, and self-destroyed, will eat the Brāhmaṇ’s cow, saying, ‘Let me live to-day, (if I can) not (live) to-morrow.’ 3. This cow, clothed with a skin, contains deadly poison, like a snake. Beware, Rājanya, of this Brāhmaṇ’s (cow); she is ill-flavoured, and must not be eaten. 4. She takes away his regal power, destroys his splendour, consumes him entire like a fire which has been kindled. The man who looks upon the Brāhmaṇ as mere food to be eaten up, drinks serpent’s poison. 5. Indra kindles a fire in the heart of that contemner of the gods who smites the Brāhmaṇ, esteeming him to be inoffensive, and foolishly covets his property. Heaven and earth abhor the man who (so) acts. 6. A Brāhmaṇ is not to be wronged, as fire (must not be touched) by a man who cherishes his own body. Soma is his (the Brāhmaṇ’s) kinsman, and Indra shields him from imprecations. 7. The wicked (?) man who thinks the priests’ food is sweet while he is eating it, swallows (the cow) bristling with a hundred sharp points, but cannot digest her. 8. The priest’s tongue is a bow-string, his voice is a barb, and his windpipe is arrow-points smeared with fire. With these god-directed, and heart-subduing bows, the priest pierces the scorers of the gods. 9. Brāhmaṇs bearing sharp arrows, armed with missiles, never miss their mark when they discharge a shaft. Shooting with fiery energy and with anger, they pierce (the enemy) from afar. 10. The descendants of Vitahavya, who ruled over a thousand men, and were ten hundred in number, were overwhelmed after they had eaten a Brāhmaṇ’s cow. 11. The cow herself, when she was slaughtered, destroyed them,—those men who cooked the last she-goat of Kesārapribandhā. 12. Those hundred persons whom the earth shook off, after they had wronged the priestly race, were overwhelmed in an inconceivable manner. 13. He lives among mortals a hater of the gods; infected with poison he becomes reduced to a skeleton; he who wrongs a Brāhmaṇ the kins-

77 I am not aware whether any traces of this story are discoverable in the Purāṇas or Mahābhārata. See the first verse of the hymn next to be quoted.
man of the deities, fails to attain to the heaven of the Forefathers. 14. Agni is called our leader; Soma ourkinsman. Indra neutralizes imprecations (directed against us); this the wise understand. 15. Like a poisoned arrow, o king, like a serpent, o lord of cows,—such is the dreadful shaft of the Brāhmaṇ, with which he pierces his enemies."


"1. The Śrīnjayas, descendants of Voitahavya, waxed exceedingly; they almost touched the sky; but after they had injured Bhrigu, they were overwhelmed. 2. When men pierced Briḥatsāman, a Brāhmaṇ descended from Angiras, a ram with two rows of teeth swallowed their children. 3. Those who spit, or throw filth (?) upon a Brāhmaṇ, sit eating hair in the midst of a stream of blood. 4. So long as this Brāhmaṇ’s cow is cut up (?) and cooked, she destroys the glory of the kingdom; no vigorous hero is born there. 5. It is cruel to
slaughter her; her ill-flavoured flesh is thrown away. When her milk is drunk, that is esteemed a sin among the Forefathers. 6. Whenever a king, fanning himself mighty, seeks to devour a Brähman, that kingdom is broken up, in which a Brähman is oppressed. Becoming eight-footed, four-eyed, four-eared, four-jawed, two-faced, two-tongued, she (the cow) shatters the kingdom of the oppressor of Brähmans. 8. (Ruin) overflows that kingdom, as water swamps a leaky boat: calamity smites that country in which a priest is wronged. 9. Even trees, o Nárada, repel, and refuse their shade to, the man who claims a right to the property of a Brähman. This (property), as king Varuṇa hath said, has been turned into a poison by the gods. No one who has eaten a Brähman’s cow continues to watch (i.e. to rule) over a country. 11. Those nine nineties (of persons) whom the earth shook off, when they had wronged the priestly race, were overwhelmed in an inconceivable manner (see verse 12 of the preceding hymn). 12. The gods have declared that the cloth wherewith a dead man’s feet are bound shall be thy pall, thou oppressor of priests. 13. The tears which flow from a persecuted man as he laments,—such is the portion of water which the gods have assigned to thee, thou oppressor of priests. 14. The gods have allotted to thee that portion of water wherewith men wash the dead, and moisten beards. 15. The rain of Mitra and Varuṇa does not descend on the oppressor of priests. For him the battle has never a successful issue; nor does he bring his friend into subjection.”

The attention of the reader is directed to the intensity of contempt and abhorrence which is sought to be conveyed by the coarse imagery contained in verses 3, and 12–14, of this last hymn.

There is another section of the same Veda, xii. 5, in which curses similar to those in the last two hymns are fulminated against the oppressors of Brähmans. The following are specimens:


"4. Prayer (brāhmaṇ) is the chief (thing); the Brāhman is the lord (adhipati). 5. From the Kṣatatriya who seizes the priest’s cow, and oppresses the Brāhman, (6) there depart piety, valour, good fortune, (7) force, keenness, vigour, strength, speech, energy, prosperity, virtue, (8) prayer (brāhmaṇ), royalty, kingdom, subjects, splendour, renown, lustre, wealth, (9) life, beauty, name, fame, inspiration and expiration, sight, hearing, (10) milk, sap, food, eating, righteousness, truth, oblation, sacrifice, offspring, and cattle;—(11) all these things depart from the Kṣatatriya who seizes the priest’s cow. 12. Terrible is the Brāhman’s cow, filled with deadly poison. . . . 13. In her reside all dreadful things, and all forms of death, (14) all cruel things, and all forms of homicide. 15. When seized, she binds in the fetters of death the oppressor of priests and despiser of the gods."

A great deal more follows to the same effect, which it would be tiresome to quote.

I subjoin some further texts, in which reference is made to brāhmaṇas.

In xix. 22, 21 (= xix. 23, 30) it is said:

Brahma-jyesṭhaṁ samhṛtāṁ viṛtyāṁ brāhmaṇe jyestaṁ divam atatāṁ | bhūtanām brāhma prathamo ha jajne tenārhati brāhmaṇaṁ sparāddhitum kaḥ |

"Powers are collected, of which prayer (or sacred science, brāhmaṇ) is the chief. Prayer, the chief, in the beginning stretched out the sky. The priest (brāhmaṇ) was born the first of beings. Who, then, ought to vie with the brāhmaṇ.

A superhuman power appears to be ascribed to the brāhmaṇ in the following passages,—unless by brāhmaṇ we are to understand Bṛhaspati:

xix. 9, 12. Brahma Prajāpatir Dhātā lokāḥ vedāḥ septa-ṛṣabhayo 'gnayaḥ | tair me kritaṁ svastrayaṁ Indro me śarma yachhatu brahmaṇa me śarma yachhatu |
"May a prosperous journey be granted to me by prayer, Prajāpati, Dhātṛi, the worlds, the Vedas, the seven rishis, the fires; may Indra grant me felicity, may the brāhmaṇ grant me felicity."

xix. 43, 8. Yatra brāhma-vido yānti dikshayā tapasā saha | brahma mā tatra nayatu brahma brahma dadhātu me | brahmaṇe svāhā.

"May the brāhmaṇ conduct me to the place whither the knowers of prayer (or of sacred science) go by initiation with austerity. May the brāhmaṇ impart to me sacred science. Svāhā to the brāhmaṇ."

The wonderful powers of the Brahmacārin, or student of sacred science, are described in a hymn (A.V. xi. 5), parts of which are translated in my paper on the progress of the Vedic Religion, pp. 374 ff.

And yet with all this sacredness of his character the priest must be devoted to destruction, if, in the interest of an enemy, he is seeking by his ceremonies to effect the ruin of the worshipper.

v. 8, 5. Yam ami puro dadhire brāhmaṇam apabhūtaye | Indra sa me adhaspadaṁ tam pratasyāmi mrityave |

"May the brāhmaṇ whom these men have placed in their front (as a purohita) for our injury, fall under my feet, o Indra; I hurl him away, to death (compare A.V. vii. 70, 1 ff.).

Sect. IV.—Opinions of Professor R. Roth and Dr. M. Haug regarding the origin of caste among the Hindus.

I shall in this section give some account of the speculations of Prof. R. Roth and Dr. M. Haug on the process by which they conceive the system of castes to have grown up among the Indians.

The remarks which I shall quote from Prof. Roth are partly drawn from his third "Dissertation on the Literature and History of the Veda," p. 117, and partly from his paper on "Brahma and the Brāhmaṇs," in the first volume of the Journal of the German Oriental Society.78 He says in the latter essay: "The religious development of India is attached through the course of three thousand years to the word brāhmaṇ. This conception might be taken as the standard for estimating the progress of thought directed to divine things, as at every step taken by the latter, it has gained a new form, while at the same time

78 The reader who is unacquainted with German will find a fuller account of this article in the Benares Magazine for October 1851, pp. 823 ff.
it has always embraced in itself the highest spiritual acquisition of the
nation. . . . The original signification of the word brāhma, as we
easily discover it in the Vedic hymns, is that of prayer; not praise
or thanksgiving, but that invocation which, with the force of the will,
directed to God, seeks to draw him to itself, and to receive satisfaction
from him. . . . From this oldest sense and form of brāhma (neuter)
was formed the masculine noun brahma, which was the designation of
those who pronounced the prayers, or performed the sacred cere-
monies; and in nearly all the passages of the Rig-veda in which it
was thought that this word must refer to the Brahanical caste, this
more extended sense must be substituted for the other more limited
one. . . . From this sense of the word brahma, nothing was more
natural than to convert this offerer of prayer into a particular description
of sacrificial priest: so soon as the ritual began to be fixed, the func-
tions which were before united in a single person, who both prayed to
the gods and sacrificed to them, became separated, and a priesthood
interposed itself between man and God."

Then further on, after quoting R.V. iv. 50, 4 ff. (see above, p. 247),
Prof. Roth continues: "In this manner here and in many places of the
liturgical and legal books, the promise of every blessing is attached to
the maintenance of a priest by the king. Inasmuch as he supports and
honours the priest, the latter ensures to him the favour of the gods.
So it was that the caste of the Brahmans arose and attained to power
and consideration: first, they were only the single domestic priests of
the kings; then the dignity became hereditary in certain families;
finally a union, occasioned by similarity of interests, of these families
in one larger community was effected; and all this in reciprocal action
with the progress made in other respects by theological doctrine and
religious worship. Still the extension of the power which fell into the
hands of this priestly caste would not be perfectly comprehensible

79 In his third Dissertation on the Literature and History of the Veda, Prof. Roth
remarks: "In the Vedic age, access to the gods by prayer and sacrifice was open to
all classes of the community; and it was only the power of expressing devotion in
a manner presumed to be acceptable to the deities, or a readiness in poetical diction,
that distinguished any individual or family from the mass, and led to their being
employed to conduct the worship of others. The name given to such persons was
purohita, one 'put forward;' one through whose mediation the gods would receive
the offering presented. But these priests had as yet no especial sanctity or exclusive
prerogative which would render their employment imperative."
from this explanation alone. The relation of spiritual superiority in which the priests came to stand to the kings was aided by other historical movements."

Professor Roth then proceeds: "When—at a period more recent than the majority of the hymns of the Rig-veda—the Vedic people, driven by some political shock, advanced from their abodes in the Punjab further and further to the south, drove the aborigines into the hills, and took possession of the broad tract of country lying between the Ganges, the Jumna, and the Vindhya range; the time had arrived when the distribution of power, the relation of king and priest, could become transformed in the most rapid and comprehensive manner. Principalities separated in such various ways, such a division into tribes as had existed in the Punjab, were no longer possible here, where nature had created a wide and continuous tract with scarcely any natural boundaries to dissemble one part from another. Most of those petty princes who had descended from the north with their tribes must here of necessity disappear, their tribes become dissolved, and contests arise for the supreme dominion. This era is perhaps portrayed to us in the principal subject of the Mahābhārata, the contest between the descendants of Pāṇḍu and Kuru. In this stage of disturbance and complication, power naturally fell into the hands of those who did not directly possess any authority, the priestly races and their leaders, who had hitherto stood rather in the position of followers of the kings, but now rose to a higher rank. It may easily be supposed that they and their families, already honoured as the confidential followers of the princes, would frequently be able to strike a decisive stroke to which the king would owe his success. If we take further into account the intellectual and moral influence which this class possessed in virtue of the prerogative conceded to, or usurped by, them, and the religious feeling of the people, it is not difficult to comprehend how in such a period of transition powerful communities should arise among the domestic priests of petty kings and their families, should attain to the highest importance in every department of life, and should grow into a caste which, like the ecclesiastical order in the middle ages of Christianity, began to look upon secular authority as an effluence from the fulness of their power, to be conferred at their will; and how, on the other hand, the numerous royal families should
sink down into a nobility which possessed, indeed, the sole right to the
kingly dignity, but at the same time, when elected by the people,
required inauguration in order to their recognition by the priesthood,
and were enjoined above all things to employ only Brāhmans as their
 counsellors.”

In order to render the probability of this theory still more apparent,
Professor Roth goes on to indicate the relations of the other castes to
the Brāhmans. The position which the three superior classes occupied
in the developed Brahmanical system was one of gradation, as they
differed only in the extent of their religious and civil prerogatives, the
Kshattrya being in some respects less favoured than the Brāhman, and
the Vaiśya than the Kshattrya. With the Śūdras, on the other hand,
the case was quite different. They were not admitted to sacrifice, to
the study of the Vedas, or to investiture with the sacred cord. From
this Professor Roth concludes that the three highest castes stood in a
closer connection with each other, whether of descent, or of culture,
than any of them did to the fourth. The Indian body politic, more-
over, was complete without the Śūdras. The Brāhman and Kshattrya
were the rulers, while the Vaiśyas formed the mass of the people.
The fact of the latter not being originally a separate community is
confirmed by the employment assigned to them, as well as by their
name Vaiśya, derived from the word Vīś, a word which in the Veda
designates the general community, especially considered as the pos-
sessor of the pure Aryan worship and culture, in contradistinction to
all barbarian races. Out of this community the priesthood arose in
the manner above described, while the Kshattryas were the nobility,
descended in the main from the kings of the earlier ages. The fourth
caste, the Śūdras, consisted, according to Prof. Roth, of a race subdued
by the Brahmanical conquerors, whether that race may have been a
branch of the Arian stock which immigrated at an earlier period into
India, or an autochthonous Indian tribe.

In his tract on the origin of Brāhmanism, from which I have already
quoted (see above, pp. 11 and 14), Dr. Haug thus states his views on
this question: “It has been of late asserted that the original parts of
the Vedas do not know the system of caste. But this conclusion was
prematurely arrived at without sufficiently weighing the evidence. It
is true the caste system is not to be found in such a developed state;
the duties enjoined to the several castes are not so clearly defined as in the Law Books and Purāṇas. But nevertheless the system is already known in the earlier parts of the Vedas, or rather presupposed. The barriers only were not so insurmountable as in later times." (p. 6).

This view he supports by a reference to the Zend Avesta, in which he finds evidence of a division of the followers of Ahura Mazda into the three classes of Atharvas, Rathaesthas, and Vaśtrya shhuyans, which he regards as corresponding exactly to the Brāhmans, Kshattriyas, and Vaiśyas of India. The Atharvas, or priests, in particular formed a class or even a caste; they had secrets which they were prohibited from divulging; they were the spiritual guides of their nation, and none but the son of a priest could become a priest—a rule which the Parsīs still maintain. From these facts, Dr. Haug deduces the conclusion that the nation of which both the Indo-Arians and the Perso-Arians originally formed a part had been divided into three classes even before the separation of the Indians from the Iranians; and he adds (p. 7): "From all we know, the real origin of caste appears to go back to a time anterior to the composition of the Vedic hymns, though its development into a regular system with insurmountable barriers can be referred only to the latest period of the Vedic times."

I shall furnish a short analysis of some other parts of Dr. Haug’s interesting tract. He derives (p. 7) the word brāhmāya from brāhmān (neuter), which originally meant "a sacred song, prayer," as an effusion of devotional feeling. Brāhmā was the "sacred element" in the sacrifice, and signified "the soul of nature, the productive power." The Brahmanic sacrifices had production as their object, and embraced some rites which were intended to furnish the sacrificer with a new spiritual body wherewith he might ascend to heaven, and others calculated to provide him with cattle and offspring (p. 8). The symbol of this brāhmā, or productive power, which must always be present at the sacrifice, was a bunch of kuśa grass, generally called Veda (a word alternating with brāhmā), which, at the sacrifice, was passed from one priest to another, and given to the sacrificer and his wife. The corresponding symbol of twigs used by the Parsīs was called in Zend bāresma, which Dr. Haug considers to have been originally the same as brāhmā (p. 9). As it was essential to the success of these sacrifices
that every portion of the complicated ceremional should be accurately performed, and as mistakes could not be avoided, it became necessary to obviate by an atonement (prāyāșchittī) the mischief which would otherwise have ensued; and the priest appointed to guard against or expiate such mistakes, when committed by the other priests—the hotri, adhvaryu, and udgātri—was called, "from the most ancient times," the brāhmān (masculine), 'who was a functionary pre-eminently supplied with brāhmā (neuter) or sacred knowledge, and thereby connected "with the soul of nature, the cause of all growth, the last cause of all sacrificial rites" (p. 10). The office of brāhmān was not one to which mere birth gave a claim, but had to be attained by ability and study. The descendants of these brāhmān priests were the Brāhmans, and the speculations of the most eminent brāhmān priests on divine things, and especially on sacrificial rites, are contained in the works called Brāhmaṇas (p. 12). Dr. Haug considers that no such a class as that of the brāhmān priests existed at the early period when the ancestors of the Hindus separated from those of the Parsīs in consequence of religious differences. The few rites preserved by the Parsīs as relics of the remotest antiquity closely resemble those of the Brāhmans. Dr. Haug finds that in the Homa ritual of the former (corresponding to the Soma ceremony of the latter) only two priests, called Zota and Raspi or Rathwi, are required, whom he recognises as corresponding to the Hotri and Adhvaryu of the latter. So long as the rites were simple, no brāhmān priest was wanted; but when they became complicated and multiform, the necessity for such a functionary arose. And it was only then that the sons of the brāhmāns, i.e. the Brāhmans, could rise through the possession of sacred knowledge, derived from their fathers, to great power, and form themselves into a regular caste. The development of these ceremonies out of their primitive simplicity into the complexity and multiformity which they ultimately assumed must, Dr. Haug thinks, have been the work of many centuries. This transformation must have taken place in the region bordering on the Sarasvati, where the expansion of the Brahmanical system, and the elevation of the Brāhmans to full spiritual supremacy, is to be sought, before the Inde-Arians advanced south-eastwards into Hindostan proper (p. 14). The ascendancy of the Brāhmans was not however attained without opposition on the part of the kings (p. 18). Dr. Haug concludes by relating the reception
of Viśvāmitra into the order of Brāhmans, and by giving some account of the rishis and the several classes into which they were divided.

As the question is generally stated by Dr. Haug in pages 6 and 12 ff., the difference between him and other European scholars is one of age and not of principle, for neither party admits any distinction of race or congenital diversity between the three superior castes or classes.
CHAPTER IV.

EARLY CONTESTS BETWEEN THE BRAHMANS AND KSHATRIYAS.

I proceed to give some legendary illustrations of the struggle which no doubt occurred in the early ages of Hindu history between the Brāhmaṇs and the Kṣattriyas, after the former had begun to constitute a fraternity exercising the sacerdotal profession, but before the respective provinces of the two classes had been accurately defined by custom, and when the members of each were ready to encroach on the prerogatives claimed as their own exclusive birthright by the other.

Sect. I.—Manu’s Summary of refractory and submissive monarchs.

I shall begin with the following passage, which we find in the Institutes of Manu, vii. 38 ff., regarding the impious resistance, as the lawgiver considered it, of certain monarchs to the legitimate claims of the priests, and the dutiful behaviour of others.

38. Vṛiddhāṁś cha nityaṁ seveta viprāṁ veda-vidāḥ śuchīṁ | vṛiddhāśeśāṁ hi satataṁ rakshobhir api pūjayate | 39. Tebhyaḥ 'dhigachhad vina-yāṁ vinītātmā 'pi nityaśah | vinītātmā hi nripatir na vinaśyati karchicḥit | 40. Bahave 'vinayād nashtāḥ rājānaḥ sa-parichhadaḥ | vanasthāḥ api rājyāni vinayāt pratipedire | 41. Veno vinashṭo 'vinayād Naḥushaṁ chaiva pārthiveḥ | Sudāḥ Paijaveṇaś śa chaiva Sumukho Nimir eva cha | 42. Prithus tu vinayād rājyam prāptavān Manur eva cha | Kuveṇaś cha dhanaśvaryaṁ brahmanyāṁ chaiva Gāḍhījaḥ |

“Let the king constantly reverence ancient Brāhmaṇs skilled in the Vedas, and pure in conduct; for he who always respects the aged is honoured even by the Rākṣāsas. 39. Let him, even though humble-

80 In support of this reading, see M. Loiseleur Deslongchamps’s and Sir G. C. Haughton’s notes on the passage.
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minded, be continually learning submissiveness from them: for a submissive monarch never perishes. 40. Through want of this character many kings have been destroyed with all their possessions; whilst by humility even hermits have obtained kingdoms. 41. Veṇa perished through want of submissiveness, and king Nahusha, and Śūḍas the son of Pījavana, and Sumukha, and Nimi. 42. But through submissiveness Prithu and Manu attained kingly power, Kuvera the lordship of wealth, and the son of Gādhi (Viśvāmitra) Brāhmanhood. 81

Veṇa is again referred to in Manu ix. 66 f.: Ayaṁ dvijaṁ hi vid-
vadbhīḥ paśudharmo nigarhitaḥ | manushyāṇām api proktō Vene rājyaṁ
praśāsati | 67. Sa mahīṁ akhilām bhunjan rājarshi-pravaraḥ purā
| varyoṇāṁ sankaraṁ chakre kāmopahata-chetanaṁ |

"This custom (of raising up seed to a deceased brother or kinsman by his widow) fit only for cattle, was declared to be (law) for men also, when Veṇa held sway. This eminent royal rishi, who in former times ruled over the whole earth, having his reason destroyed by lust, occasioned a confusion of castes."

The legendary history of nearly all the kings thus stigmatized or celebrated can be traced in the Purāṇas and other parts of Indian literature. I shall supply such particulars of the refractory monarchs as I can find.

It will be observed that Manu is spoken of as an ordinary prince; and that even Kuvera, the god of wealth, is said to have attained his dignity by the same species of merit as the other persons whom the writer eulogizes. I am not aware whether any legends exist to the same effect. Something of a contrary tendency is found with regard to the deity in question in the passage of the Mahābhārata, of which an extract is given above, in p. 140, note 249.

81 Kullūka remarks on this passage: Gādhi-putra Viśvāmitra's cha kṣattryiyah sāṁ
tenaiva dehena brāhmaṇyam prōptavān | rājya-tābhāsasare brāhmaṇya-prōptir aprastutā
'pi vinayotkarśhārtham uktā | īdṛiśo 'yāṁ sāstrāṇusūṭhāna-nīkṣiddha-varjana-rūpa-
vinayodayeṇa kṣattryio 'pi duralbham brāhmaṇyam lēbha | "Viśvāmitra, the son of Gādhi, being a Kṣattryiya, obtained Brāhmaṇhood in the same body (i.e. without being again born in another body). The attainment of Brāhmaṇhood by one who at the time held kingly authority, although an unusual occurrence, is mentioned to show the excellence of submissiveness. Through that quality, as exhibited in the observance of scriptural injunctions, and in abstinence from things forbidden, he, being a Kṣattryiya, obtained Brāhmaṇhood, so difficult to acquire."
I have not met with any story of Sumukha’s contest with the Brāhmaṇas. Some MSS. read Suratha instead of Sumukha.

The name of Sudās, the son of Pijavana, occurs in several parts of the Rig-veda. I shall return to him in relating the contest between Vasishṭha and Viśvāmitra. I begin with the story of Veṇa.

SECT. II.—Legend of Veṇa.

According to the Vishṇu Purāṇa, i. 13, Veṇa was the son of Anga, and the descendant in the ninth generation of the first Manu, Svāyambhūva; the line of ancestors from the latter downwards being as follows: Uttānapāda, Dhruva, Slishti, Ripu, Chākshusha, the sixth Manu called Chākshusha, Uru, Anga (see Wilson’s Vishṇu P. vol. i.). Veṇa thus belongs to a mythical age preceding by an enormous interval that of the descendants of Manu Vaivasvata mentioned in the preceding chapter of this volume; five Manvantaras, or periods of 308,571 years each, having intervened in the present Kalpa between the close of the Svāyambhūva, and the beginning of the existing, or Vaivasvata, Manvantara.

Hutabhog Varuno Dhātā Pūṣāh Bhūmir Niśākaraḥ | et e chāṇya cha ye
dvāḥ sāpānugraha-kāriṇāḥ | nṛpasya te śarira-sthāḥ sarva-devamayo
nṛpāḥ | etaj jñātā mayā "jnāptaṁ yad yathā kriyatāṁ tathā | na
dātavyaṁ na hotavyaṁ na yasāṁ navayaṁ ca vo deviāḥ | 14. Bhartṛtuḥ śuṣ-
rāshayam dharmo yathā śrīṇāṁ paro mātāḥ | mamājñā-pātānaṁ dharmo
bharatāṁ ca tathā deviāḥ" | rishayāḥ ūcuh | “dehy anujṇāṁ mahā-
rāja mā dharmo yātu sankṣhayan | havishām parināmo yaṁ yad etad
akṣiḥāṁ jagat | 15. Dharmo cha sankṣhayaṁ yāte kṣīyate chākhilāṁ
jagat" | Parāśaraḥ uvācha | iti vijnāpyamāno ‘pi sa Veṇāḥ paramar-
shībhīḥ | yadā dadāti nānuyāṁ proktāḥ proktāḥ punah punah | tataḥ te
munayāḥ sarve kopāmarṣa-samaneśāṁ | “hanyatāṁ hanyatām pāpaṁ”
ity ūcchus te parasparam | 16. “Yo yajna-purushaṁ devam anādi-ni-
dhanam prabhum | vinindaty adhamācāro na sa yogyo bhuvah pātiḥ” | ity
uktvā mantra-pūtais te kuśair muni-ganiṇāḥ nṛpām | nirjaghnur nihatham
puro vahavan-vindamidinā | tataḥ cha munayo reṇuṁ dadriśuḥ sar-
vato deviā | “kim etad” iti chāsannam paprachhus te janaiṁ tado |
17. Ākhyātāṁ cha janeis teshāṁ “chauriṁhūtaṁ arājake | rāṣṭre tu
lokaiṁ ārādhmaṁ para-svādāṇāṁ āturoāḥ | 18. Teshāṁ udīṁga-vegānāṁ
chaurāṉāṁ muni-sattamanāḥ | sumahāṇ dṛisyate reṇuḥ para-vittāpahā-
vināṁ” | tataḥ sammantrya te sarve munayās tasya bhūbhṛitaḥ | mamān-
thur ārum putrārtham anapatyasya yatnataḥ | mathyataḥ cha samuttas-
thau tasyorō purushaṁ kila | dāgḍha-sthīṇāṃ pratikṣāsaḥ harkvāṣaṃ
tiḥrasvakaḥ | 19. Kiṁ karomīti tāṁ sarvān viprān āha sa chāturāḥ | nishhāti
tam ōcchus te nīshādāṁ tena so ’bhucat | 20. Tataė tat-sambhavāṁ
jātāḥ Vindhya-saila-vīcāsinaḥ | nishhādāḥ muni-sārdūla pāpa-karmo-
palakshanāḥ | 21. Tena dēremaṁ nishkrāntam tat pāpaṁ tasya bhūpateḥ | nishhādās
ta tathā jātāḥ Veṇa-kalmasha-sambhavāḥ | 22. Tato ’syā daks-
iniṇāḥ hastam mamānthus te tāda deviāḥ | mathyamāne cha tatrābhūṭ
Prithuṛ Vainyāḥ pratāparan | dīpyamānāḥ svā-vapuṣpa śaṅkṣad Aṅgir
ivcijvalaḥ | 23. Ādyaṁ ājagavaṁ nāma khāt papāta tato dhanuḥ | śaṅkṣā
ta deviāḥ nabhasaṅ kavacaṁ cha papāta ha | tasmin jāte tu bhātāṁ
samprahṛśṭāṁ sarvāśaḥ | satputreṇa cha jātēna Veṇo ’pi tridivaṁ
yayau | pun-nāmno narakāt trāteḥ sa tēna sumahātanā |

“7. The maiden named Sunīthā, who was the first-born of Mṛtyu
(Death) was given as wife to Anga; and of her Veṇa was born.
8. This son of Mṛtyu’s daughter, infected with the taint of his ma-

See above, p. 124, and note 230.
ternal grandfather, was born corrupt, as if by nature. 9. When Veṇa was inaugurated as king by the eminent rishis, he caused this proclamation to be made on the earth: ‘Men must not sacrifice, or give gifts, or present oblations. Who else but myself is the enjoyer of sacrifices? I am for ever the lord of offerings.’ 10. Then all the rishis approaching the king with respectful salutations, said to him in a gentle and conciliatory tone: 11. ‘Hear, o king, what we have to say: 12. We shall worship Hari, the monarch of the gods, and the lord of all sacrifices, with a Dirghasattra (prolonged sacrifice), from which the highest benefits will accrue to your kingdom, your person, and your subjects. May blessings rest upon you! You shall have a share in the ceremony. 13. Vishṇu the lord, the sacrificial Male, being propitiated by us with this rite, will grant all the objects of your desire. Hari, the lord of sacrifices, bestows on those kings in whose country he is honoured with obligations, everything that they wish.’ Veṇa replied: ‘What other being is superior to me? who else but I should be adored? who is this person called Hari, whom you regard as the lord of sacrifice? Brahmā, Janārdana, Rudra, Indra, Vāyu, Yama, Ravi (the Sun), Agni, Varuṇa, Dhātṛi, Pūshan, Earth, the Moon,—these and the other gods who curse and bless are all present in a king’s person: for he is composed of all the gods.83

83 The orthodox doctrine, as stated by Manu, vii. 3 ff., coincides very nearly with Veṇa’s estimate of himself, although the legislator does not deduce from it the same conclusions: 3. Rakṣāhṛtam asya sarvasya rūjānam asṣajyat phṛbblek | 4. Indrāśam- yamūrkiṇīṇī Agneśa cha Varuṇasya cha | Chandra-Viṭṭaīasya chaive mātrāḥ nirhrītya śvāvāvī | 5. Yasmād eṣāṃ suṇendrāṇāṃ mātrāḥbhyyo nirmito nripañḥ | tasmād abhi- bhāvayet eṣa savay-bhūtāni tejasī | 6. Tapatyā udītya-vach chaisha chakṣuṁśi cha manāmī cha’ | na chainam bhivā śakuti kaschid apy abhiśekhitum | 7. So ‘gnir bhavati Vāyue cha so ‘rkaḥ Somaḥ sa Dharmarājat | sa Kuveraḥ sa Varuṇaḥ sa Mahendrah prabhāvataḥ | 8. Balo ‘pi nīvantateyo “manuṣyah” iti bhūmipah | mahatī devatā hy eṣā nara-rūpena tiṣṭhati | 4. The lord created the king for the preservation of this entire world, (4) extracting the eternal essential particles of Indra, Vāyu, Yama, Śūrya, Agni, Varuṇa, Chandra, and Kuvera. 5. Inasmuch as the king is formed of the particles of all these gods, he surpasses all beings in brilliance. 6. Like the Sun, he distresses both men’s eyes and minds; and no one on earth can ever gaze upon him. 7. He is Agni, Vāyu, Śūrya, Soma, Yama, Kuvera, Varuṇa, and Indra, in majesty. 8. Even when a child a king is not to be despised under the idea that he is a mere man; for he is a great deity in human form.’

In another passage, ix. 303, this is qualified by saying that the king should imitate the functions of the different gods: Indrasēṣyakṣya Vāyuḥca Yamaḥca Varuṇasya cha | Chandraṣyogneḥ Prithiyeṣu cha tejo vrittaṁ nripaḥ chareṇ | This expanded in the next verses.
act in conformity with my commands. Brāhmans, ye must neither
give gifts, nor present oblations nor sacrifices. 14. As obedience to
their husbands is esteemed the highest duty of women, so is the obser-
vance of my orders incumbent upon you.' The rishis answered: 'Give
permission, great king: let not religion perish: this whole world is
but a modified form of oblations. 15. When religion perishes the whole
world is destroyed with it.' When Venā, although thus admonished
and repeatedly addressed by the eminent rishis, did not give his per-
mission, then all the munis, filled with wrath and indignation, cried
out to one another, 'Slay, slay the sinner. 16. This man of degraded
life, who blasphemes the sacrificial Male, the god, the lord without
beginning or end, is not fit to be lord of the earth.' So saying the
munis smote with blades of kuṣa grass consecrated by texts this king
who had been already smitten by his blasphemy of the divine Being and
his other offences. The munis afterwards beheld dust all round, and
asked the people who were standing near what that was. 17. They
were informed: 'In this country which has no king, the people, being
distressed, have become robbers, and have begun to seize the property
of others. 18. It is from these robbers rushing impetuously, and
plundering other men's goods, that this great dust is seen? Then all
the munis, consulting together, rubbed with force the thigh of the
king, who was childless, in order to produce a son. From his thigh
when rubbed there was produced a man like a charred log, with flat
face, and extremely short. 19. 'What shall I do?' cried the man, in
distress, to the Brāhmans. They said to him, 'Sit down' (nīshāda);
and from this he became a Nīshāda. 20. From him sprang the
Nīshādas dwelling in the Vindhya mountains, distinguished by their
wicked deeds. 21. By this means the sin of the king departed out of
him; and so were the Nīshādas produced, the offspring of the wicked-
ness of Venā. 22. The Brāhmans then rubbed his right hand; and
from it, when rubbed, sprang the majestic Prithu, Venā's son, re-
splendent in body, glowing like the manifested Agni. 23. Then the
primeval bow called Ājagava fell from the sky, with celestial arrows,
and a coat of mail. At Prithu's birth all creatures rejoiced. And
through the birth of this virtuous son, Venā, delivered from the hell
called Put54 by this eminent person, ascended to heaven.'

54 This alludes to the fanciful derivation of puttra, "son," from put + tra.
The Harivaṃśa (sect. 5) relates the same story thus, with little variation from the Viṣṇu Purāṇa:

Vaisampāyanaḥ uvāca | Āstād dharmasya gopta vai pūrvaṃ Atri-samaḥ prabhuh | Atri-vaṃśa-samutpannas te Ango nāma prajāpatih | tasya putro 'bhavad Veno nātyarthaṁ dharma-kovidaḥ | jāto Mrityu-sūlāyāṁ vai Sunithāyāṁ prajāpatih | sa mātāmaha-dosheṇa tena kālātmajātmajah | ava-dharmān prishṭhataḥ kṛtvā kāmā lobhēśu avarttata | māryādaṁ sthāpayāmā sa dharmāpetaṁ sa pārthivah | veda-dharmān atikramya so 'dharma-nirato bhavat | niḥ-svādhyāya-vrāśaktārūras tasmin rājani śāsat | prāvarthan na papaḥ somaṁ hutaṁ yajneshu devataḥ | “na yasātavāṁ na hotavyāṁ” iti tasya prajāpatah | āśīt pratijñā kuruvēryāṁ vināśe samupasthitah | aham ijayā cha yashṭā cha yajñaḥ cheti kurudvahā | “mayi yajñāḥ vidhātavyāḥ mayi hotayām” ity api | tam atikratā- mardādaṁ ādadānam asāmputram | uchur maharshayāṁ sarve Marichi-pramukhāḥ tadā | “vayaṁ dikṣhāṁ pravekṣyāmāḥ saṁwatsara-gaṅgan badun | adharmāṁ kuru ma Vena naṁ yah dharmaṁ sanātānaḥ | aneaye 'treh ārasāts team prajāpatir asāsāyāṁ | ‘prajāṣ cha pālayishya 'ham’ iti te samayāḥ kriṭah” | tāṁs tathā bruvitaṁ sarvān mahuṁ abhavē tadā | Venaḥ praḥasya durbuddhir inam arthan anartha-ūt | Venaḥ uvāca | “svashtā dharmasya kās chānyaḥ śrotavyāṁ kasya vā mayā | śruta-virya-topaḥ-satyair mayā cā kaḥ saṁ bhūva | prabhavaṁ sarva-bhūtānam dharmaṁ śāsaḥ cha viśeṣhataḥ | samabhāgaḥ na vidur nāmen bhavanto mām achenāyaḥ | ichhan daheyam prithivēm pāvayeyāṁ jalaṁ tathā | dyām bhuvāṁ chaive rundheyyāṁ nātra kāryāṁ eśārānā” | yadā na sākyate mohād avalepāḥ cha pārthivāḥ | anumetum tadā Venas tataḥ krūddhāḥ maharshayāḥ | nigriṛha tam mahātmano visphurantam mahā- balam | tato 'ṣya savyāṁ ārum te mamāntur jāta-manyayāḥ | tasmāṁs tu mathyamāne vai rājnaḥ āruṇa vijayāṇaḥ | āravva 'timātraḥ purushah | krishṇaḥ chāpi babhūva ha | sa bhātaḥ prāṇajīrī hūteca sthitēva Janmejaya | tam Atrir vihavāṁ ṛṣīṣṭva nishidety abhavē tadā | nishāda- caṅkā-saritāḥ 'sa babhūva vadatāṁ vara | dhivarān asrijach chāpi Vena- kalmaḥa-sambhavān | ye chānae Vindhya-nilayās Tukharās Tumburās tathā | adharma-ruchayas tāta viḍḍhi tān Vena-sambhavān | tataḥ punar mahātmānaḥ pāṇīṁ Venasya dakṣiṇam | arāṇīm īva saṁrabhāḥ mamar- thur jāta-manyācāḥ | Prithus tasmāt samutasthau karāj jvalana-sannih- bhaḥ | diśyamanāḥ śva-vapushā sākṣhād Aṅgrim īva jicalan | “There was formerly a Prajāpati (lord of creatures), a protector of
righteousness, called Anga, of the race of Atri, and resembling him in power. His son was the Prajapati Vena, who was but indifferently skilled in duty, and was born of Sunitha, the daughter of Mrityu. This son of the daughter of Kala (Death), owing to the taint derived from his maternal grandfather, threw his duties behind his back, and lived in covetousness under the influence of desire. This king established an irreligious system of conduct: transgressing the ordinances of the Veda, he was devoted to lawlessness. In his reign men lived without study of the sacred books and without the vashatka, and the gods had no Soma-libations to drink at sacrifices. 'No sacrifice or oblation shall be offered,'—such was the ruthless determination of that Prajapati, as the time of his destruction approached. 'I,' he declared, 'am the object, and the performer of sacrifice, and the sacrifice itself: it is to me that sacrifice should be presented, and oblations offered.' This transgressor of the rules of duty, who arrogated to himself what was not his due, was then addressed by all the great rishis, headed by Marichi: 'We are about to consecrate ourselves for a ceremony which shall last for many years: practise not unrighteousness, o Vena: this is not the eternal rule of duty. Thou art in very deed a Prajapati of Atri's race, and thou hast engaged to protect thy subjects.' The foolish Vena, ignorant of what was right, laughingly answered these great rishis who had so addressed him: 'Who but myself is the ordainer of duty? or whom ought I to obey? Who on earth equals me in sacred knowledge, in prowess, in austere fervour, in truth? Ye who are deluded and senseless know not that I am the source of all beings and duties. Hesitate not to believe that I, if I willed, could burn up the earth, or deluge it with water, or close up heaven and earth.' When owing to his delusion and arrogance Vena could not be governed, then the mighty rishis becoming incensed, seized the vigorous and struggling king, and rubbed his left thigh. From this thigh, so rubbed, was produced a black man, very short in stature, who, being alarmed, stood with joined hands. Seeing that he was agitated, Atri said to him 'Sit down' (nishida). He became the founder of the race of the Nishadas, and also progenitor of the Dhivaras (fishermen), who sprang from the corruption of Vena. So too were produced from him the other inhabitants of the Vindhyasa range, the Tukharas, and Tumburas, who are prone to lawlessness. Then the mighty sages, excited and incensed, again rubbed
the right hand of Vena, as men do the arani wood, and from it arose Prithu, resplendent in body, glowing like the manifested Agni.”

Although the Harivamśa declares Vena to be a descendant of Atri, yet as the Prajāpati Atri is said in a previous section to have adopted Uttānapāda, Vena’s ancestor, for his son (Hariv. sect. 2, verse 60, Uttānapādaṁ jagrāha putram Atriḥ praśāpatiḥ) there is no contradiction between the genealogy given here and in the Vishnu Purāṇa.

The story of Vena is told in the same way, but more briefly, in the Mahābhārata, Sāntip. sect. 59. After narrating the birth of Prithu, the writer proceeds, verse 2221:

Tatas tu prāṇjalir Vainyo maharṣihīṁ tāṁ uvācha ha | "susūkṣhmā me samutpāṇā buddhir dharmārtha-darśinā | anayā kim mayā kāryyaṁ tad me tatteenā śāṁsata | yad māṁ bhavanto vakahyanti kāryam artha- 

samanvītām | tad ahaṁ vai karishyāṁ nātra kāryā vichāraṇā” | tam ācuchas tattvā devās te te chaiva paramarāhayaḥ | "niyato yāttra dharmo vai team aśankaḥ samāchara | priyāpriye parityajya samaḥ sarceshu jan-

tushu | kāma-bhodhau cha lobhaṁ cha mānaṁ chotsprījya dūrataḥ | yas cha dharmat parichalelo loke kaśchana mānaṇaḥ | nigrāhyas te svā-bāhubhyāṁ śāśvad dharmam avēkṣataḥ | pratijñāṁ chādhvahosva manasā karmāṇa 
girā | "pālayishyāmy aham bhaunam brahmaṁ īty eva chāsakriṇ ṃ | . . . . . . 
adandyaṁ me deijāṁ cheti pratijñāniḥ ke vībho | lokāṁ cha sankarāt kṛtāsmanaṁ 

trātāsmiti parantapa” | Vainyas tatas tāṁ uvāca devāṁ rishi-puṇgamān | "brāhmaṁ me mahābhāgaḥ namasyaḥ purusharāhbabhāḥ” | “ecam āstva” iti Vainyas tu tair ukto brahmavādibhiḥ | purodhāṁ chābhavat 
tasya Sukro brahmanayo nidhiḥ | mantriṇo Bālakhilyaḥ cha Sūrasvatyo 

ganās tathā | maharṣih bhagavān Gargya tasya saṁvatsaro ’bhavat |

“The son of Vena (Prithu) then, with joined hands, addressed the great rishis: ‘A very slender understanding for perceiving the principles of duty has been given to me by nature: tell me truly how I must employ it. Doubt not that I shall perform whatever you shall declare to me as my duty, and its object.’ Then those gods and great rishis said to him: ‘Whatever duty is enjoined perform it without hesitation, disregarding what thou mayest like or dislike, looking on all creatures with an equal eye, putting far from thee lust, anger, cupidity, and pride. Restrain by the strength of thine arm all those men who swerve from righteousness, having a constant regard to duty. And in thought, act, and word, and thence, and continually renew, the
engagement to protect the terrestrial Brāhmān (Veda, or Brāhmans?) 
...

And promise that thou wilt exempt the Brāhmans from punishment, and preserve society from the confusion of castes.' The son of Vena then replied to the gods, headed by the rishis: 'The great Brāhmans, the chief of men, shall be reverenced by me.' 'So be it,' rejoined those decliners of the Veda. Sukra, the depository of divine knowledge, became his purohita; the Bālakhilyas and Sārasvatyas his ministers; and the venerable Garga, the great rishi, his astrologer.'

The character and conduct of Prīthu, as portrayed in the last passage presents a strong, and when regarded from a Brahmanical point of view, an edifying, contrast to the contempt of priestly authority and disregard of Vedic observances which his predecessor had shewn.

In legends like that of Vena we see, I think, a reflection of the questions which were agitating the religious world of India at the period when the Purāṇas in which they appear were compiled, viz., those which were then at issue between the adherents of the Veda, and the various classes of their opponents, Baudhāya, Jainā, Chaṭrāka, etc. These stories were no doubt written with a purpose. They were intended to deter the monarchs contemporary with the authors from tampering with those heresies which had gained, or were gaining, circulation and popularity, by the example of the punishment which, it was pretended, had overtaken the princes who had dared to deviate from orthodoxy in earlier times. Compare the account given of the rise of heretical doctrines in the Vishṇu Purāṇa (pp. 209 ff. vol. iii. of Dr. Hall's edition of Professor Wilson's translation), which the writer no doubt intended to have something more than a merely historical interest.

The legend of Vena is told at greater length, but with no material variation in substance, in the Bhaṭṭavata Purāṇa, iv. sections 13-15. See also Professor Wilson's note in his Vishṇu Purāṇa, vol. i. in loco.

In ascribing to Vena an irreligious character and a contempt for the priests, the Purāṇas contradict a verse in the Rig-veda x. 93, 14, in which (unless we suppose a different individual to be there meant) Vena is celebrated along with Duḥśima, Prithavāna, and Rāma for his conspicuous liberality to the author of the hymn (pra tad Duḥśime Prithavāne Vene pra Rāme vocham asure maghavatam | ye yuktaye pancha šatā asmayu pathā viśrāvi eśhām). The two other passages,
viii. 9, 10, and x. 148, 5, in which he is alluded to as the father of Prithu have been quoted above, p. 268.

I observe that a Vena, called Bhárgava (or a descendant of Bhárgu), is mentioned in the list of traditional authors of hymns, given at the end of Professor Aufrecht’s Rig-veda, vol. ii., as the rishi of R.V. ix. 85, and x. 123.

Sect. III.—Legend of Purúravas.

Purúravas has been already alluded to (in pp. 158, 221, 226, 268, and 279 f.) as the son of Ida (or Ídá), and the grandson of Manu Vaivás-vata; as the author of the triple division of the sacred fire; and as a royal rishi. We have also seen (p. 172) that in Rig-veda i. 31, 4, he is referred to as sukrite, a “beneficent,” or “pious,” prince. Rig-veda x. 95 is considered to contain a dialogue between him and the Apsaras Urvāśī (see above, p. 226). In verse 7 of that hymn the gods are alluded to as having strengthened Purúravas for a great conflict for the slaughter of the Dasyus (mahe yat teṛ Purúravo raṇaya avardhayan dasyu-hatyāya devaḥ); and in the 18th verse he is thus addressed by his patronymic: Iti teṛ devaḥ ime āhur Aila yathā im etad bhavasi mṛtyubandhuḥ | praṇa te devaṁ havishā yajāti vārge u tvam api māda-γāse | “Thus say these gods to thee, o son of Ila, that thou art indeed nothing more than a kinsman of death: (yet) let thy offspring worship the gods with an obligation, and thou also shalt rejoice in heaven.”

It thus appears that in the Vedic hymns and elsewhere Purúravas is regarded as a pious prince, and Manu does not include him in his list of those who resisted the Brāhmans. But the M. Bh., Ádiparvan 3143 speaks of him as follows:

Purúravas tato vidvān Ilāyāṁ samapadyata | sā vai tasyābhavād mātā pītā chaiceti naḥ śrutam | trayodāsa samudrasya deśāṁ aśna Purúravaḥ | amānushair vṛtah sarvair mānushāḥ san mahāyāsāḥ | vipraḥ sa vigrāhaṁ chakre viryayonmattah Purúravāḥ | jahāra cha sa viprānāṁ ratnāṁ utkroṣṭātm api | Sanatkumāras taṁ rūjan Brahma-lokaṁ upetya ha | anudarsāṁ tataḥ chakre pratyaṁrūṇād na čāpy asau | tato mahār-śabhīḥ krūdhaṁ saṅgaḥ saṁpo vyāsaṁyata | lobhāṅvito bala-madād nāṣṭa-санjno nārādhīpaḥ | sa hi gandhāra-loka-sthān Urvāśyā sahito vīraṁ | ānīnāya kriyārthe 'gnin yathāvad vihitāṁs tridhā |
"Subsequently the wise Purūravas was born of Ilā, who, as we have heard, was both his father and his mother. Ruling over thirteen islands of the ocean, and surrounded by beings who were all superhuman, himself a man of great renown, Purūravas, intoxicated by his prowess, engaged in a conflict with the Brāhmans, and robbed them of their jewels, although they loudly remonstrated. Sanatkumāra came from Brahmā’s heaven, and addressed to him an admonition, which, however, he did not regard. Being thenstraightway cursed by the incensed rishis, he perished, this covetous monarch, who, through pride of power, had lost his understanding. This glorious being (vīrāt), accompanied by Urvasī, brought down for the performance of sacred rites the fires which existed in the heaven of the Gandharvas, properly distributed into three.” (See Wilson’s Vishnupurāṇa, 4to. ed. pp. 350 and 394 ff. with note p. 397.)

I cite from the Harivaṃśa another passage regarding Purūravas, although no distinct mention is made in it of his contest with the Brāhmans:

Harivaṃśa 8811. Pīṭā Budhasyottama-vīrya-karmā Purūravāḥ yasya suto nṛ-devaḥ | prāṇāgnir idyo 'gniṃ ajijanad yo nashtam śami-garbha-bhavam bhavatmā | tathaiva paschāch chakame mahātmā purorvāśīm aṣ- sarasām varishthām | pīṭaḥ purā yo 'mrīta-sara-deho muni-pravīraṁ vara-gātri-ghoraiḥ | nripah kuśāgraiḥ punar eva yaṁ cha dhīmān kṛito 'gnir dīci pūjyaṁ cha |

“He (the Moon) was the father of Budha (Mercury), whose son was Purūravas, a god among men, of distinguished heroic deeds, the vital fire, worthy of adoration, the generator, who begot the lost fire which sprang from the heart of the śami-wood, the great personage, who, placed to the west, loved Urvasī, the paragon of Apsarases, who was placed to the east. This king with his entire immortal body was formerly swallowed up with the points of Kuśa grass by the munis terrible with their resplendent forms; but was again made wise, and is worshipped in heaven as fire.”

Sect. IV.—Story of Nahusha.

The legend of Nahusha, grandson of Purūravas (see above, p. 226),

The name of Nahusha occurs in the Rig-veda as that of the progenitor of a race.
the second prince described by Manu as having come into hostile col-
losion with the Brāhmans is narrated with more or less detail in dif-
f erent parts of the Mahābhārata, as well as in the Purāṇas. The fol-
lowing passage is from the former work, Ādip. 3151:

Āyusho Nahushaḥ putro dhīmān satya-parākramah | rājyāṁ kāśāsa
sumahad dharmena prīthivipate | pitṛin devān rishin viprān gandharvo-
rāga-rākshasān | Nahushaḥ pālayāmās brahma kṣattram atho viśāh |
sa hatvā dasya-sanghātān rishān karam adāpayat | paśucach chaiva tān
prīṣthe vāhayāmāsa vīryavān | kārayāmāsa chendratvam abhibhūya
dīvaukasaḥ | tejāsā tapasā chaiva vikramena vijāsā tathā |

“Nahusha the son of Āyus, wise, and of genuine prowess, ruled
with justice a mighty empire. He protected the pitris, gods, rishis, wise
men, gandharvas, serpents (uraga), and rākshasas, as well as
Brāhmans, Kṣattriyas, and Vaiśyas. This energetic prince, after
slaying the hosts of the Dasyus, compelled the rishis to pay tribute,
and made them carry him like beasts upon their backs. After subduing
the celestials he conquered for himself the rank of Indra, through his
vigour, austere fervour, valour and fire.”

The story is thus introduced in another part of the same work, the
Vanaparvan, section 180. Yudhishṭhīra found his brother Bhīmasena
seized by a serpent in a forest (see above, p. 133). This serpent, it
appears, was no other than King Nahusha, who on being questioned
thus relates his own history:

Nahusho nāma rājāḥ ham āsam pūreas tavaṅagha | prathītah ponehamah
Somād Ayōḥ putro narādhipa | kratubhis tapasā chaiva svādhīyayena
damena cha | trailokyaśevaram avyagram prāpto 'haṁ vikramena cha |
tad aśevaryaṁ samāsādyā darpo mām agamat tadā | sahastraṁ hi devi-
tināṁ uvāha śivikam mama | aśevarya-mada-matto 'ham avamanya tato
dejān | imām Agastyena dasām ānītaḥ prīthivipate | . . . ahaṁ hi
divi divyena vimāṇena charan purā | abhimāṇena mattaḥ san kanchid
nānyam achintayam | brahmārshi-deva-gandharva-yakṣa-rākṣasapanna-
gāḥ | karun mama prayachhanti sarve trailokya-vāsinaḥ | chakshushā
yam prapaśyāmi prāṇinam prīthivipate | tasya tejo harāνy āśu tad hi
drishter balam mama | maharṣīnāṁ sahastraṁ hi uvāha śivikam mama |

See above, p. 165, note 7, and pp. 179 f. Nahusha Māṇava is the traditional rishi of
Rig-veda ix. 101, verses 7–9, and Yayāti Nāhusha of verses 4–6 of the same hymn.
See list of rishis in Professor Aufrecht’s Rig-veda ii. 464 ff.
sa mām apanayo rājan bhramśayāmāsa vai śriyāḥ | tatra hy Agastyaḥ pādena vahan sprśīto mayā muniḥ | Agastyaṇa tato 'smy ukto dveśa sarpeti vai rūṣa | tataḥ tasmād vimānagryat prachyutaḥ chyuta-lakṣanāḥ | prapatam bubudhe "īmānaṁ vyāśhūtah adhomukham | ayāchaṁ tam ahaṁ vipraṁ "sāpasyānto bhaved " iti | "pramādāt sampramādha-sya bhagavan kshantum arhasi" | tataḥ sa mām urāchedam prapatantāṁ kripāvitaḥ | "Yudhishṭhira dharma-rājaḥ śāpāt tvām mochatīśyati" |

. . . . ity uttvā "jagaraṁ deham muktavā na Nahuṣho nṛpāḥ | dieyāṁ vapiḥ samāsthiyā gataṁ tridivam eva cha |

"I was a king called Nahusha, more ancient than thou, known as the son of Āyus, and fifth in descent from Soma. By my sacrifices, austere fervour, sacred study, self-restraint, and valour, I acquired the undisturbed sovereignty of the three worlds. When I had attained that dominion, pride took possession of my soul: a thousand Brāhmans bore my vehicle. Becoming intoxicated by the conceit of my lordly power, and contemning the Brāhmans, I was reduced to this condition by Agastya. The serpent then promises to let Bhimasena go, if Yudhishṭhira will answer certain questions (above referred to in p. 133 ff.). Yudhishṭhira afterwards enquires how delusion had happened to take possession of so wise a person as their conversation shewed Nahusha to be. The latter replies that he had been perverted by the pride of power, and proceeds: "Formerly, as I moved through the sky on a celestial car, intoxicated with self-conceit, I regarded no one but myself. All the inhabitants of the three worlds, brāhmanical rishis, gods, gandharvas, yakshas, rākshasas, pannagas, paid me tribute. Such was the power of my gaze that on what creature soever I fixed my eyes, I straightway robbed him of his energy. A thousand of the great sages bore my vehicle. That misconduct it was, o king, which hurled me from my high estate. For I then touched with my foot the muni Agastya who was carrying me. Agastya in his wrath cried out to me 'Fall, thou serpent.' Hurlcd therefore from that magnificent car, and fallen from my prosperity, as I descended headlong, I felt that I had become a serpent. I entreated the Brāhman (Agastya), 'Let there be a termination of the curse: thou, o reverend rishi, shouldest forgive one who has been deluded through his inconsideration.' He then compassionately replied to me as I fell, 'Yudhishṭhira, the king of righteousness, will free thee from the curse.'" And at the close of the
conversation between Yudhishthira and the serpent, we are told that “King Nahusha, throwing of his huge reptile form, became clothed in a celestial body, and ascended to heaven.”

The same story is related in greater detail in the Udyogaparvan, sections 10–16, as follows:

After his slaughter of the demon Vṛittra, Indra became alarmed at the idea of having taken the life of a Brāhman (for Vṛittra was regarded as such), and hid himself in the waters. In consequence of the disappearance of the king of the gods, all affairs, celestial as well as terrestrial, fell into confusion. The rishis and gods then applied to Nahusha to be their king. After at first excusing himself on the plea of want of power, Nahusha at length, in compliance with their solicitations, accepted the high function. Up to the period of his elevation he had led a virtuous life, but he now became addicted to amusement and sensual pleasure; and even aspired to the possession of Indrāṇī, Indra’s wife, whom he had happened to see. The queen resorted to the Angiras Vṛihaspati, the preceptor of the gods, who engaged to protect her. Nahusha was greatly incensed on hearing of this interference; but the gods endeavoured to pacify him, and pointed out the immorality of appropriating another person’s wife. Nahusha, however, would listen to no remonstrance, and insisted that in his adulterous designs he was no worse than Indra himself: 373. *Ahalyā dharṣhitā pūrvaṃ rishi-patnī yaśasvinī | jīvato bhārttur Indraṇa sa vah kiṁ na nivāritaḥ | 374. Bahūni cha nṛśaṁśāni kṛitāṇindreṇa vai purā | vai-dharmyāṇy upadāś chaiva sa vah kiṁ na nivāritaḥ | “373. The renowned Ahalyā, a rishi’s wife, was formerly corrupted by Indra in her husband’s lifetime (see p. 121 f.): Why was he not prevented by you? 374. And many barbarous acts, and unrighteous deeds, and frauds, were perpetrated of old by Indra: Why was he not prevented by you?” The gods, urged by Nahusha, then went to bring Indrāṇī; but Vṛihaspati would not give her up. At his recommendation, however, she solicited Nahusha for some delay, till she should ascertain what had become of her husband. This request was granted. The gods next applied to Vishṇu on behalf of Indra; and Vishṇu promised that if Indra would sacrifice to him, he should be purged from his guilt, and recover his dominion, while Nahusha would be destroyed. Indra sacrificed accordingly; and the result is thus told: 419. *Vibhajya brahma-hatyām tu vriksheshu
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cha nadishu cha | parvateshu prithivyām cha strīshu chaive Yudhish-
thira | sa vibhajya cha bhāteshu visriṣya cha sureśvarah | vijvaro
dhuta-pāpma cha Vāsavo 'bhavad ātmavañ | "Having divided the guilt
of brahmanicide among trees, rivers, mountains, the earth, women,
and the elements, Vāsava (Indra), lord of the gods, became freed from
suffering and sin, and self-governed." Nahusha was by this means
shaken from his place. But (unless this is said by way of prolepsis,
or there is some confusion in the narrative) he must have speedily
regained his position, as we are told that Indra was again ruined, and
became invisible. Indraṇi now went in search of her husband; and
by the help of Upaśruti (the goddess of night and revealer of secrets) dis-
covered him existing in a very subtle form in the stem of a lotus
growing in a lake situated in a continent within an ocean north of the
Himalaya. She made known to him the wicked intentions of Nahusha,
and entreated him to exert his power, rescue her from danger, and
resume his dominion. Indra declined any immediate interposition on
the plea of Nahusha's superior strength; but suggested to his wife
a device by which the usurper might be hurled from his position. She
was recommended to say to Nahusha that "if he would visit her on a
celestial vehicle borne by rishis, she would with pleasure submit herself
to him" (449. Rishi-yānena divyena mām upaihi jagatpate | evaṁ tava
vaśe prītā bhavishyāmīti taṁ vada). The queen of the gods accordingly
went to Nahusha, by whom she was graciously received, and made this
proposal: 457. Ichhāmy aham athāpūrcvān vāhanaṁ te surādhīpa | yad
na Vishnur na Rudrasya nāsurānām na rākṣasām | vahantu tvām mahā-
bhāgaḥ rishayaḥ sangataḥ vibho | sarve śivikayā rājann etad hi mama
rochate | "I desire for thee, king of the gods, a vehicle hitherto un-
known, such as neither Vishṇu, nor Rudra, nor the asuras, nor the rak-
shases employ. Let the eminent rishis, all united, bear thee, lord, in a
car: this idea pleases me." Nahusha receives favourably this appeal
to his vanity, and in the course of his reply thus gives utterance to his
self-congratulation: 463. Na hy alpa-viryo bhavati yo vāhān kurute mu-
nin | aham tapasvi balavān bhūta-bhāvyap bhavat-prabhuh | mayi kruddho
jagad na syād mayi sarvam pratishṭhitaṁ | . . . . tasmāt te vachanaṁ
devi karishyāmi na saṁsayaḥ | saptarshayo māṁ vakshyanti sarve brah-
marshayas tathā | pāṣya māhātmyaṁ asmākaṁ riddhiṁ cha varavarṇini | . . . .

468. Vīmāne yojayitvā sa rishin niyamam āsthitān | abrahmanyo
balopecto matto mada-balena cha | kama-vritisah sa dushtatma vahayamasa
tan rishin | “He is a personage of no mean prowess who makes the
munis his bearers. I am a fervid devotee of great might, lord of the
past, the future, and the present. If I were angry the world would
no longer stand; on me everything depends. . . . Wherefore, o
goddess, I shall, without doubt, carry out what you propose. The
seven rishis, and all the brahm-an-rishis, shall carry me. Behold,
beautiful goddess, my majesty and my prosperity.” The narrative
goes on: “Accordingly this wicked being, irreligious, violent, intoxi-
cated by the force of conceit, and arbitrary in his conduct, attached to
his car the rishis, who submitted to his commands, and compelled them
to bear him.” Indra then again resorts to Vrihaspati, who assures
her that vengeance will soon overtake Nahusha for his presumption;
and promises that he will himself perform a sacrifice with a view to
the destruction of the oppressor, and the discovery of Indra’s lurking
place. Agni is then sent to discover and bring Indra to Vrihaspati;
and the latter, on Indra’s arrival, informs him of all that had occurred
during his absence. While Indra, with Kuvera, Yama, Soma, and
Varuna, was devising means for the destruction of Nahusha, the sage
Agastya came up, congratulated Indra on the fall of his rival, and pro-
cceeded to relate how it had occurred: 527. Sramartiścha vahantas
tam Nahusham pāpakārinam | devarshayo mahābhāgas tathā brahmashayo ’malāḥ | paprachhur Nahusham demam saṃśayaṁ jayatāṁ vara | ye ime brāhmaṇaḥ proktāḥ maṇtrāḥ vai prokṣhaṇe gavaṁ | ete pramāṇam
bhavataḥ utāho neti Vāsaca | Nahusho neti tāṁ āha tamasaḥ mūḍha-četanaḥ | rishayaḥ uṣchuḥ | adharme sampravṛttas tvāṁ dharmaṁ na prati-
padyase | pramāṇam etad asmākaṁ pūrvaṁ praktaṁ maharṣibhiḥ | Agastyaḥ vācha | Tato vivadamanah sa muniḥbiḥ saha Vāsaca | atha māṁ aspriṣad mūrdhni pūdenādharma-yojitaḥ | tenābhūd hata-tejāś cha
niḥśriśaḥ cha mahipatiḥ | tatāṁ sahaṁ vigam avocham bhaya-piditaṁ | “yasmät pūrvaḥ kriyam brahma brahmarshibhir anushṭhitam
aduṣṭaṁ dushhayasi vai yach cha mūrdhny aspriṣaḥ padā | yach chūpi
team rishin mūḍha brahma-kalpaṁ durāsadān | vahān kriyā vahayasi
tena svargāṁ hata-prabhāḥ | dveṣasa pāpa paribhraṣṭaḥ kṣīna-punya
mahītalam | daśa-varsho-sahasrāṁ sarpa-rūpa-dhara mahān | vihari-
shyasi pūrṇeshu puṇaḥ svargam acāryaṁ” | evam bhrasṭo durātmā sa
deva-rājyaṁ arindama | dishtyā varddhāmaḥ sakra hato brāhmaṇa-kaṇ-
takāḥ | tripitakapam prapadayaśa pāhi lokān sākṣipate | jetendriyo jītāmitraḥ stāyamāno maharshībhīḥ |

"Wearied with carrying the sinner Nahuṣa, the eminent divine-rishis, and the spotless brāhman-rishis, asked that divine personage Nahuṣa [to solve] a difficulty: 'Dost thou, o Vāsava, most excellent of conquerers, regard as authoritative or not those Brāhmaṇa texts which are recited at the immolation of kine?'

'No,' replied Nahuṣa, whose understanding was enveloped in darkness. The rishis rejoined: 'Engaged in unrighteousness, thou attainest not unto righteousness: these texts, which were formerly uttered by great rishis, are regarded by us as authoritative.' Then (proceeds Agastya) disputing with the munis, Nahuṣa, impelled by unrighteousness, touched me on the head with his foot. In consequence of this the king's glory was smitten and his prosperity departed. When he had instantly become agitated and oppressed with fear, I said to him,

'Since thou, o fool, contemnest that sacred text, always held in honour, which has been composed by former sages, and employed by brāhman-rishis, and hast touched my head with thy foot, and employest the Brahmā-like and irresistible rishis as bearers to carry thee,—therefore, shorn of thy lustre, and all thy merit exhausted, sink down, sinner, degraded from heaven to earth. For ten thousand years thou shalt crawl in the form of a huge serpent. When that period is completed, thou shalt again ascend to heaven.' So fell that wicked wretch from the sovereignty of the gods. Happily, o Indra, we shall now prosper, for the enemy of the Brāhmans has been smitten. Take possession of the three worlds, and protect their inhabitants, o husband of Śachi (Indrāṇī), subduing thy senses, overcoming thine enemies, and celebrated by the great rishis." 86

Indra, as we have seen above, was noted for his dissolute character. The epithet "subduing thy senses," assigned to him in the last sentence by Agastya, is at variance with this indifferent reputation. Is it to be regarded as a piece of flattery, or as a delicate hint that the god would do well to practise a purer morality in future?

This legend appears, like some others, to have been a favourite with the compilers of the Mahābhārata; for we find it once more related, though with some variety of detail, (which may justify its repetition in

86 Further on, in verse 556, Nahuṣa is called "the depraved, the hater of brāhmaṇ, the sinful-minded (durāchārās cha Nahuṣho brahma-deviṣ pūṣchetanah)."
a condensed form), in the Anuśāsanaparvan, verses 4745–4810. We are there told that Nahusha, in recompense for his good deeds, was exalted to heaven; where he continued to perform all divine and human ceremonies, and to worship the gods as before. At length he became puffed up with pride at the idea that he was Indra, and all his good works in consequence were neutralized. For a great length of time he compelled the rishis to carry him about. At last it came to Agastya's turn to perform the servile office. Bhṛigu then came and said to Agastya, 'Why do we submit to the insults of this wicked king of the gods?' Agastya answered that none of the rishis had ventured to curse Nahusha, because he had obtained the power of subduing to his service everyone upon whom he fixed his eyes; and that he had amṛita (nectar) for his beverage. However, Agastya said he was prepared to do anything that Bhṛigu might suggest. Bhṛigu said he had been sent by Brahmā to take vengeance on Nahusha, who was that day about to attack Agastya to his car, and would spurn him with his foot; and that he himself (Bhṛigu), "incensed at this insult, would by a curse condemn the transgressor and hater of Brāhmans to become a serpent" (vyutkṛantā-dharmāṁ tam ahaṁ dharshaṇāmarmihito bhṛiśam | ahir bha-vasseti rashā sapsye pāpaṁ devija-druham). All this accordingly happened as follows:

Aṭhāgastyaṁ rishi-sreshṭham vāhanāyājuhāva ha [drutaṁ Sarvasvati-kulat smayann ieva mahāballāḥ | tato Bhṛigur mahātejāḥ Maitrāvarunim abravit | "nimilayave svayame jatāṁ yācadi visāmi te" | aṭhāsamāṁbťasayā tasyātkha jatāṁ praśīsad achyutaḥ | Bhṛiguḥ sa sumahātejāḥ pātanāya nṛpasya cha | tataḥ sa deva-rāt prāptas tam rishiṁ vāhanāya vai | tato 'gastyaḥ surapatiṁ vākyam āha viśāmpate | "yojṣayasi māṁ kshiprāṁ kaṁ cha deśāṁ vahāmi te | yattra vākṣhyai tattra tvaṁ nayishyāmi surā-dhipa" | ity uktaḥ Nahusas tena yojayāmaṁa tam munim | Bhṛigus tasya jatāntah-stho bahūva hṛishiṁ bhṛiśam | na chāpi darśanaṁ tasya chakāra sa Bhṛigus tada | vara-dāna-prabhāva-jno Nahusasya mahātmanah | na chukopa tada 'gastyo ukto 'pi Nahusheṇa vai | tmaṁ tu rāja pratodena chadayāmāsa Bhārata | na chukupa sa dharmāṁ tataḥ pādena deva-rāt | Agastyasya tada krudho vāmenabhyaḥanach chhiraḥ | tasmin śirasy abhi-hate sa jatāntargato Bhṛiguḥ | śaśāpa balavat krudho Nahusham pāpa-chetasam | "yasmāt padā'hanaḥ krūdhot śirasīmam mahāmuniṁ | tasmad āśu mahīṁ gachha sarpo bhūtvā sudurmate" | ity uktaḥ sa tada tena
sarpo bhūtā papāta ha | adrishtenātha Bhṛiguṇā bhūtāle Bharatarsha-

bhā | Bhṛiguṇā hi yādi so 'drakshyad Nahushaḥ prthīvīpate | sa na śakto

'bharishyad vai pātane tasya tejasā |

"The mighty Nahusha, as it were smiling, straightway summoned
the eminent rishi Agastya from the banks of the Sarasvatī to carry him.
The glorious Bhṛigu then said to Maitrāvaruṇi (Agastya), 'Close thy
eyes whilst I enter into the knot of thy hair.' With the view of over-
throwing the king, Bhṛigu then entered into the hair of Agastya who
stood motionless as a stock. Nahusha then came to be carried by
Agastya, who desired to be attached to the vehicle and agreed to carry
the king of the gods whithersoever he pleased. Nahusha in consequence
attached him. Bhṛigu, who was lodged in the knot of Agastya's hair,
was greatly delighted, but did not venture to look at Nahusha, as he
knew the potency of the boon which had been accorded to him (of sub-
duing to his will everyone on whom he fixed his eyes). Agastya did not
lose his temper when attached to the vehicle, and even when urged by
a goad the holy man remained unmoved. The king of the gods, incensed,
next struck the rishi's head with his left foot, when Bhṛigu, invisible
within the knot of hair, became enraged, and violently cursed the
wicked Nahusha: 'Since, fool, thou hast in thine anger smitten this
great muni on the head with thy foot, therefore become a serpent, and
fall down swiftly to the earth.' Being thus addressed, Nahusha be-
came a serpent, and fell to the earth, through the agency of Bhṛigu,
who remained invisible. For if he had been seen by Nahusha, the
saint would have been unable, in consequence of the power possessed
by the oppressor, to hurl him to the ground."

Bhṛigu, on Nahusha's solicitation, and the intercession of Agastya,
placed a period to the effects of the curse, which, as in the other version
of the legend, Yudhishṭhira was to be the instrument of terminating.

From several phrases which I have quoted from the version of this
legend given in the Udyogaparvan, as well as the tenor of the whole,
it appears to be the intention of the writers to hold up the case of
Nahusha as an example of the nemesis awaiting not merely any gross
display of presumption, but all resistance to the pretensions of the
priesthood, and contempt of their persons or authority.
Sect. V.—Story of Nimi.

Nimi (one of Ikshvāku’s sons) is another of the princes who are stigmatized by Manu, in the passage above quoted, for their want of deference to the Brāhmaṇs. The Vishṇu P. (Wilson, 4to. ed. p. 388) relates the story as follows: Nimi had requested the Brāhmaṇ-rishi Vasīṣṭha to officiate at a sacrifice, which was to last a thousand years. Vasīṣṭha in reply pleaded a pre-engagement to Indra for five hundred years, but promised to return at the end of that period. The king made no remark, and Vasīṣṭha went away, supposing that he had assented to this arrangement. On his return, however, the priest discovered that Nimi had retained Gautama (who was, equally with Vasīṣṭha, a Brāhmaṇ-rishi) and others to perform the sacrifice; and being incensed at the neglect to give him notice of what was intended, he cursed the king, who was then asleep, to lose his corporeal form. When Nimi awoke and learnt that he had been cursed without any previous warning, he retorted, by uttering a similar curse on Vasīṣṭha, and then died. “In consequence of this curse” (proceeds the Vishṇu Purāṇa, iv. 5, 6) “the vigour of Vasīṣṭha entered into the vigour of Mitra and Varuṇa. Vasīṣṭha, however, received from them another body when their seed had fallen from them at the sight of Urvasī” (tach-chhāpāch cha Mitra-varuṇayos tejasi Vasīṣṭha-tejah pravishṭam | Urvasī-darśanād udbhūta-viryya-prapatayoh sakāsād Vasīṣṭho deham aparām lehe). Nimi’s body was embalmed. At the close of the sacrifice which he had begun, the gods were willing, on the intercession of the priests, to restore him to life, but he declined the offer; and was placed by the deities, according to his desire, in the eyes of all living creatures. It is in consequence of this that they are always opening and shutting (nimīṣha means “the twinkling of the eye”).

The story is similarly related in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, ix. 13, 1–13. A portion of the passage is as follows:


This story will be further illustrated in the next section.
loḥḥād dharmam ajānataḥ” | ity utsasajja svāṁ dehaṁ Nimi adhyāt-
ma-kocidaḥ | Mitrā-varuṇayor jajne Urvāśyām prapitāmahāḥ |

“Nimi, who was self-controlled, knowing the world to be fleeting, commenced the sacrifice with other priests until his own spiritual instructor should come back. The latter, on his return, discovering the transgression of his disciple, cursed him thus: ‘Let the body of Nimi, who fancies himself learned, fall from him.’ Nimi retorted the curse on his preceptor, who was acting unrighteously: ‘Let thy body also fall from thee, since thou, through covetousness, art ignorant of duty.’ Having so spoken, Nimi, who knew the supreme spirit, abandoned his body: and the patriarch (Vāśishṭha) was born of Urvāśī to Mitra and Varuṇa.”

The offence of Nimi, as declared in these passages, is not that of contemning the sacerdotal order in general, or of usurping their functions; but merely of presuming to consult his own convenience by proceeding to celebrate a sacrifice with the assistance of another Brāhman (for Gautama also was a man of priestly descent) when his own spiritual preceptor was otherwise engaged, without giving the latter any notice of his intention. The Bhāgavata, as we have seen, awards blame impartially to both parties, and relates (as does also the Viṣṇu Purāṇa) that the king’s curse took effect on the Brāhman, as well as on the Brāhman’s on the king.

Sect. VI.—Vāśishṭha.

One of the most remarkable and renowned of the struggles between Brāhmans and Kshattriyas which occur in the legendary history of India is that which is said to have taken place between Vāśishṭha and Viśvāmitra. I propose to furnish full details of this conflict with its fabulous accompaniments from the Rāmāyaṇa, which dwells upon it at considerable length, as well as from the Mahābhārata, where it is repeatedly

88 On the last verse the commentator Śrīdhara has the following note: Urvāśī-
darśanāṁ retas tūḥhyāṁ kumbhe nishkītam | tasmāt prapitāmahā Vāśishṭho jajne |
tathā cha śrutīḥ “kumbhe retaḥ sishchitah samūnān” iti | “Seed fell from them at the sight of Urvāśī and was shed into a jar: from it the patriarch, Vāśishṭha, was born. And so says the śrutī” (R.V. vii. 33, 13, which will be quoted in the next section).
introduced; but before doing so, I shall quote the passages of the Rigveda which appear to throw a faint light on the real history of the two rivals. It is clear from what has been said in the Introduction to this volume, pp. 1–6, as well as from the remarks I have made in pp. 139 f., that the Vedic hymns, being far more ancient than the Epic and Puranic compilations, must be more trustworthy guides to a knowledge of the remotest Indian antiquity. While the Epic poems and Puranas no doubt embody numerous ancient traditions, yet these have been freely altered according to the caprice or dogmatic views of later writers, and have received many purely fictitious additions. The Vedic hymns, on the contrary, have been preserved unchanged from a very remote period, and exhibit a faithful reflection of the social, religious, and ecclesiastical condition of the age in which they were composed, and of the feelings which were awakened by contemporary occurrences. As yet there was no conscious perversion or colouring of facts for dogmatic or sectarian purposes; and much of the information which we derive from these naïve compositions is the more trustworthy that it is deduced from hints and allusions, and from the comparison of isolated particulars, and not from direct and connected statements or descriptions. It is here therefore, if anywhere, that we may look for some light on the real relations between Vasishtha and Visvamitra. After quoting the hymns regarding these two personages, I shall adduce from the Brāhmaṇas, or other later works, any particulars regarding their birth and history which I have discovered. The conflict between Vasishtha and Visvamitra has been already discussed at length in the third of Dr. Rudolf Roth’s “Dissertations on the literature and history of the Veda,” 89 where the most important parts of the hymns bearing upon the subject are translated. The first hymn which I shall adduce is intended for the glorification of Vasishtha and his family. The latter part relates the birth of the sage, while the earlier verses refer to his connection with king Sudās. Much of this hymn is very obscure.
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Bhedam ebhir jaghāna | eva in nu kaṁ dāsārājne Sudāsam prāvac Indra
brahmaṇā vo Vasishṭhāḥ | 4. Jushtī naro brahmaṇā vah pīṭrīnām aksham
avyayaṁ na kila rishātha | yat sākvarishu brihatā ravena Indre śuṣk-
man adadhdāta Vasishṭhāḥ | 5. Ud dyām iva it trishnujo nāḥhitāsa adi-
dhayur dāsārājne eṛitāsah | Vasishṭhasya stuvataḥ Indro aśrod uruṁ
Trīṣubhīyo akṛṇod u lokam | 6. Daṇḍā iva gojanāsaḥ āsan parichhin-
nāḥ Bharatāḥ arbhakāsaḥ | abhavach cha pura-ēta Vasishṭhāḥ ād it
Trīṣūnāṁ viśo aprathanta | 7. Trayaḥ kṛṇvanti bhuvanesu retas
tīśrāḥ prajāḥ āryāḥ jyotir-agrāḥ | trayo āharmāsaḥ ushasāṁ sachante
sarcān it tān anu vidur Vasishṭhāḥ | 8. Sūrasya iva vakshatho jyotir
eshāṁ samudrasya iva mahīmā gabhīrāḥ | vātasya iva prajavo na anyena
stomo Vasishṭhāḥ anu etave vah | 9. Te in niṇyāṁ hridayasya praketaḥ sa-
hasra-valśaṁ abhi saṁ charanti | yamena tatam paridhiṁ vayanto apsarasaḥ
upa sedur Vasishṭhāḥ | 10. Viduyoto jyotiḥ pari saṁ jihānam Mitrā-varuṇā
yad apasyataṁ tvā | tat te janma uta ekoṁ Vasishṭha Agastyo yat te tvā viśaṁ
ājaphāra | 11. Uta asi Maitrīvāruṇa Vasishṭha Urvasyāḥ brahman ma-
naśo 'dhi jātañ | drapsam skannam brahmaṇā daivyena viśe decaḥ push-
kare tvā dadanta | 12. Sa praketaḥ udbhayasya pravidevaṁ sahasra-
danaḥ uta va sadānāḥ | yamena tatam paridhiṁ vayishyann apsarasaḥ
pari jañye Vasishṭhāḥ | 13. Sattre ha jātāv ishidā namobhiṁ kumbhe
retah sishchatuḥ samānam | tato ha Māṇaḥ ud iyāya madhyāt tato
jātam rishim āhur Vasishṭham |

"1. The white-robed (priests) with hair-knots on the right, stimu-
lating to devotion, have filled me with delight. Rising from the sacrif-
cial grass, I call to the men, 'Let not the Vasishṭhas (stand too) far
off to succour [or gladden] me."

2. By their libation they brought
Indra hither from afar across the Vaiśanta away from the powerful
draught. Indra preferred the Vasishṭhas to the soma offered by
Pāṣadyumna, the son of Vayata. So too with them he crossed the
river; so too with them he slew Bheda; so too in the battle of the
ten kings Indra delivered Sudās through your prayer, o Vasishṭhas.

90 Sāyaṇa thinks that Vasishṭha is the speaker, and refers here to his own sons.
Professor Roth (under the word se) regards Indra as the speaker. May it not be
Sudās?

91 This is the interpretation of this clause suggested by Professor Aufrecht, who
thinks Vaiśanta is probably the name of a river.

92 According to Sāyaṇa, another king who was sacrificing at the same time as Sudās.
93 See verses 6–8 of R.V. vii. 83, to be next quoted.
4. Through gratification caused by the prayer of your fathers, o men, ye do not obstruct the undecaying axle (?), since at (the recitation of the) Sakvari verses with a loud voice ye have infused energy into Indra, o Vasishtha. 5. Distressed, when surrounded in the fight of the ten kings, they looked up, like thirsty men, to the sky. Indra heard Vasishtha when he uttered praise, and opened up a wide space for the Tritsus. 6. Like staves for driving cattle, the contemptible Bharatas were lopped all round. Vasishtha marched in front, and then the tribes of the Tritsus were deployed. 7. Three deities create a fertilizing fluid in the worlds. Three are the noble creatures whom light precedes. Three fires attend the dawn. All these the Vasishthas know. 8. Their lustre is like the full radiance of the sun; their greatness is like the depth of the ocean; like the swiftness of the wind, your hymn, o Vasishthas, can be followed by no one else. 9. By the intuitions of their heart they seek out the mystery with a thousand branches. Weaving the envelopment stretched out by Yama, the Vasishthas sat down by the Apsaras. 10. When Mitra and Varuna saw thee quitting the flame of the lightning, that was thy birth; and thou hadst one (other birth), o Vasishtha, when Agasty a brought thee to the people. 11. And thou art also a son of Mitra and Varuna, o Vasishtha, born, o priest, from the soul of Urvasi. All the gods placed thee—a drop which fell through divine contemplation—in the vessel. 12. He, the intelligent, knowing both (worlds ?), with a thousand gifts, or with gifts—he who was to weave the envelopment stretched out by Yama—he, Vasishtha, was born of the Apsaras. 13. They, two (Mitra and Varuna ?), born at the sacrifice, and impelled by adorations, dropped into the jar the same amount of seed. From the

See R.V. x. 71, 11, above, p. 256.

This is evidently the name of the tribe which the Vasishthas favoured, and to which they themselves must have belonged. See vii. 83, 4. The Bharatas in the next verse appear to be the hostile tribe.

In explanation of this Sāyana quotes a passage from the Śatāyana Brāhmaṇa, as follows: “Troyah kriyamāṇi bhuvanesu retah” ity Agniḥ prthivyayān retah kriyoti Vāyur antarikṣe Adityo dieiḥ “tisraḥ prajāḥ āryyāḥ jyotir-agrāḥ” iti Vasavo Rudrād Adityaś tūṣaṁ jyotir yad asē Adityah | “trayo gharīṃśah uhasaṁ sachtāṃ” ity Agniḥ Uhasaṁ sachtate Vāyur Uhasaṁ sachtate Adityaḥ Uhasaṁ sachtate | (1) “Agni produces a fertilizing fluid on the earth, Vāyu in the air, the Sun in the sky. (2) The ‘three noble creatures’ are the Vasus, Rudras, and Adityas. The Sun is their light. (3) Agni, Vāyu, and the Sun each attend the Dawn.”
THE BRAHMANS AND KSHATRIYAS.

midst of that arose Māna (Agastya?); and from that they say that the rishi Vasishṭha sprang."

There is another hymn (R.V. vii. 18) which relates to the connection between Vasishṭha and Sudās (verses 4, 5, 21–25) and the conflict between the latter and the Trīstu with their enemies (verses 6–18); but as it is long and obscure I shall content myself with quoting a few verses.

R.V. vii. 18, 4. Dhenuṃ na tvā suyavasā duḥhukshann upa brahmāṇi
sasriye Vasishṭhaḥ | tvām id me gopatiṁ viśvāḥ āha ā nah Indraḥ suṇa-
tiṁ gantu achha | 5. Arṇāṃśi chit paprathānā Sudāse Indro gādhāni

Whatever may be the sense of verses 11 and 13, the Nirukta states plainly enough v. 13; Tasyāh darśanād Mitrā-varunayoh retai chakṣanda | tad-vaśvādityām
ēśu pīg bhavati | "On seeing her (Urvāśī) the seed of Mitra and Varuṇa fell from
them. To this the following verse (R.V. vii. 33, 11) refers." And Sāyaṇa on the
same verse quotes a passage from the Bṛhaddevatā: Tayor adityayoh sattre dṛṣṭe
’psarasam Urvāśīm | retai chakṣanda tat kumbhe nyapataḥ vīśatīcora | tenāvā tu
mukūrttena vīryavantau tapasvinau | Agastyaḥ cha Vasishṭhāḥ cha tatravṛti saṃbhū-
vṛataḥ | bahudhāḥ paṇītām retai kalaśe cha jale athale | athale Vasishṭhās tu muniḥ saṃbhā-
bhūvārshi-sattamah | kumbhe to Agastyaḥ saṃbhūto jale matsyo mahādyutiḥ | udīyāya
tato ’grastyo sāmyā-mātrā mahātapatāḥ | mānena sammilo yasmāt tasmād Māṇyāh
iḥchhyate | yadeva kumbhād rishir jataḥ kumbhēnīpi hi miyate | kumbhāh ity abhidhā-
nāma cha parimāṇasya laksyate | tato ’psu gṛhyānāmīsa Vasishṭhāḥ pushkare sthit-
taḥ | savatāḥ pushkare taṁ hi viśe devāḥ adhārayan | "When these two Adityas (Mitra and Varuṇa) beheld the Apsaras Urvāśī at a sacrifice their seed fell from them into the sacrificial jar called vīśatīcora. At that very moment the two energetic and austere rishis Agastya and Vasishṭha were produced there. The seed fell on many places, into the jar, into water, and on the ground. The muni Vasishṭha, most excellent of rishis, was produced on the ground; while Agastya was born in the jar, a fish of great lustre. The austere Agastya sprang thence of the size of a sāmyā (i.e. the pin of a yoke; see Wilson, s.v., and Professor Roth, s.v. māna). Since he was measured by a certain standard (māna) he is called the 'measurable' (mānaya). Or, the rishi, having sprung from a jar (kumbha), is also measured by a jar, as the word kumbha is also designated as the name of a measure. Then when the waters were taken, Vasishṭha remained in the vessel (pushkara); for all the gods held him in it on all sides." In his Illustrations of the Nirukta, p. 64, Prof. Roth speaks of the verses of the hymn which relate to Vasishṭha's origin as being a more modern addition to an older composition, and as describing the miraculous birth of the sage in the taste and style of the Epic mythology. Professor Max Müller (Oxford Essays for 1856, pp. 61 f.) says that Vasishṭha is a name of the Sun; and that the ancient poet is also 4 called the son of Mitra and Varuṇa, night and day, an expression which has a meaning only in regard to Vasishṭha, the sun; and as the sun is frequently called the offspring of the dawn, Vasishṭha, the poet, is said to owe his birth to Urvāśī" (whom Müller identifies with Ushas). For M. Langlois's view of the passage, see his French version of the R.V. vol. iii. pp. 79 f. and his note, p. 234.

97 See Roth's Litt. u. Gesch. des Weda, pp. 87 ff. where it is translated into German.

"4. Seeking to milk thee (Indra), like a cow in a rich meadow, Vasishṭha sent forth his prayers to thee; for every one tells me that thou art a lord of cows; may Indra come to our hymn. 5. However the waters swelled, Indra made them shallow and fordable to Sudās. . . . . 21. Parāsara,99 Satayātu, and Vasishṭha, devoted to thee, who from indifference have left their home, have not forgotten the friendship of thee the bountiful;—therefore let prosperous days dawn for these sages. 22. Earning two hundred cows and two chariots with mares, the gift of Sudās the son of Pijavana, and grandson of Devavat,100 I walk round the house, o Agni, uttering praises, like a hotṛ priest. 23. The four brown steeds, bestowed by Sudās the son of Pijavana, vigorous, decked with pearls, standing on the ground, carry me on securely from generation to generation. 24. That donor, whose fame pervades both worlds, has distributed gifts to every person. They praise him as the seven rivers101 praise Indra; he has slain Yuḍhyāmadhi in battle. 25. Befriend him (Sudās), ye heroic Maruts, as

99 Parāśara is said in Nir. vi. 30, which refers to this passage, to have been a son of Vasishṭha born in his old age (Parāśarāh parāśtvasvam Vasīṣṭhaya athavairasya jajne); or he was a son of Sakti and grandson of Vasishṭha (Roth s.v.)

100 Devavat is said by Śayana to be a proper name. He may be the same as Divodāsa in verse 25. Or Divodāsa may be the father, and Pijavana and Devavat among the forefathers of Sudās. In the Vishnu Purāṇa Sarvakīma is said to have been the father and Rītuparna the grandfather of Sudās, Wilson's V.P. 4to. ed. p. 380. At p. 454 f. a Sudās is mentioned who was son of Chyavana, grandson of Mitrayu and great-grandson of Divodāsa.

101 Professor Roth (Litt. u. Gesch. des Weda, p. 100) compares R. V. i. 102, 2, asya śravo nadyah sapta bibhrati, "the seven rivers extalt his (Indra's) renown." These rivers are, as Roth explains, the streams freed by Indra from Vrittra's power.
ye did Divodāsa the (fore)father of Sudās; fulfil the desire of the son of Pijavana (by granting him) imperishable, undeceasing power, worthy of reverence (?)."

Although the Vasishṭhas are not named in the next hymn, it must refer to the same persons and circumstances as are alluded to in the first portion of R.V. vii. 33, quoted above.


"Looking to you, o heroes, to your friendship, the men with broad axes advanced to fight. Slay our Daśa and our Arya enemies, and deliver Sudās by your succour, o Indra and Varuṇa. 2. In the battle where men clash with elevated banners, where something which we desire is to be found, where all beings and creatures tremble, there, o Indra and Varuṇa, take our part. 3. The ends of the earth were seen to be darkened, o Indra and Varuṇa, a shout ascended to the sky; the foes of my warriors came close up to me; come hither with your help, ye hearers of our invocations. 4. Indra and Varuṇa, unequalled with your weapons, ye have slain Bheda, and delivered Sudās; ye heard the prayers of these men in their invocation; the priestly agency

103 Sāyāna divides the kinehāna of the Pada-text into kinehā na, which gives the sense "where nothing is desired, but everything is difficult."
of the Tritisus was efficacious. 5. O Indra and Varuna, the injurious acts of the enemy, the hostilities of the murderous, afflict me on every side. Ye are lords of the resources of both worlds: protect us therefore (where ye live) in the remotest heavens. 6. Both parties invoke you, both Indra and Varuna, in the battles, in order that ye may bestow riches. (They did so in the fight) in which ye delivered Sudās—when harassed by the ten kings—together with the Tritisus. 7. The ten kings, who were no sacrificers, united, did not vanquish Sudās, o Indra and Varuna. The praises of the men who officiated at the sacrifice were effectual; the gods were present at their invocations. 8. Ye, o Indra and Varuna, granted succour to Sudās, hemmed in on every side in the battle of the ten kings, where the white-robed Tritisus, with hair-knots, reverentially praying, adored you with a hymn.

From these hymns it appears that Vasishṭha, or a Vasishṭha and his family were the priests of king Sudās (vii. 18, 4 f., 21 ff.; vii. 33, 3 f.); that, in their own opinion, these priests were the objects of Indra’s preference (vii. 33, 2), and had by the efficacy of their intercessions been the instruments of the victory gained by Sudās over his enemies in the battle of the ten kings. It seems also to result from some of the verses (vii. 33, 6; vii. 83, 4, 6; and vii. 33, 1, compared with vii. 83, 8) that both the king and the priests belonged to the tribe of the Tritisus.

Professor Roth remarks that in none of the hymns which

103 Compare verses 7 and 8. Sāyana, however, translates the clause differently: "The act of the Tritisus for whom I sacrificed, and who put me forward as their priest, was effectual: my priestly function on their behalf was successful." (Tritisūnām etat-sanjñānām mama yugyānam purohitir mama purodhānam satyā satya-phalam abhavat | tehu yad mama paurāhityaṁ tat saphalam jālam |

101 According to Sāyana the two parties were Sudās and the Tritisus his allies (ubhaya-vindhāḥ Sudās-sanjna roṣṭā tat-sahāya-bhūtās Tritisāvasa cha evāṁ dev-prakārāḥ janaḥ). It might have been supposed that one of the parties meant was the hostile kings; but they are said in the next verse to be ayaśyavah, "persons who did not sacrifice to the gods."

102 Dīṇārājña. This word is explained by Sāyana in his note on vii. 33, 3, dasabhī roṣṭabhīḥ sāha yuddhe puvrīrte, "battle having been joined with ten kings." In the verse before us he says "the lengthening of the first syllable is a Vedic peculiarity, and that the case-ending is altered, and that the word merely means ‘by the ten kings’" (dasa-sabhasya chhandaso dirghah | vibhakti-vyatayah | dasabhī roṣṭabhīḥ . . . parivesṭhitāya). 103 Here Sāyana says the Tritisus are "the priests so called who were Vasishṭha’s disciples" (Tritisavo Vasishṭha-sisyāḥ etat-sanjnaḥ ritevaḥ). 107 See Roth, Lit. u. Gesch. des Weda, p. 120.
he quotes is any allusion made to the Vasishṭhas being members of any particular caste; but that their connection with Sudās is ascribed to their knowledge of the gods, and their unequalled power of invocation.

(vii. 33, 7 f.)

In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, viii. 21, we have another testimony to the connection of Vasishṭha with Sudās, as he is there stated to have “consecrated Sudās son of Pijavana by a great inauguration similar to Indra’s; in consequence of which Sudās went round the earth in every direction conquering, and performed an aśvamedha sacrifice” (etena va vai aindreṇa mahābhishēkena Vasishṭhaḥ Sudāsam Pijavananam abhishecheha | tasmād u Sudāḥ Pijavanah samantaṁ sarvataḥ prithiṣṭāṁ jayan pariṣṭya aścena cha medhyena īje).

The following passages refer to Vasishṭha having received a revelation from the god Varuṇa, or to his being the object of that god’s special favour:

vii. 87, 4. Ucācha me Varuṇo medhirāya triḥ sapta nāma aghnyā bi-bharṭi | videśān padasya guhyā na vochad yugāya vipraḥ upāraya śikshān |

“Varuṇa has declared to me who am intelligent, ‘The Cow possesses thrice seven names. The wise god, though he knows them, has not revealed the mysteries of (her) place, which he desires to grant to a future generation.”


108 Colebrooke’s Misc. Essays, i. 40.
109 Vasishṭha is not named in this hymn, but he is its traditional author.
110 Sāyaṇa says that either (1) Vāch is here meant under the figure of a cow having the names of 21 metres, the Gāyatrī, etc., attached to her breast, throat, and head, or (2) that Vāch in the form of the Veda holds the names of 21 sacrifices; but that (3) another authority says the earth is meant, which (in the Nighaṇṭu, i. 1) has 21 names, go, gmā, jāṇa, etc. (Vāg atra gaur uchyat | sā cha utari kṣatthe śivasi cha baddhāni gāyatrī-udāni sapta ehandaśaṁ nāmaṁ bibhārtti | yadeva vedātmikā vāg ekaviṁśati-sanisthānaṁ yajñānāṁ nāmaṁ bibhārtti | dhārayati | aparāḥ āha “gauḥ prithiviḥ | tasyaḥ cha ‘gau rūpaṁ jānti iti pāthitāny ekaviṁśati-nāmaṁ” iti. I have, in translating the second clause of the verse, followed for the most part a rendering suggested by Professor Aufrecht.
avrikam purā chit | brihantam mānam Varuṇa svadhāvāḥ sahasra-dvāraṁ
dhagama griham te | 6. Yaṁ āpir nityo Varuṇa priyah san tvām āgāṁśi
krīnavat sakhā te | mā te enasvanto yakshin bhujema yandhi utma vipraṁ
stuvate varūtham |

"When Varuṇa and I embark on the boat, when we propel it into
the midst of the ocean, when we advance over the surface of the
waters, may we rock upon the undulating element till we become
brilliant. 4. Varuṇa took Vasishṭha into the boat; by his mighty acts
working skilfully he (Varuṇa) has made him a rishi; the wise (god
has made) him an utterer of praises in an auspicious time, that his
days and dawns may be prolonged.511 5. Where are (now) our friend-
ships, the tranquility which we enjoyed of old? We have come, o self-
sustaining Varuṇa, to thy vast abode, to thy house with a thousand
gates. 6. Whatever friend of thine, being a kinsman constant and
beloved, may commit offences against thee;—may we not, though sin-
ful, suffer (punishment), o adorable being; do thou, o wise god, grant
us protection."

R.V. vii. 86 is a sort of penitential hymn in which Vasishṭha refers
to the anger of Varuṇa against his old friend (verse 4) and entreats for-
giveness of his offences. This hymn, which appears to be an earnest
and genuine effusion of natural feeling, is translated in Professor

The passage which follows is part of a long hymn, consisting chiefly
of imprecations directed against Rākshāses and Yātudhānas, and said in
the Brihaddevatā (as quoted by Śāyaṇa in his introductory remarks) to
have "been seen" by the rishi (Vasishṭha) when he was overwhelmed
with grief and anger for the loss of his hundred sons who had been slain
by the sons of Sudās" (rishir dadarśa rakṣho-gñam puttra-śoka-paripulis-
tāḥ | hate puttra-śate krūddhaḥ Saudāsair duḥkhītas tadā). I shall cite
only the verses in which Vasishṭha repels the imputation (by whom-
soever it may have been made) that he was a demon (Rakshaś or Yātu-
dhana).

R.V. vii. 104, 12. Suvijnānam chākītushe janāya saḥ cha asaḥ cha
vachas paspridhate | tayor yat satyaṁ yatarad riṣīyas tad it Somo avati
hanti asat | 13. Na vai u Somo vṛjīnāṁ hinoti na kṣattṛiyam mithuyā

511 Professor Aufrecht renders the last clause, "As long as days and dawns shall
continue."
dhārayantam | hanti raksho hanti asad vādantam ubhāv Indrasya prasitau sayate | 14. Yadi vā aham anṛita-devaḥ asa mogham vā devān api uhe Agne | kim asmabhyaṁ Jātavedo kṛiṇīše droghavāchas te nirṛtham sachantām | 15. Adya muriya yadi yātudhāno asmi yadi vā āyus tatapa pūruṣasya | adha sa virair dāsabhir vi gūyāḥ yo mā mogham “Yātudhāna” ity āha | 16. Yo mā ayātuṁ “yātudhāna” ity āha yo vā rakshāḥ “suchir asmi” ity āha | Indras taṁ hantu mahatā vadhena viś- vasya jantor adhamas padikṣta |“The intelligent man is well able to discriminate (when) true and false words contend together. Soma favours that one of them which is true and right, and annihilates falsehood. 13. Soma does not prosper the wicked, nor the man who wields power unjustly. He slays the Rakshas; he slays the liar: they both lie (bound) in the fetters of Indra. 14. If I were either a follower of false gods, or if I erroneously conceived of the gods, o Agni:—Why, o Jātavedas, art thou incensed against us? Let injurious speakers fall into thy destruction. 15. May I die this very day, if I be a Yātudhāna, or if I have destroyed any man’s life. May he be severed from his ten sons who falsely says to me, ‘o Yātudhāna.’ 16. He who says to me, who am no Yātu, ‘o Yātudhāna,’ or who (being himself) a Rakshas, says, ‘I am pure,’—may Indra smite him with his great weapon; may he sink down the lowest of all creatures.

In elucidation of this passage Sāyaṇa quotes the following lines:

Hatvā puttra-śatam pūreṇa Vasishṭhasya mahātmanāḥ | Vasishṭhām “rākshasā ’si tvam” Vasishṭhām rūpam āsthitah | “aham Vasishṭhāḥ” ity evam jighāṁsuḥ rākshasā ’bravīt | atrottarāḥ richo driṣṭaḥ Vasishṭheneti naḥ śrutam |

“Having slain the hundred sons of the great Vasishṭha, a murderous Rākṣas, assuming the form of that rishi, formerly said to him, ‘Thou art a Rākṣas, and I am Vasishṭha.’ In allusion to this the latter verses were seen by Vasishṭha, as we have heard.”

We may, however, safely dismiss this explanation resting on fabulous grounds.

The verses may, as Professor Max Müller supposes,112 have arisen out

112 “Vasishṭha himself, the very type of the Arian Brahm, when in feud with Viśvāmitra, is called not only an enemy, but a ‘Yātudhāna,’ and other names which in common parlance are only bestowed on barbarian savages and evil spirits. We
of Vasishṭha's contest with Viśvāmitra, and it may have been the latter personage who brought these charges of heresy, and of murderous and demoniacal character against his rival.\textsuperscript{113}

Allusion is made both in the Taittirīya Sanhitā and in the Kaushitakī Brāhmaṇa to the slaughter of a son of Vasishṭha by the sons or descendants of Sudās. The former work states, Ashtaka vii. (p. 47 of the India Office MS. No. 1702):

\textit{Vasishṭho hataputro kāmayata "vindeya prajām abhi Saudāsān bhaveyam" iti | sa etam ekasmāṇnapanchāsām apaśyat tam āharat tenāyajata | tato cai so'vindata prajām abhi Saudāsān abhavat|}

"Vasishṭha, when his son had been slain, desired, ‘May I obtain offspring; may I overcome the Saudāsas.’ He beheld this ekasmāṇnapanchāśa (?), he took it, and sacrificed with it. In consequence he obtained offspring, and overcame the Saudāsas."

The passage of the Kaushitakī Brāhmaṇa, 4th adhyāya, as quoted by Professor Weber (Ind. St. ii. 299) is very similar:

\textit{Vasishṭho kāmayata hata-putraḥ “prajāyeya prajayā paśubhir abhi Saudāsān bhaveyam” iti | sa etam yajna-kratum apaśyad Vasishṭha-yajnam . . . . tena ishtvā . . . . abhi Saudāsān abhavat|}

"Vasishṭha, when his son had been slain, desired, ‘May I be fruitful in offspring and cattle, and overcome the Saudāsas.’ He beheld this form of offering, the Vasishṭha-sacrifice; and having performed it, he overcame the Saudāsas."

In his introduction to Rig-veda, vii. 32, Sāyaṇa has the following notice from the Anukramanikā:

"Saudāsair agrau prakshiyamāṇaḥ Saktir antyam pragātham ālebhe so ‘rđhareḥ ukte ’dhyata | tam putrotaṁ Vasishṭhaḥ samāpayata” iti Sātyāyanakam |"Vasishṭhasya eva hata-putrasya ārsham” iti Tāṇḍakam|

"The Sātyayana Brāhmaṇa says that ‘Sakti (son of Vasishṭha), when being thrown into the fire by the Saudāsas, received (by inspiration) the concluding pragātha of the hymn. He was burnt after he had spoken half a rīch; and Vasishṭha completed what his son was have still the very hymn in which Vasishṭha deprecates such charges with powerful indignation.” Prof. Müller then quotes verses 14–16 of the hymn before us (‘‘Last Results of the Turanian Researches,” in Bunsen’s ‘‘Gutlines of the Philosophy of Univ. History,” i. 344.

\textsuperscript{113} See my article “On the relations of the priests to the other classes of Indian society in the Vedic age,” in the Journal Roy. As. Soc. for 1866, pp. 295 ff.
uttering. The Tāṇḍaka says that 'it was Vasishṭha himself who spoke the whole when his son was slain.'"

The words supposed to have been spoken by Sakti, viz. "O Indra, grant to us strength as a father to his sons" (Indra krataṁ naḥ ā bhara pitaḥ putreḥ sau yathā) do not seem to be appropriate to the situation in which he is said to have been placed; and nothing in the hymn appears to allude to any circumstances of the kind imagined in the two Brāhmaṇas.

Manu says of Vasishṭha (viii. 110): Maharśibhiś cha devaiś cha kāryyārthaṁ sapathaṁ kritāḥ | Vasishṭhaś cha piṛī ṣapathaṁ sepe Paiyavane nripe | “Great rishis and gods too have taken oaths for particular objects. Vasishṭha also swore an oath to king Paiyavana.” The occasion on which this was done is stated by the Commentator Kullūka: Vasishṭho ’py anena puttra-śatam bhakshitam iti Viśvāmitreṇa ākruṣto sva-parisuddhaye Piyaovanāpatye Sudāmīnī rājani ṣapathaṁ chakāra | “Vasishṭha being angrily accused by Viśvāmitra of having eaten (his) hundred sons, took an oath before king Sudāman (Sudās, no doubt, is meant) the son of Piyaavana in order to clear himself.” This seems to refer to the same story which is alluded to in the passage quoted by the Commentator on Rig-veda vii. 104, 12.

In the Rāmāyaṇa, i. 55, 5f., a hundred sons of Viśvāmitra are said to have been burnt up by the blast of Vasishṭha’s mouth when they rushed upon him armed with various weapons (Viśvāmitra-sutānāṁ tu śataṁ nānā-vidhyāuddham | abhyadhāvat susankruddhaṁ Vasishṭham japa- tāṁ varam | hunkareṇaiva tān sātvāṁ nirdadāḥa mahān rishiḥ).

Vasishṭha is also mentioned in Rig-veda, i. 112, 9, as having received succour from the Āśvins (—Vasishṭham yābhir ajarav ajīvatam).

Vasishṭha, or the Vasishṭhas, are also referred to by name in the following verses of the seventh Mandala of the Rig-veda: 7, 7; 9, 6; 12, 3; 23, 1, 6; 26, 5; 37, 4; 39, 7; 42, 6; 59, 3; 70, 6; 73, 3; 76, 6, 7; 77, 6; 80, 1; 90, 7; 95, 6; 96, 1, 3; but as no information is derivable from these texts, except that the persons alluded to were the authors or reciters of the hymns, it is needless to quote them.114

114 Another verse of a hymn in which the author is not referred to (vii. 72, 2) is as follows: A no decebhir upa yūtam arvak sajasvahā nāsatyā rathena | yuvor hi naḥ sakhyā pitrīṇī samāṇo bauddhur uṭa tasya vittam | “Come near to us, Āśvins, on the same ear with the gods: for we have ancestral friendships with you, a common relation; do ye recognize it.” Although this has probably no mythological
In the Atharva-veda, iv. 29, 3 and 5, Vasishtha and Visvāmitra are mentioned among other personages, Angiras, Agasti, Jamadagni, Atri, Kaśyapa, Bharadvāja, Gavishṭhira, and Kutsa, as being succoured by Mitra and Varuṇa (… yāv Angirasam avatoh yāv Agastim Mitrā Varuṇā Jamadagnim Atrim yau Kaśyapam avatoh yau Vasishtham … yau Bharadvajam avatoh yau Gavishṭhirāṁ Visvāmitraṁ Varuṇa Mitra Kutsam). And in the same Veda, xviii. 3, 15 f., they are invoked as deliverers: Visvāmitro 'yaṁ Jamadagnir Atrim avantu naḥ Kaśyapop Vāmadevaḥ | Visvāmitra Jamadagnē Vasishṭhā Bharadvājā Gotama Vāmadeva… | “15. May this Visvāmitra, may Jamadagni, Atri, Kaśyapa, Vāmadeva preserve us. 16. O Visvāmitra, o Jamadagni, o Vasishṭha, o Bharadvāja, o Gotama, o Vāmadeva.” The second passage at least must be a good deal more recent than the most of the hymns of the Rig-veda.

Sudās is mentioned in other parts of the Rig-veda without any reference either to Vasishṭha or to Visvāmitra. In some cases his name is coupled with that of other kings or sages, which appears to shew that in some of these passages at least a person, and not a mere epithet, “the liberal man,” is denoted by the word Sudās.

R.V. i. 47, 6. (The traditional rishi is Praskaṇva.) Sudāse daurrection vasu bibhratā rathe priksho vahatam Aśvinā | rayin samudrād uṣa vā divas pari asme dhattam puru-spriham |

“O impetuous Aśvins, possessing wealth in your car, bring sustenance to Sudās. Send to us from the (aerial) ocean, or the sky, the riches which are much coveted.”

Śayaṇa says the person here meant is “king Sudās, son of Pijavana” (Sudāsa . . . rājna Pijavana-pustrāya).

i. 63, 7. (The rishi is Nodhas, of the family of Gotama.) Tvaṁ ha tyad Indra sapta yudhyan puro vajrin Purukutsāya dardaḥ | bahrir na yat Sudāse vṛthā varga anho rājān varivah Pūrve kah |

“Thou didst then, o thundering Indra, war against, and shatter, the seven cities for Purukutsa, when thou, o king, didst without effort hurl reference, Śayaṇa explains it as follows: Vivasvān Varuṇaḥ cha uṣhāv api Kaśyapaḥ Aditer jītau | Vivasvān Aśvinor janaka Varuṇa Vasishṭhaya iti evam samāna-bahu-dhavem | “Vivasvat and Varuṇa were both sons of Kaśyapa and Aditi. Vivasvat was the father of the Aśvins and Varuṇa of Vasishṭha; such is the affinity.” Śayaṇa then quotes the Brihaddevatā to prove the descent of the Aśvins from Vivasvat. Compare R.V. x. 17, 1, 2, and Nirukta, xii. 10, 11.
away distress from Sudās like a bunch of grass, and bestow wealth on Pūrū.\textsuperscript{116}

\begin{itemize}
\item i. 112, 19. (The rishi is Kutsa.) . . . yābhir Sudāse uḥathuḥ sudyayāṁ tābhīr u śhu ātibhir Āśvinā gatam |
\item “Come, o Āśvins, with those succours whereby ye brought glorious power to Sudās” [‘son of Pijavana’—Sāyana].\textsuperscript{116}
\end{itemize}

The further texts which follow are all from the seventh Mandala, of which the rishis, with scarcely any exception, are said to be Vasishṭha and his descendants:

\begin{itemize}
\item vii. 19, 3. Tvaṁ dhrīshno dhrīshatā vitahavyam prāvo viśvābhir ātibhiḥ Sudāsah | pra Paurukutsiṁ Trasadasyum āvah kṣetrasātā vṛitrahat-yesu Pūrum |
\item “Thou, o fierce Indra, hast impetuously protected Sudās, who offered oblations, with every kind of succour. Thou hast preserved Trasadasyu the son of Purukutsa, and Pūrū in his conquest of land and in his slaughter of enemies.”
\item vii. 20, 2. Hantā Vṛittram Indraḥ śuśuvānah prāvid nu viro jari- tāram uti | kārtā Sudāse aha vai u lokaṁ dātā vasu mūhur u dāsūhe bhūt |
\item “Indra growing in force slays Vṛitra; the hero protects him who praises him; he makes room for Sudās [or the liberal sacrificer—kal- yāna-dānāya yajamānaya. Sāyana]; he gives riches repeatedly to his worshipper.”
\item vii. 25, 3. S'atam te śiprinn utayaḥ Sudāse sahasraṁ saṁsaḥ uṭa rātir astu | jahi vadhah vanusho marITYasya asmo dyumnam adhi ratnaṁ cha dhehi |
\item “Let a hundred succours come to Sudās, a thousand desirable (gifts) and prosperity. Destroy the weapon of the murderous. Confer renown and wealth on us.”
\end{itemize}

(Sāyana takes sudās here and in all the following citations to signify a “liberal man.”)

\textsuperscript{115} Professor Roth renders this passage differently in his Litt. u. Gesch. des Weda, p. 132; as does also Prof. Benfey, Orient und Occident, i. p. 590.

\textsuperscript{116} In R.V. i. 185, 9, we find the word sudās in the comparative degree sudāstar, where it must have the sense of “very liberal”: bhūri chīḍ aryaḥ sudāstarāya | “(give the wealth) of my enemy, though it be abundant to (me who am) most liberal.” In v, 53, 2, the term sudās appears to be an adjective: ā etāṁ raṭheṣu taschushhaḥ kah śūrīva kathā yayaḥ | kasmai nasraḥ sudāsa anu āpayaḥ śabhir vrishṭayaḥ saha | “Who has heard them (the Maruts) mounted on their ears, how they have gone? To what liberal man have they resorted as friends, (in the form of) showers with blessings?”
vii. 32. 10. **Nakīh Sudāso ratham pari āsa na rīramat | Indro yasya avitā yasya Maruto gamat sa gomati vraje |**

“No one can oppose or stop the chariot of Sudās. He whom Indra, whom the Maruts, protect, walks in a pasture filled with cattle.”

vii. 53, 3: **Uto hi vaṁ ratnadheyāni santi purūṇi dyāvā-prithivi Sudāse |**

“And ye, o Heaven and Earth, have many gifts of wealth for Sudās [or the liberal man].”

vii. 60, 8. **Yad gopāvad Aditiḥ śarma bhadram Mitro yachhanti Varuṇaḥ Sudāse | tasminn ā tokaṁ tanayaṁ dadhanāḥ mā karma deve-helanaṁ turāsaḥ | 9. ... pari deshabhir Āryamā vriṇaktu urum Sudāse evrishaṇau u lokam |**

“Since Aditi, Mitra, and Varuṇa afford secure protection to Sudās (or the liberal man), bestowing on him offspring;—may we not, o mighty deities, commit any offence against the gods. 9. ... May Aryaman rid us of our enemies. (Grant) ye vigorous gods, a wide space to Sudās.”

There is another passage, vii. 64, 3 (bravād yathā naḥ ād ariḥ Sudāse), to which I find it difficult to assign the proper sense.

Vasishṭha is referred to in the following passages of the Brāhmaṇas:

Kāthaka 37, 17. 117 **Rishayo vai Indram pratyakshaṁ na apakṣyaṁ tam Vasishṭhaḥ eva pratyasham apakṣyat | so ‘bībhod “itarebhyo mā rishi-bhyyah pravakhyaṭi” iti 118 | so ‘bravād “brāhmaṇaṁ te vakṣhyāmi yathā tvat-purohitah prajāḥ prajanishyante | atha mā itarebhyaḥ rishibhyo mā pravechaḥ” iti | tasmai etāṁ stoma-bhāgān abhavat tato Vasishṭha-purohitah prajāḥ prājayanta |**

“The rishis did not behold Indra face to face; it was only Vasishṭha who so beheld him. He (Indra) was afraid lest Vasishṭha should reveal him to the other rishis; and said to him, ‘I shall declare to thee a Brāhmaṇa in order that men may be born who shall take thee for their purohitas. Do not reveal me to the other rishis.’ Accordingly he declared to

---

117 Quoted by Professor Weber, Indische Studien, iii. 478.
118 The words from so ‘bībhod down to iti are omitted in the Taṅkt. Saṁhitā, iii. 6, 2, 2, where this passage is also found. Weber refers in Ind. St. ii. to another part of the Kāthaka, ii. 9, where Vasishṭha is alluded to as having “seen” a text beginning with the word purovāta during a time of drought (“Purovāta” iti vṛṣṭhy-apete bhūta-grūme Vasishṭha dādarā).
him these parts of the hymn. In consequence men were born who took Vasishtha for their purohita.”

Professor Weber refers in the same place to a passage of the Sata-patha Brähmana relating to the former superiority of Vasishtha’s family in sacred knowledge and priestly functions:

xii. 6, 1, 38. Vasishtha ha virajam vidâncakkâra tām ha Indro ’bhïdâdhya ...  

“Vasishtha was acquainted with the Viraj (a particular Vedic metre). Indra desired it; and said, ‘O rishi, thou knowest the Viraj: declare it to me.’ Vasishtha asked: ‘What (advantage) will result to me from doing so?’ (Indra replied) ‘I shall both explain to thee the forms for rectifying anything amiss (prâyaschitti) in the entire sacrifice, and show thee its form.’ Vasishtha further enquired, ‘If thou declarest to me the remedial rites for the entire sacrifice, what shall he become to whom thou wilt show the form?’ (Indra answered) ‘He shall ascend from this world to the heaven of life.’ The rishi then declared this Viraj to Indra, saying, ‘this is the Viraj.’ Wherefore it is he who obtains the most of this (Viraj) that becomes the most eminent. Then Indra explained to the rishi this remedial formula from the agnihotra to the great uktha. Formerly the Vasishthas alone knew these sacred syllables (vyâhriti). Hence in former times a Vasishtha only was a (priest of the kind called) brâhmân.”

Professor Weber quotes also the following from the Kâthaka 32, 2.

Yam abrâhmanâh prâsnâti sâ skannâ ahutis tasyâ vai Vasishthâh eva prâyaschittaṁ vidâncakkâra | “The oblation of which a person not a brâhman partakes is vitiated. Vasishtha alone knew the remedial rite for such a case.”

119 See above, p. 294.
In the Śadvimśa Brāhmaṇa of the Sāma-veda, quoted by the same writer (Ibid. i. 39, and described p. 37, as possessing a distinctly formed Brahmanical character indicating a not very early date), we have the following passage:

i. 5. Indro ha Viśvāmitrāya uktham uvācha Vasishṭhāya brahma vāg uktham ity eva Viśvāmitrāya mano brahma Vasishṭhāya | tad vai etad Vasishṭham brahma | api ha evaṁvidham vā Vasishṭham vā brahmāṇam kureita |

"Indra declared the uktha (hymn) to Viśvāmitra, and the brāhmāṇ (devotion) to Vasishṭha. The uktha is expression (vāk); that (he made known) to Viśvāmitra; and the brāhmāṇ is the soul; that (he made known) to Vasishṭha. Hence this brāhmāṇ (devotional power) belongs to the Vasishṭhas. Moreover, let either a person of this description, or a man of the family of Vasishṭha, be appointed a brāhmāṇ-priest."

Here the superiority of Vasishṭha over Viśvāmitra is clearly asserted.120

Vasishṭha is mentioned in the Mahābhārata, Santip. verses 11221 ff., as having communicated divine knowledge to king Janaka, and as referring (see verses 11232, 11347, 11409, 11418, 11461, etc.) to the Sāṅkhya and Yoga systems. The sage is thus characterized:

11221. Vasishṭhaṁ kṛṣṇaṁ āśīnam rishināṁ bhāskara-dyutim | pa- praekha Janako rājā jñānaṁ naiśreyasam param | param adhyātma- kusalam adhātma-gati-nīchhayam | Maitrāvarūpin āśīnam abhīvādyā kṛitānjalīḥ |

"King Janaka with joined hands saluted Vasishṭha the son of Mitra and Varuṇa, the highest and most excellent of rishis, resplendent as the sun, who was acquainted with the Supreme Spirit, who had ascertained the means of attaining to the Supreme Spirit; and asked him after that highest knowledge which leads to final beatitude."

The doctrine which the saint imparts to the king he professes to have derived from the eternal Hiranyagarbha, i.e. Brahmā (avāptam etad hi mayā sanātanaḥ Hiranyagarbhād gadato narādhipa).

I have already in former parts of this volume quoted passages from Manu, the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, and the Mahābhārata, regarding the creation

120 Professor Weber mentions (Ind. St. i. 53) that in the commentary of Rāmakṛṣṇa on the Pāraskara Grihya Sūtras allusion is made to the "Chhandogas who follow the Sūtras of the Vasishṭha family" Viśisṭha-sūtrānuchāriṇāś chhandogāh).
of Vasishtha. The first-named work (see above, p. 36) makes him one of ten Maharshis created by Manu Svāyambhuva in the first (or Svāyambhuva) Manvantara. The Vishnu Purāṇa (p. 65) declares him to have been one of nine mind-born sons or Brahmās created by Brahmā in the Manvantara just mentioned. The same Purāṇa, however, iii. 1, 14, makes him also one of the seven rishis of the existing or Vaivasvata Manvantara, of which the son of Vivasvat, Srūddhadeva, is the Manu (Vivasvataḥ upto vipra Srūddhadevo mahādyutih | Manuḥ samvarttate dhīmān sāmprataḥ saptame 'ntare . . . Vasishṭhaḥ Kāśyapa ‘thātir Jamadagniḥ sa-Gautamaḥ | Viscāmitra-Bharadeujau sapta saptarshayo 'bhavan). The Mahābhārata (see p. 122) varies in its accounts, as in one place it does not include Vasishtha among Brahmā’s six mind-born sons, whilst in a second passage it adds him to the number which is there raised to seven, and in a third text describes him as one of twenty-one Prajāpatis.

According to the Vishnu Purāṇa, i. 10, 10, “Vasishtha had by his wife Ürjā” (one of the daughters of Daksha, and an allegorical personage, see V. P. i. 7, 18), seven sons called Rajas, Gātra, Ürddhvabāhu, Savana, Anagha, Sutapas, and Sukra, who were all spotless rishis” (Ürjāyaṁ cha Vasishṭhasya saptājāyantena vai sutāḥ | Rajo- Gātrođhva-bāhuṣa Savanaḥ čānaghaḥ tathā | Sutapaḥ Śukraḥ ity ece sarve saptarshayo ’malāḥ). This must be understood as referring to the Svāyambhuva Manvantara. The Commentator says these sons were the seven rishis in the third Manvantara (saptarşhayas triśya- manvantare). In the description of that period the V. P. merely says, without naming them (iii. 1, 9) that “the seven sons of Vasishtha were the seven rishis” (Vasishṭha-tanayās tatra saptā saptarshayo ’bhavan). The Bhāgavata Purāṇa (iv. 1, 40 f.) gives the names of Vasishtha’s sons differently; and also specifies Saktri and others as the offspring of a different marriage. (Compare Professor Wilson’s notes on these passages of the Vishnu Purāṇa.)

121 See above p. 209, note 66, and pp. 188 ff.
122 In another verse also (Adip. 6638, which will be quoted below in a future section) he is said to be a mind-born son of Brahmā.
123 Ürjā, who in the Vishnu P. iii. 1, 6, is stated to be one of the rishis of the second or Svārochisha Manvantara, is said in the Vāyu P. to be a son of Vasishtha. See Professor Wilson’s note (vol. iii. p. 3) on Vishnu P. iii. 1, 6. The Vāyu P. also declares that one of the rishis in each of the fourth and fifth Manvantaras was a son of Vasishtha. (See Prof. Wilson’s notes (vol. iii. pp. 8 and 11) on Vishnu P. iii. 1.)
In Manu, ix. 22 f., it is said that “a wife acquires the qualities of the husband with whom she is duly united, as a river does when blended with the ocean. 23. Akshamālā, though of the lowest origin, became honourable through her union with Vasishṭha, as did also Sārangī through her marriage with Mandapāla” (Yādīg-guṇena bhārtrā strī saṁyujyate yathāvaidhi | tādīg-guṇā sat brahavi samudreṇeva nimnagā | 23. Akshamālā Vasishṭhena saṁyuktā 'dhamā-yoni-jā | Sārangī Mandāpalena jagāmābhyarhaṇīyatām).

Vasishṭha’s wife receives the same name (Vasishṭhas chākshamālayā) in a verse of the Mahābhārata (Udyogaparvan, v. 3970), but in two other passages of the same work, which will be adduced further on, she is called Arundhati.125

According to the Vishṇu Purāṇa (ii. 10, 8) Vasishṭha is one of the superintendents who in the month of Āśaḍha abide in the Sun’s chariot, the others being Varuṇa, Rambhā, Sahajanyā, Huhu, Budha, and Rathachitra (Vasishṭho Varuṇo Rambhā Sahajanyā Huhur Budhah | Rathachitra sathā Sūkrezavanthy Āśaḍhā-sañjīte); whilst in the month of Phalguna (ibid. v. 16) the rival sage Viśvāmitra exercises the same function along with Vishṇu, Aśvatara, Rambhā, Sūryavarchas, Satyajit, and the Rākṣasas Yajñāpeta (śrūyatāṁ chāpare sūrye phalguninevasantiye | Vishnur Aśvataro Rambhā Sūryavarchāḥ cha Satyajit | Viśvāmitras tathā raksho Yajñāpeto mahātmanah).

At the commencement of the Vāyu Purāṇa Vasishṭha is characterized as being the most excellent of the rishis (rishīnāṁ cha varishṭhāya Vasishṭhāya mahātmane).

It is stated in the Vishṇu Purāṇa, iii. 3, 9, that the Vedas have been already divided twenty-eight times in the course of the present or Vaivasvata Manvantara; and that this division has always taken place in the Dvāpara age of each system of four yugas. In the first Dvāpara Brahmā Svayambhū himself divided them; in the sixth Mrītyu (Death, or Yama); whilst in the eighth Dvāpara it was Vasishṭha who was the Vyāsa or divider (Ashtāvīṁśatikrite vai vedāḥ vyastāḥ maharshibhiḥ | Vaivasvate ‘ntare tasmin deśapareṣhu punah punah | . . . 10. Dvāpare prathame vyastāḥ svayāṁ vedāḥ Svayambhuvā | . . . 11. . . . Mrītyuḥ shasṭhe smṛitah prabhum | . . . Vasishṭhas chāṣhtame smṛitah).

124 Two lines below Haimavati is mentioned as the wife of Viśvāmitra (Haimavatyā cha Kauśikā).
125 In the St. Petersburg Lexicon akshamāla is taken for an epithet of Arundhati.
Vasishṭha was, as we have seen above, the family-priest of Nimi, son of Ikshvāku, who was the son of Manu Vaivasvata, and the first prince of the solar race of kings; and in a passage of the Mahābhārata, Ādip. (6643 f.), which will be quoted in a future section, he is stated to have been the purohita of all the kings of that family. He is accordingly mentioned in Vishṇu Purāṇa, iv. 3, 18, as the religious teacher of Sagara, the thirty-seventh in descent from Ikshvāku (tatt-kula-gurun Vasishṭham sarayam jagmuḥ); and as conducting a sacrifice for Saudāsa or Mitrasaha, a descendant in the fiftieth generation of the same prince (Vishṇu P. iv. 4, 25, Kālena gachhatā sa Saudāso yajnam ayajat | parinishtīta-yajne cha ächāryyo Vasishṭhe nishkrānte ityādi).

Vasishṭha is also spoken of in the Rāmāyana, ii. 110, 1 (see above, p. 115), and elsewhere (ii. 111, 1, etc.), as the priest of Rāma, who appears from the Vishṇu Purāṇa, (iv. 4, 40, and the preceding narrative), to have been a descendant of Ikshvāku in the sixty-first generation.126

Vasishṭha, according to all these accounts, must have been possessed of a vitality altogether superhuman; for it does not appear that any of the accounts to which I have referred intend under the name of Vasishṭha to denote merely a person belonging to the family so called, but to represent the founder of the family himself as taking part in the transactions of many successive ages.

It is clear that Vasishṭha, although, as we shall see, he is frequently designated in post-vedic writings as a Brāhman, was, according to some other authorities I have quoted, not really such in any proper sense of the word, as in the accounts which are there given of his birth he is declared to have been either a mind-born son of Brahmā, or the son of Mitra, Varuṇa, and the Apsaras Urvasī, or to have had some other supernatural origin.

Sect. VII.—Viśvāmitra.

Viśvāmitra is stated in the Anukramaṇikā, as quoted by Sāyaṇa at the commencement of the third Maṇḍala of the Rig-veda, to be the rishi, or “seer,” of that book of the collection: Asya maṇḍala-drashaṭā

126 Rāma’s genealogy is also given in the Rāmāyana, i. 70, and ii. 110, 6 ff., where, however, he is said to be only the thirty-third or thirty-fourth from Ikshvāku.
Viśvāmitraḥ rishiḥ | “The rishi of this (the first hymn) was Viśvāmitra, the ‘seer’ of the Maṇḍala.” This, however, is to be understood with some exceptions, as other persons, almost exclusively his descendants, are said to be the rishis of some of the hymns.

I shall quote such passages as refer, or are traditionally declared to refer, to Viśvāmitra or his family.

In reference to the thirty-third hymn the Nirukta states as follows:

ii. 24. Tatra itihāsam āchakshate | Viśvāmitraḥ rishiḥ Sudāsah Paijavanasya purohito babhūvā . . . . | sa vītaṁ grihitva Vīpāt-chhutudryoḥ sambhedam āyayau | anuyayur itare | sa Viśvāmitro naḍis tushṭāva “gā- dhāḥ bhavata” iti |

“They there relate a story. The rishi Viśvāmitra was the purohita of Sudās, the son of Pijavana. (Here the etymologies of the names Viśvāmitra, Sudās, and Pijavana are given.) Taking his property, he came to the confluence of the Vipāś and Sutudrī (Sutlej); others followed. Viśvāmitra lauded the rivers (praying them to) become fordable.”

Sāyāna expands the legend a little as follows:

Purā kila Viśvāmitraḥ Paijavanasya Sudāsō rājanaḥ purohito babhūva | sa cha paurohityena labdha-dhanaḥ sarvan dhanam ādaya Vīpāt-chhutudryoḥ sambhedam āyayau | anuyayur itare | athottīṁśhur Viśvāmitro ‘gādhā-jale te nadyau drishtiścā uttaranyaṁśham ādyābhīḥ tisrībhīḥ tushṭāva’ |

“Formerly Viśvāmitra was the purohita of king Sudās, the son of Pijavana. He, having obtained wealth by means of his office as purohita, took the whole of it, and came to the confluence of the Vipāś and the Sutudrī. Others followed. Being then desirous to cross, but perceiving that the waters of the rivers were not fordable, Viśvāmitra, with the view of getting across lauded them with the first three verses of the hymn.”

The hymn makes no allusion whatever to Sudās, but mentions the son of Kuśika (Viśvāmitra) and the Bhārataś. It is not devoid of poetical beauty, and is as follows:

R.V. iii. 33, 1 (= Nirukta, ix. 39). Prā parcatānāṁ uṣatī upasthād aśve iva vishlita hāsamāne | gāveva śubhre mātarā rihāge Vīpāṭ Chhutudrī payasā jave | 2. Indreshite prasavam bhikshamāne achha samudrām rathyā iva yaṭhaḥ | samāraṇe ūrmiḥpiṇcavāne anyā rām anyām api eti śubhre | 3. Achha sindhum mātritamām ayāsam Vipāṣam ūrvīṁ
THE BRAHMANS AND KSHATTRIYAS.


1. (Viśvāmitra speaks): Hastening eagerly from the heart of the mountains, contending like two mares let loose, like two bright mother-cows licking (each her calf), the Vipāś and Sutudṛi rush onward with their waters. 2. Impelled by Indra, seeking a rapid course, ye move towards the ocean, as if mounted on a car. Running together, as ye do, swelling with your waves, the one of you joins the other, ye bright streams. 3. I have come to the most motherly stream; we have arrived at the broad and beautiful Vipāś; proceeding, both of them, like two mother(-cows) licking each her calf, to a common receptacle. 4. (The rivers reply): Here swelling with our waters we move forward to the receptacle fashioned by the gods (the ocean); our headlong course cannot be arrested. What does the sage desire that he invokes the rivers? 5. (Viśvāmitra says): Stay your course for a moment, ye pure streams, (yielding) to my pleasant words. 128 With a powerful prayer, I, the son

127 Prof. Roth (Illustr. of Nirukta, p. 133) refers to vii. 2. 5 (pūrvi śīuṁ na maṭara śīhāne) as a parallel passage.
128 Prof. Roth (Litt. u. Gesch. des Weda, p. 103) renders: "Listen joyfully for a
of Kuśika, 129 desiring succour, invoke the river. 6. (The rivers answer): Indra, the wielder of the thunderbolt, has hollowed out our channels; he has smitten Ahi who hemmed in the streams. Savitri the skilful-handed has led us hither; by his impulse we flow on in our breadth. 7. For ever to be celebrated is the heroic deed of Indra, that he has split Vrittra in sunder. He smote the obstructions with his thunderbolt; and the waters desiring an outlet went on their way. 8. Do, not, o utterer of praises, forget this word, which future ages will re-echo to thee. In hymns, o bard, show us thy devotion; do not humble us before men; reverence be paid to thee. 9. (Viśvāmitra says): Listen, o sisters, to the bard who has come to you from afar with waggon and chariot. Sink down; become fordaible; reach not up to our chariots-axles with your streams. 10. (The rivers answer): We shall listen to thy words, o bard; thou hast come from far with waggon and chariot. I will bow down to thee like a woman with full breast 130 (suckling her child); as a maid to a man will I throw myself open to thee. 11. (Viśvāmitra says): When the Bharatas, 131 that war-loving tribe, sent forward, impelled by Indra, have crossed thee, then thy headlong current shall hold on its course. I seek the favour of you the adorabele. 12. The war-loving Bharatas have crossed; the Sage has obtained the favour of the rivers. Swell on impetuous, and fertilising; fill your channels; roll rapidly.”

The next quotation is from the fifty-third hymn of the same third Maṇḍala, verses 6 ff.:

6. Apāh somam astam Indra pra yāhi kalyānitr jāyā suraṇaṁ grihe moment to my amiable speech, ye streams rich in water; stay your progress;” and adds in a note: “I do not connect the particle upa with ramadheam, as the Nirukta and Śāyaṇa do; the fact that upa stands in another Pāda (quarter of the verse) requires a different explanation. The most of those interpretations of the Commentator which destroy the sense have their ultimate ground in the circumstance that he combines the words of different divisions of the verse; and any one may easily convince himself that every Pāda has commonly a separate sense, and is far more independent of the others than is the case in the sloka of later times.” In his Lexicon Roth renders ritēvari in this passage by “regular,” “equally flowing.”

129 “Kusika was a king” (Kusiko rājā babhūva. Nir. ii. 25). Śāyaṇa calls him a royal rishi.

130 This is the sense assigned by Prof. Roth, s.v. pī to pīpyōnī. Śāyaṇa, following Yāska, ii. 27, gives the sense “suckling her child.” Prof. Aufrecht considers that the word means “pregnant.” In the next clause śāvachai is rendered in the manner suggested by Prof. A., who compares R.V. x. 18, 11, 12.

131 “The men of the family of Bharata, my people” (Bharata-kulā-jāh madiyāḥ sarve.” Śāyaṇa).

132 Sāyāṇa says that the liberal men are the Kshattriyas, sons of Sudās, that virūpāḥ means their different priests of the race of Angiras, Medhātithi, and others, and that the sons of the sky are the Maruts, the sons of Rudra (Imē yaṁgān kureṇāṁ bhojāḥ Saudāśāḥ kṣattriyāḥ teḥāṁ yājakaḥ virūpāḥ nānārūpāḥ Medhātithi-prabhrīta-yagya 'ngirasā cha dieo 'surasya deśhbyo 'pi balavato Rudrasva putrāṣo . . . . Maruṭaḥ). The Virūpas are connected with Angiras in R.V. x. 62, 5; and a Virūpa is mentioned in i. 45, 3; and viii. 64, 6.
Dyaus (sky), bestowing wealth upon Viśvāmitra at the sacrifice with a thousand libations, prolong their lives. 8. The opulent god (Indra) constantly assumes various forms, exhibiting with his body illusive appearances; since he came from the sky thrice in a moment, drinking (soma) according to his own will, at other than the stated seasons, and yet observing the ceremonial. 9. The great rishi, god-born, god-impelled, leader of men, stayed the watery current; when Viśvāmitra conducted Sūdās, Indra was propitiated through the Kuśikas. 10. Like swans, ye make a sound with the (soma-crushing) stones, exulting with your hymns when the libation is poured forth; ye Kuśikas, sage rishis, leaders of men, drink the honied soma with the gods. 11. Approach, ye Kuśikas, be alert; let loose the horse of Sūdās to (conquer) riches; let the king smite strongly his enemy in the east, the west, and the north; and then let him sacrifice on the most excellent (spot) of the earth. 12. I Viśvāmitra have caused both heaven and earth to sing the praises of Indra; and my prayer protects the race of Bharata. 13. The Viśvāmitras have offered up prayer to Indra the thunderer. May he render us prosperous! 14. What are thy cows doing among the Kīkaṭas, who neither draw from them the milk (which is to be mixed with soma), nor heat the sacrificial kettle. Bring to us the wealth of Pramaganda; subdue to us the son of Nīchāsākha. 15. Moving swiftly, removing poverty, brought by the Jamadagnis, she has mightily uttered her voice: this daughter of the sun has conveyed (our) renown, eternal and undecaying, (even) to the gods. 16. Moving swiftly she has speedily brought down (our) renown from them to the five races of men; this winged goddess whom the aged Jamadagnis brought to us, has conferred on us new life.” Omitting verses

123 Verses 9–13 are translated by Prof. Roth, Litt. u. Gesch. des Weda, p. 106 f.
124 Comp. M. Bh. Ādip. v. 6695. *Apibach cha tataḥ somam Indreṇa saha Kauśikāḥ* | “And then the Kauśika drank soma with Indra.”
125 Compare R.V. iii. 23, 4, which will be quoted below.
126 Compare R.V. iv. 17, 1.
127 *Kīkaṭaḥ nāma desō ‘nāryya-nīśīṣaḥ* | “Kīkaṭa is a country inhabited by people who are not Āryas.” See the second vol. of this work, p. 362, and Journ. Royal As. Soc. for 1866, p. 340.
128 *Pakṣyā.* This word is rendered by Sāyaṇa “the daughter of the sun who causes the light and dark periods of the moon, etc.” *(Pakṣaya pakṣhōdi-nirvāhākṣaya Sūryasya duḥhitō).* Prof. Roth s.v. thinks the word may mean “she who changes according to the (light and dark) fortnights.”
17–20 we have the following: "21. Prosper us to-day, o opulent Indra, by numerous and most excellent succours. May he who hates us fall down low; and may breath abandon him whom we hate." This is succeeded by three obscure verses, of which a translation will be attempted further on.

Sāyaṇa prefaces verses 15 and 16 by a quotation from Śaṅgurūśishya's Commentary on the Anukramaṇikā, which is given with an addition in Weber's Indische Studien i. 119 f. as follows: Sasarpāri-de-riche prāhur itiḥāsam purāvidāḥ | Saudāsa-nripater yajne Vaisiṣṭhāt-maṇa-Saktiṇā | Viśvāmitrasyāḥbhātām baldam vāk cha samantataḥ | Vāisishṭhenāḥbhātāḥ sa hy avāśidach cha Gādhi-jāḥ | tasmai Brāhmaṇu tu Sauriṇi vā namnā vāchaḥ Saudāsa | Sūrya-vēśamaṇa āhritya dadur vai Jamadagnyaḥ | Kuśikānāṁ tataḥ sā vān manān chintām athānudat | upapreteti Kuśikān Vīśvāmitro 'nvachodayat | labdhevā vāchaḥ cha hriṣṭāṁma Jamadagnīn apūjayaḥ | "Sasarpāri" iti deśbhyāṁ riṣbhyaṁ Vācham stuvam svayam | "Regarding the two verses beginning "Sasarpāri" those acquainted with antiquity tell a story. At a sacrifice of king Saudāsa129 the power and speech of Vīśvāmitra were completely vanquished by Sakti, son of Vaisiṣṭha; and the son of Gādhi (Vīśvāmitra) being so overcome, became dejected. The Jamadagnīs drew from the abode of the Sun a Voice called "Sasarpāri," the daughter of Brahmā, or of the Sun, and gave her to him. Then that voice somewhat dispelled the disquiet of the Jamadagnīs [or, according to the reading of this line given by Sāyaṇa (Kuśikānāṁ maṭiḥ sā vāg amatiṁ tām apānudat) “that Voice, being intelligence, dispelled the unintelligence of the Kuśikas.”]. Vīśvāmitra then incited the Kuśikas with the words upapretā 'approach' (see verse 11). And being gladened by receiving the Voice, he paid homage to the Jamadagnīs; praising them with the two verses beginning ‘Sasarpāriḥ.’"

In regard to the verses 21–24 Sāyaṇa has the following remarks: "Indra utibhir ity adyāṁ chatauro Vasishṭha-devakṣyāḥ | purā khalu Vīśvāmitra-sishyaḥ Sudāḥ nāma rājaśhir āsīt | sa cha kenachit kāraṇena Vasishṭha-devahyo 'bhūt | Vīśvāmitras tu sishyasya rakshārtham abhir pīghbir Vasishṭham aṣapat | imāḥ abhīṣāpa-rūpaḥ | tāḥ rīco Vasishṭhāḥ na śrīṇvanti | "The four verses beginning ‘o Indra, with succours’ express hatred to Vasishṭha. There was formerly a royal rishi called

129 The Bṛihṣadvatā, which has some lines nearly to the same effect as these I have quoted (see Ind. Stud. i. 119), gives Sudās instead of Saudāsa.
Sudāsa, a disciple of Viśvāmitra; who for some reason had incurred the ill-will of Vasishṭha. For his disciple's protection Viśvāmitra cursed Vasishṭha in these verses. They thus consist of curses, and the Vasishṭhas do not listen to them."

In reference to the same passage the Brāhadevaṭā iv. 23 f., as quoted in Indische Studien, i. 120, has the following lines: Parāś chatasro yās tattva Vasishṭha-deeshinir viduḥ | Viśvāmitreṇa tāḥ proktāḥ abhīsāpāḥ iti smṛtāḥ | deesha-deeshaś tu tāḥ proktāḥ vidyāḥ chaivebhichārikāḥ | Vasishṭhāś tu na śriṇvanti tad āchāryaka-sammatam | kirttanāḥ chhara-vanāḥ va 'pi mahān doṣaḥ pra+jāyate | śatadhā bhidyate mūrdhā kṛitti-tena śrutena va | teshāṁ bālaḥ pramiyante tasmāt tāṁ tu na kṛttayet |

"The other four verses of that hymn, which are regarded as expressing hatred to Vasishṭha, were uttered by Viśvāmitra, and are traditionally reported to contain imprecations. They are said to express hatred in return for (?) hatred, and should also be considered as incantations. The descendants of Vasishṭha do not listen to them, as this is the will of their preceptor. Great guilt is incurred by repeating or hearing them. The heads of those who do so are split into a hundred fragments; and their children die. Wherefore let no one recite them."

Durgā, the commentator on the Nirukta, in accordance with this injunction and warning, says in reference to verse 23: Yasmin nigame esha sabdaḥ (lodhaḥ) sa Vasishṭhadeeshini rik | ahaṁ cha Kāpiṣṭhālo Vasishṭhāḥ | atas tāṁ na niribrāvimi | "The text in which this word (lodha) occurs is a verse expressing hatred of Vasishṭha. But I am a Kāpiṣṭhāla of the family of Vasishṭha; and therefore do not interpret it."

The following text also may have reference to the personal history of Viśvāmitra: R.V. iii. 43, 4. Ācha tevāṁ etā vrishaya vahāto hari sakhaya sudhura svangā | dhānāvad Indraḥ savanām jushānaḥ sakhā sakhyah śriṇvad vandanāni | 5. Kuvid mā gopaṁ karase janasya kuid rājanaṁ maghavann riṣiśhin | kuvid mā rishim papivāmsaṁ sutasya kuid me vasvo anritasya śikshaḥ [ "4. May these two vigorous brown steeds, friendly, well-yoked, stout-limbed, convey thee hither. May Indra gratified by our libation mingled with grain, hear (like) a friend, the praises of a friend. 5. Wilt thou make me a ruler of the people? wilt

thou make me a king, o impetuous lord of riches? wilt thou make me a rishi a drinker of soma? wilt thou endow me with imperishable wealth?"

The next passage refers to Devaśravas and Devavāta, of the race of Bharata, who are called in the Anukramanikā, quoted by Śaṇḍa, "sons of Bharata" (Bharatasya putrau); but one of whom at least is elsewhere, as we shall see, said to be a son of Viśvāmitra: R.V. iii. 23, 2. Amanthiśtām Bhārata revad Agnīm Devaśravāḥ Devavātāḥ sudaksam | Agne vi paśya bhrīhata' bhī rāyā iṣṭāḥ no netā bhavatād anu dyān | 3. Daśa kṣhipāḥ pūrvyān sim ajījanan sujātam mātriṣhu priyam | Agniṁ stuhi Daivaścātaṁ Devaśravo yo janānāṁ asad vaśi | 4. Ni te dādeh vare ā pṛthiviyaḥ ilāyāṁ pade sudinatvē aṁnāṁ | Drishadvatāyāṁ mānushe Āpayāyāṁ Sarasvatāyāṁ revad Agne didīhi | "2. The two Bhāratas Devaśravas and Devavāta have brilliantly created by friction the powerful Agni. Look upon us, o Agni, manifesting thyself with much wealth; be a bringer of nourishment to us every day. 3. The ten fingers (of Devavāta) have generated the ancient god, happily born and dear to his mothers. Praise, o Devaśravas, Agni, the offspring of Devavāta, who has become the lord of men. 4. I placed (or he placed) thee on the most excellent spot of earth on the place of worship, at an auspicious time. Shine, o Agni, brilliantly on the (banks of the) Dṛishadvatī, on (a site) auspicious for men, on (the banks of) the Āpayā, of the Sarasvati."

Viśvāmitra is mentioned along with Jamadagni in the fourth verse of the 167th hymn of the tenth Maṇḍala, which is ascribed to these two sages as its authors: Prasūto bhaksham akaram charāv api stomāṁ cheham prathamāḥ sūrir un mṛje | sute sātena yadi āgamaṁ vām prati Viśvāmitra-Jamadagnī dame | "Impelled, I have quaffed this draught of soma when the oblation of boiled rice was presented; and I, the first bard, prepare this hymn, whilst I have come to you, o Viśvāmitra and Jamadagni in the house, with that which has been offered as a libation."

The family of the Viśvāmitras has, as we have seen, been already mentioned in R.V. iii. 53, 13. They are also named in the following passages:

iii. 1, 21. Janman janman nihito Jātavedāḥ Viśvāmitrebhir idhyate ajasraḥ |
"The undecaying Jātavedas (Agni) placed (on the hearth) is in every
generation kindled by the Viśvāmitras."

iii. 18, 4. Uch chhochisha sahasas putraḥ stuto bhīhad vayaḥ kabamā-
neshu dhehi | revād Agne Viśvāmitresu saṁ yor marmrijma te tanvam
bhūri krivāḥ |

"Son of strength, when lauded, do thou with thy upward flame
inspire vigorous life into thy worshippers; (grant) o Agni, brilliant
good fortune and prosperity to the Viśvāmitras; many a time have we
given lustre to thy body."

x. 89, 17. Eva te vayam Indra bhunjatināṁ vidyāma sumatināṁ navā-
nāṁ | vidyāma vastor avasā grīṇanto Viśvāmitraḥ uta te Indra nānām |

"Thus may we obtain from thee new favours to delight us: and
may we, Viśvāmitras, who praise thee, now obtain riches through thy
help, o Indra."

This hymn is ascribed in the Anukramaṇī to Renu, the son or
descendant of Viśvāmitra; and the 18th verse is identical with the
22nd of the 30th hymn of the third Maṇḍala, which is said to be Viś-
vāmitra's production.

In a verse already quoted (R.V. iii. 33, 11) Viśvāmitra is spoken of
as the son of Kuśika; at least the Nirukta regards that passage as
referring to him; and the Kuśikas, who no doubt belonged to the
same family as Viśvāmitra, are mentioned in another hymn which I
have cited (iii. 53, 9, 10). They are also alluded to in the following
texts:

R.V. iii. 26, 1. Vaiśvānaram manasaś 'gniśā nichāyya havishmanto anu-
shatayaṁ svarvidam | sudānum devaṁ rathirāṁ vasūyavo girbhiḥ raṇvaṁ
Kuśikāso havāmahe | . . . . 3. Aśca na krundan janibhiḥ sam idhyate
Vaiśvānaraḥ Kuśikebhir yuge yuge | sa no Agniḥ swarvaṁ svaśvaṁ da-
dhātu ratnam amrītesu jāgrīvīḥ |

"We, the Kuśikas, presenting oblations, and desiring riches, revering
in our souls, as is meet,142 the divine Agni Vaiśvānara, the heavenly,
the bountiful, the charioteer, the pleasant, invoke him with hymns.
. . . . 3. Vaiśvānara, who (crackles) like a neighing horse, is kindled
by the Kuśikas with the mothers (i.e. their fingers) in every age. May

142 This is the sense of anuṣhatayaṁ according to Prof. Aufrecht. Sāyaṇa makes it
one of the epithets of Agni "he who is true to his promise in granting rewards
according to works" (sātyenauxataṁ karmānurūpa-phāla-pradāne sātya-pratijñāṇi).
this Agni, who is ever alive among the immortals, bestow on us wealth, with vigour and with horse.”

iii. 29, 15. \textit{Amitrāyudho Marutāṁ iva prayāḥ prathamajāḥ brahmaṇo viśvam īd viduḥ | dyumnavad brahma Kuśikāsah ā ārire ekaḥ eko dama Agniṁ sam idhīre |}

“Combating their enemies like the hosts of the Maruts, (the sages) the first-born of prayer\textsuperscript{142} know everything; the Kuśikas have sent forth an enthusiastic prayer; they have kindled Agni, each in his own house.”

iii. 30, 20. \textit{Imāṁ kānatam mandaya gobhir aśvaṁ chandrāvatā rūdhasā paprathāṣ cha | svaryavo matibhis tubhyam viprāḥ Indrāya vāhaḥ Kuśī- kāso akran |}

“Gratify this (our) desire with kine and horses; and prosper us with brilliant wealth. The wise Kuśikas, desiring heaven, have with their minds composed for thee a hymn.”

iii. 42, 9. \textit{Tvāṁ sutasya pitaye pratham Indra havāmahe | Kuśikāso avasyavah |}

“We, the Kuśikas, desiring succour, summon thee the ancient Indra to drink the soma libation.”

It will be seen from these passages that the Viśvāmitras and the Kuśikas assert themselves to have been ancient worshippers of Agni, and to be the composers of hymns, and the possessors of all divine knowledge.

In the eleventh verse of the tenth hymn of the first Maṇḍala of the R.V., of which the traditional author is Madhuchhandas of the family of Viśvāmitra, the epithet \textit{Kauṣika} is applied to Indra: \textit{Ā tu naḥ Indra Kauṣika mandasānaḥ sutam pība | navyam āyuḥ pra sutira kridhi sahasra-sām rishim | “Come, Indra, Kauṣika, drink our oblation with delight. Grant me new and prolonged life; make the rishi the possessor of a thousand boons.”}

Sāyaṇa explains the epithet in question as follows: \textit{Kauṣika Kuṣikasya putra ... yadyapi Viṣvāmitro Kuṣikasya putras tathāpi tad- rūpeṇa Indrasya eva utpattatcāt Kuṣika-putravam aviruddham | ayaṁ vṛttānto ’nukramaṇīkāyam uktah | “Kuṣikas tv Aishvāraṁ Indra-}

\textsuperscript{142} Compare with this the epithet of \textit{deva}, “god-born,” applied to Viśvāmitra in iii. 53, 9 (above p. 342); and the claim of knowledge made for the Vasishṭhas in vii. 33, 7 (above p. 320).
tulyam putram ichhan brahmacharyaṁ chachāra | tasya Indraḥ eva Gāthī
putro jajne" iti | "Kauśika means the son of Kuśika . . . Although Viśvāmitra was the son of Kuśika, yet, as it was Indra who was born in his form, there is nothing to hinder Indra being the son of Kuśika. This story is thus told in the Anukramaṇīkā: 'Kuśika, the son of Ishīratha desiring a son like Indra, lived in the state of a Brahmachārīn. It was Indra who was born to him as his son Gāthin.' To this the Anukramaṇī (as quoted by Prof. Müller, Rig-veda, vol. ii. pref. p. xl.) adds the words: Gāthino Viśvāmitraḥ | sa trītyam maṇḍalam apaśyat | "The son of Gāthin was Viśvāmitra, who saw the third Maṇḍala." In quoting this passage Professor Müller remarks: "According to Shād-gurusīshya this preamble was meant to vindicate the Rishitva of the family of Viśvāmitra:144 Saty apavāde svayam riṣhitvam anubhavato Viśvāmitra-gotrasya vivakshayā iṣṭānāṁ āha' | "Wishing to declare the rishihood of the family of Viśvāmitra which was controverted, although they were themselves aware of it, he tells a story."

Professor Roth in his Lexicon (s.v. Kauśika) thinks that this term as originally applied to Indra meant merely that the god "belonged, was devoted to," the Kuśikas; and Professor Benfey, in a note to his translation of R.V. i. 10, 11,145 remarks that "by this family-name Indra is designated as the sole or principal god of this tribe."

144 Prof. Müller states that "Sāyaṇa passes over what Kātyāyana (the author of the Anukramaṇī) says about the race of Viśvāmitra;" and adds "This (the fact of the preamble being 'meant to vindicate the Rishitva of the family of Viśvāmitra') was probably the reason why Sāyaṇa left it out." It is true that Sāyaṇa does not quote the words of the Anukramaṇī in his introductory remarks to the third Maṇḍala; but as we have seen he had previously adduced the greater part of them in his note on i. 10, 11.

145 Orient und Occident, vol. i. p. 18, note 50. We have seen above, p. 345, that in R.V. iii. 23, 3, another god, Agni, is called Daivavaśa, after the rishi Devavāśa, by whom he had been kindled. Compare also the expression Daivodāsa Agniḥ in R.V. viii. 92, 2, which Sāyaṇa explains as = Daivodāsaınaḥ, "Agni invoked by Divodāsa;" while Prof. Roth s.v. understands it to mean "Agni who stands in relation to Divodāsa." In R.V. vi. 16, 19, Agni is called Daivodāasya satpatiḥ, "the good lord of Divodāsa." Agni is also called Bhārata in R.V. ii. 7, 1, 5; iv. 25, 4; vi. 16, 19. On the first text (ii. 7, 1) Sāyaṇa says Bharataḥ ritevijñā | teshāṁ sambandāhī Bhārataḥ, "Bharatas are priests. Bhārata is he who is connected with them." On ii. 7, 5 he explains the word by ritevijñā putra-sthāniya, "Thou who art in the place of a son to the priests." On the second text (iv. 25, 4) tasmo Agnir Bhārataḥ śarma yaṁsat, "may Agni Bhārata give him protection") Sāyaṇa takes Bhārata to mean "the bearer of the oblation" (harisho bhatī); but also refers to the S.P.Br. i. 4, 2, 2, where it is said, "or Agni is called 'Bhārata,' because, becoming breath, he sustains all creatures"
According to the Vishnu Purāṇa (pp. 398–400, Wilson, 4to ed.) Viśvāmitra was the twelfth in descent from Purūravas, the persons intermediate being (1) Āmāvasu, (2) Bhima, (3) Kāchchana, (4) Suhotra, (5) Jahnu, (6) Sumantu, (7) Ajaka, (8) Valākāśva, (9) Kuṣa, (10) Kuśāmba, and (11) Gādhi. The birth of Viśvāmitra’s father is thus described, V.P. iv. 7, 4: Teshāṁ Kuśāmabh “śakrā-tulyo me putro bhavera iti tapaś cāchāra taṁ cha ugra-tapasm auraloka “mā bhavati anyo’smat-tulya-viryyaḥ” ity ātmanaeva aṣya Indrāḥ putratvam agachhat | Gādhir nāma sa Kaustikōḥbhavat | “Kuśāmba (one of Kuṣa’s four sons) practised austere fervour with the view of obtaining a son equal to Indra. Perceiving him to be very ardent in his austere fervour, Indra, fearing lest another person should be born his own equal in vigour, became himself the son of Kuśāmba, with the name of Gādhi the Kaustika.” Regarding the birth of Viśvāmitra himself, the Vishnu Purāṇa relates the following story: Gādhi’s daughter Satyavatī had been given in marriage to an old Brāhmaṇ called Richika, of the family of Bhrigu. In order that his wife might bear a son with the qualities of a Brāhmaṇ, Richika had prepared for her a dish of charu (rice, barley, and pulse, with butter and milk) for her to eat; and a similar mess for her mother, calculated to make her conceive a son with the character of a warrior. Satyavatī’s mother, however, persuaded her to exchange messes. She was blamed by her husband on her return home for what she had done. I quote the words of the original:

V.P. iv. 7, 14: “Aitī pāpe kim idam akāryyam bhavatyā kriyān | atiraudrāṁ te vapur ālakṣyate | nūnāṁ tvayā tevan-mātri-satīritas | charur upayuktāḥ (?) upabhuktāḥ | na yuktam etat | 15. Mayā hi tatra | charau sakalā eva śaurya-viryya-balā-sampad āropita tevriyā charāv | apy akhilaśānti-jnāna-titikshādikā brāhmaṇa-sampat | etach cha vipa- (eṣaḥ u vai imāḥ prajāḥ prāgo bhūteḥ bībharti tasmād u eva āha “Bhratā” iti). Another explanation had previously been given that the word Bhratā means “he who bears oblations to the gods.” On the third text (vi. 16, 19) Sāyana interprets the term in the same way. Roth, s.v., thinks it may mean “warlike.” In R.V. vii. 8, 4, (V.S. 12, 34) we find the words prā par ayaṁ Agniś Bharataśa śrīne, “this Agni (the son?) of Bharata has been greatly renowned.” Sāyana makes bharatasya = yajamāṇasya, “the worshipper,” and prā par śrīne = prathito bhavati, “is renowned.” The Comm. on the Vāj. S. translates “Agni hears the invocation of the worshipper” (śrīne śrīnute āhvinam). The S. P. Br. vi. 8, 1, 14, quotes the verse, and explains Bharata as meaning “Prajāpati, the supporter of the universe” (Prajāpati vai Bharataḥ sa hi idaṁ sarvam bībharti).
ritau kuratyah tava atirudrasya dhara na marana nishthka kshattri-
yachara putro bhavishyaty asya cha upasama ruchir brhmanna-
chara ah bhagavan maya etad ajnamad anushhilitam praasadam me kuru m evamvidah putro bhavatu kama evamvidhad pautro bhavatu ity ukto munir apya aha evam astu iti 16. Anantarau cha sa Jamad-
agnim ajjanat tan-mata cha Visvamitra janayamasa Satyavati cha
Kausiki nama nady abhavat Jamadagnir Ikshvaku vaishodhavasya
Rehsh tanayaa Reukam upayeme tasya cha asheka-kshattri-vaishna-hantaram
Paraasurama-sanjnam bhagavatah sakala-loka-guror Narayanasya
aahsah Jamadagnir ajjanat Visvamitra-putras tu Bhargava eka Sunahshe
nama devair dattah tatas cha Devarata-nama bhavat tatas cha anye
Madhuchhanda-Jayakrita Devadeva-Ashhaka-Kachhapa-Hartalakhyah
Visvamitra-putrah bahuvah 17. Teshan cha bahuni Kausika-gotrangi
rishyantareshu vaiavayani bhavanti

""Sinful woman, what improper deed is this that thou hast done? I behold thy body of a very terrible appearance. Thou hast certainly eaten the charu prepared for thy mother. This was wrong. For into that charu I had infused all the endowments of heroism, vigour, and force, whilst into thine I had introduced all those qualities of quietude, knowledge, and patience which constitute the perfection of a Brhauman. Since thou hast acted in contravention of my design a son shall be born to thee who shall live the dreadful, martial, and murderous life of a Kshattriya; and thy mother's offspring shall exhibit the peaceful disposition and conduct of a Brhauman."" As soon as she had heard this, Satyavati fell down and seized her husband's feet, and said, 'My lord, I have acted from ignorance; show kindness to me; let me not have a son of the sort thou hast described; if thou pleasest, let me have a grandson of that description.' Hearing this the muni replied, 'Be it so.' Subsequently she bore Jamadagni, and her mother gave birth to Visvamitra. Satyavati became the river called Kausiki. Jamadagni wedded Reuk, the daughter of Rehu, of the family of Ikshvaku; and on her he begot a son called Paraasurama, the slayer of the entire race of Kshattriyas, who was a portion of the divine Narayana, the lord of the universe.146 To Visvamitra a son called Sunaasepa, of the race of

146 According to the Bhagavata Purana, i. 3, 20, Paraasurama was the sixteenth incarnation of Vishnu: Avatare shofoasame pasyan brhma-druho nipan trissapta-
Bṛigu, was given by the gods, who in consequence received the name of Devarāta ("god-given"). And then other sons, Madhuchhandas, Jayakrīta, Devadeva, Ashtaka, Kachhapa, Hārītaka, etc., were born to Viśvāmitra. From them sprang many families of Kausikas, which intermarried with those of other rishis."

The Harivāmśa, verses 1425 ff., gives a similar account, but makes Kuśika, not Kuśamba, the grandfather of Viśvāmitra:

*Kuśa-putrāḥ babhūvur hi chātvāro deva-varchasah | Kuśikah Kuśanā-bhaś cha Kuśāmbo Mūrtimāṇs tathā | Pahlavāh saha saumṛiddho rājā vana-charais tada | Kuśikas tu tapas tepe puttram Indra-samaṁ vibhūḥ | labheyam iti tāṁ Sākras trāsād abhyetya jajñivān | pūrṇe varsha-sahasre vai tat tāṁ Sākro hy apasyata | aty ugra-tapasāṁ drṣṭveda sahasrākṣahāḥ purandaraḥ | samarthah putra-janane svam evāṁśam avāsayat | putrave kalpayāṁśa sa devendra surottamaḥ | sa Gādhir abhavad rājā Maḥagāvān Kuśikaḥ svayam | Paurukutsy abhavad bhāryā Gādhis tasyāṁ ajāyatā |

"Kuśa had four sons, equal in lustre to the gods, Kuśika, Kuśanābha, Kuśāmbo, and Mūrttimat. Growing up among the Pahlavas, who dwelt in the woods, the glorious king Kuśika practised austere fervour, with the view of obtaining a son equal to Indra; and Indra from apprehension came and was born. When a thousand years had elapsed Sakra (Indra) beheld him. Perceiving the intensity of his austere fervour, the thousand-eyed, city-destroying, god of gods, highest of the deities, powerful to procreate offspring, introduced a portion of himself, and caused it to take the form of a son; and thus Maḥavat himself became Gādhi, the son of Kuśika. Paurukutsi was the wife (of the latter), and of her Gādhi was born."

The Harivāmśa then relates a story similar to that just extracted from the Viṣṇu Purāṇa regarding the births of Jamadagni and Viśvāmitra, and then proceeds, verse 1456:

*Aurvasayavam Richikasya Satyavatyāṁ mahāyaśāḥ | Jamadagnis tapo-vīryyāj jagne brahma-vidāṁ varaḥ | madhyamaś cha Sūnaśeṣphaḥ Sūnaḥ-puchhāḥ kanīṣthākāḥ | Viśvāmitraś tu dāyādam Gādhiḥ Kuśika-nandanaḥ | janayāṁśa putraṁ tu tapo-vidyā-śamātmakam | prāpya brah-

kritvāh kuspi nikhshatrām akarod mahāṁ | "In his sixteenth incarnation, perceiving that kings were oppressors of Brāhmaś, he, incensed, made the earth destitute of Kshattriyas one and twenty times."
Thus was the renowned Jamadagni, the most excellent of those possessed of sacred knowledge, born by the power of austere fervour to Richika, the son of Īrva, by Satyavati. Their second son was Sunaś-āpi and the youngest Sunahpuchha. And Gādhi, son of Kuśika, begot as his son and inheritor Viśvāmitra, distinguished for austere fervour, science, and quietude; who attained an equality with Brahman-rishi, and became one of the seven rishis. The righteous Viśvāmitra, who was known by name as Viśvaratha, was by the favour of a Bhṛgu born to the son of Kuśika, an augmenter (of the glory) of his race. The sons of Viśvāmitra are related to have been Devarāta and the rest, renowned in the three worlds. Hear their names: Devasravas, Kati (from whom the Kātyāyanas had their name); Hiraṇyāksha, born of Śālāvatī, and Reṇumat of Reṇu; Sāṅkrite, Gālava, Mudgala, Madhučhanda, Jaya, Devala, Ashṭaka, Kachhapa, Hārita—these were the

147 The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, as we shall shortly see, makes 'Sunaśēpa' a son of Ajīgarta. The Mahābhārata Anuśasanap. verse 186, coincides with the Harivaṃśa.

148 In another passage of the Harivaṃśa (verses 1764 ff.), which repeats the particulars given in this passage, it appears to be differently stated, verse 1766, that besides a daughter Satyavati, and his son Viśvāmitra, Gādhi had three other sons, Viśvaratha, Viśvakrīt, and Viśvajīt (Viśvāmitras tu Gādheyo rājā Viśvarathas tado Viśvakriḍ Viśvajīch chaiva tathā Satyavatī nīpya).
sons of Viśvāmitra. From them the families of the great Kauśikas are said to have sprung: the Pāṇins, Babhrus, Dhānakapyas, Parthivas, Devarātas, Sālankāyanas, Vāskalas, Lohitas, Yamadūtas, Kārīshis, Sau-śrutas, Kauśikas, Saindhavāyanas, Devalas, Reṇus, Yājnavalkyas, Aghamarshaṇas, Audumbaras, Abhishṇātas, Tārakayaṇas, Chuneulas, Sūlavatyas, Hariṇyākshas, Sānkṛityas, and Gālavas. Nārāyaṇi and Nara were also (descendants) of the wise Viśvāmitra. Many Kauśikas are recorded who intermarried with the families of other rishis. In this race of the Paurava and Kauśika Brahman-rishi, there is well known to have been a connection of the Brāhmans and Kshattriyas. Śunāśāpeha, who was a descendant of Bṛigu, and obtained the position of a Kauśika, is recorded to have been the eldest of Viśvāmitra’s sons."

It will be observed that in this passage, Devaśravas is given as one of Viśvāmitra’s sons. A Devaśravas, as we have already seen, is mentioned in R.V. iii. 23, 2, as a Bārata, along with Devavāta. Here however in the Harivaṃśa we have no Devavāta, but a Devarāta, who is identified with Śunāśāpeha. This, as we shall find, is also the case in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.

In the genealogy given in both of the preceding passages, from the Vīṣṇu Purāṇa, and the 27th chapter of the Harivaṃśa respectively, Viśvāmitra is declared to be the descendant of Amāvasu the third son of Purūravas. In the 32nd chapter of the Harivaṃśa, however, we find a different account. Viśvāmitra’s lineage is there traced up to a Jahnu, as in the former case; but Jahnu is no longer represented as a descendant of Amāvasu, the third son of Purūravas; but (as appears from the preceding narrative) of Āyus, the eldest son of that prince, and of Puru, the great-grandson of Āyus. Professor Wilson (Vīṣṇu Purāṇa, 4to ed. p. 451, note 23) is of opinion that this confusion originated in the recurrence of the name of Suhotra in different genealogical lists, and in the ascription to one king of this name of descendants who were

149 Professor Wilson (V.P. 4to ed. p. 405, note) gives these names, and remarks that the authorities add "an infinity of others, multiplied by intermarriages with other tribes, and who, according to the Vāyu, were originally of the regal caste like Viśvāmitra; but like him obtained Brahmanhood through devotion. Now these gotras, or some of them at least, no doubt existed, partaking more of the character of schools of doctrine, but in which teachers and scholars were very likely to have become of one family by intermarrying; and the whole, as well as their original founder, imply the interference of the Kshattriya caste with the Brahmanical monopoly of religious instruction and composition."
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really sprung from another. It is not, however, clear that the genealogy of Viśvāmitra given in the Vishnū Purāṇa is the right one. For in the Rig-veda, as we have seen, he is connected with the Bharatas, and in the passage about to be quoted from the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, he is called a Bharata and his sons Kuśikas; and Bharata is said both in the Vishnū Purāṇa (Wilson's V.P. 4to. ed. p. 449) and in the Harivaṃśa (sect. 32, v. 1723, and preceding narrative) to be a descendant of Áyus and of Puru. Accordingly we have seen that the Harivaṃśa styles Viśvāmitra at once a Paurava and a Kauśika.

A similar genealogy to that in the 32nd section of the Harivaṃśa is given in the Mahābārata, Anuśasanaparvan, verses 201 ff., where it is said that in the line of Bharata there was a king called Ajamīdha who was also a priest (Bharatasyāνvaye chaiva jaśamiḥ ho nāma pārthivah | babhūva Bharata-sreshṭha yaśevā dharma-bhrītān varaḥ), from whom Viśvāmitra was descended through (1) Jahnu, (2) Sindhudvīpa, (3) Balākaśva, (4) Kuśika, (5) Gādhi.

One of the names applied to Viśvāmitra and his race, as I have just noticed, is Bharata. The last of the four verses at the close of the 53rd hymn of the third Maṇḍala of the Rig-veda, which are supposed to contain a malediction directed by Viśvāmitra against Vasishṭha (see above) is as follows: iii. 53, 24. Īme Indra Bharatasya putrāḥ āpapitevaṁ chikitur na prapitvam | “These sons of Bharata, o Indra, desire to avoid (the Vasishṭhas), not to approach them.” These words are thus explained by Sāyaṇa: Bharatasya putrāḥ Bharata-vāṁśyāḥ īme Viśvāmitraḥ āpapitevaṁ apagamanāṁ Vasishṭhebhyaś chikitur na prapitvam | [Va]sishṭaṁ saha teṣeṁ sangatir nāsti | brāhmaṇāḥ eva ity arthaḥ | “These sons of Bharata, persons of his race, know departure from, and not approach to, the Vasishṭhas. They do not associate with the Vasishṭhas. This means they are Brāhmans.”

The persons who accompanied Viśvāmitra when he wished to cross the Vipāś and the Sutudrī are, as we have seen above, called Bhārātas; and Devaśravas and Devavāta are designated in R.V. iii. 23, 2, as Bhārātas. On the other hand in one of the hymns ascribed to Vasishṭha (R.V. vii. 33, 6) the Bhārātas are alluded to as a tribe hostile to the Tritus, the race to which Vasishṭha belonged.

See Roth’s Lexicon, s.v. Bharata, (7) “the name of a hero, the forefather of a tribe. His sons are called Viśvāmitras and the members of his family Bharatas.”
In the legend of Sunaśsepa, told in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, vii. 13–18, Viśvāmitra is alluded to as being the hotṛi-priest of king Harīśchandra, and as belonging to the tribe of the Bharatas. He is also addressed as rājaputra, and his sons are called Kuśikas. The outlines of the story are as follows: King Harīśchandra of the family of Ikshvāku having no son, promised to Varuṇa, by the advice of Nārada, that if a son should be born to him he would sacrifice him to that god. A son was accordingly born to the king, who received the name of Rohita; but Harīśchandra, though called upon by Varuṇa, put off from time to time, on various pleas, the fulfillment of his promise. When the father at length consented, the youth himself refused to be sacrificed and went into the forest. After passing six years there he met a poor Brāhman rishi called Ajīgartha who had three sons, the second of whom, Sunaśsepa, he sold for a hundred cows to Rohita, who brought the young Brāhman to be sacrificed instead of himself. Varuṇa accepted the vicarious victim, and arrangements were made accordingly, “Viśvāmitra being the hotṛi-priest, Jamadagni the adhvaryu, Vasishṭha the brāhmāṇ, and Ayāsya the udgātṛī (tasya ha Viśvāmitro hotā āśīj Jamadagnir adhvaryaḥ Vasishṭho brahmā Ayāsyaḥ udgātā).” The sacrifice was not, however, completed, although the father received a hundred more cows for binding his son to the sacrificial post, and a third hundred for agreeing to slaughter him. By reciting verses in honour of different deities in succession Sunaśsepa was delivered; and at the request of the priests took part in the ceremonial of the day. I shall quote the remainder of the story at length:

17. Atha ha Sunaśsepo Viśvāmitrasyāṇkam āsasāda | sa ha uvācha Ajīgarthaḥ Sauyacasis “rishe punar me puttraṁ dehi” iti | “Na” iti ha uvācha Viśvāmitro “devaḥ vai iñam mahyam arāsata” iti | sa ha Devarāto Vaiśvāmitraḥ āsa | tasya ete Kāpilya-Bābhravaḥ | sa ha uvācha Ajīgarthaḥ Sauyacasis “teṣām vṛhiḥ vihavayevahai” iti | sa ha uvācha Ajīgarthaḥ Sauyacasis “Āngiraḥ jañanāḥ ’sy Ajīgarthīḥ śrutāḥ kaviḥ | rishe paitāmahāt tantor mā ’pagāḥ punar ehi mām” iti | sa

---

131 This legend is translated into German by Prof. Roth in Weber’s Ind. Stud. i. 467 ff., into English by Prof. Wilson, Journ. Roy. As. Soc. vol. xiii. for 1851, pp. 96 ff., by Dr. Haug in his Ait. Brāhmaṇa, vol. ii. 460 ff., by Prof. Müller in his Anc. Sansk. Lit. pp. 408 ff., and into Latin by Dr. Streiter in his “Diss. de Sunaśsepo.”
ha uvācha Sunahśepah “adarśus tvā śāsa-hastaṁ na yach cchādreshe alapsata | gavāṁ trini śatāni team avrinīthāḥ mad Angirah” iti | sa ha uvācha Ajīgartaḥ Sauyavasis “tad vai mā tāta tapati pāpaṁ karma mayā kritam | tad aham nihcave tubhyam pratiyantau satā gavāṁ” iti | sa ha uvācha Sunahśepah “yaḥ sakrit pāpakaṁ kuryāt kuryād enat tato ’param | nāpāgaḥ saudānṛyāyād asandheyaṁ tevā kritam” iti | “asandheyaṁ” iti ha Viśvāmitraḥ upapapāda | sa ha uvācha Viśvāmitraḥ “Bhīmah eva Sauyavasiḥ śāsena visiśāśishuh | asthaṁ maityasya putro bhūr māmaivophei putratām” iti | sa ha uvācha Sunahśepah “sa vai yathā no jnāpāya rājaputra tatha vada | yathāvāṅgirasah sann upeyāṁ tava putratām” iti | sa ha uvācha Viśvāmitraḥ “Jyeshto me team putrah sāṁ tava śreshthā praṣjā syāt | upeyāḥ daicam me dāyāṁ tena vai tvopamantrage” iti | sa ha uvācha Sunahśepah “sanjnānāneshu vai brūyāt sauhārdyāya me śrīyāḥ | yathā ‘ham Bharata-rishabhā upeyāṁ tava putratām” iti | atha ha Viśvāmitraḥ putrān āmantrayāmāsa “Madhu- chhandah śriṇotana Rishabhā Reynur Ashtakaḥ | ye ke cha bhrātaraḥ sthana asmait jyaiśthhyāya kalpadvam” iti | 18. Tasya ha Viśvāmitraṇya eka-satam putrāḥ āsuḥ panchaśad eva jyāyāṁso Madhuchhandasah panchāsat kalyāṁsaḥ | tad ye jyāyāṁso na te kuśalam menire | tān anuvyājaha “aṁtan caḥ praṣā bhakshoṣṭa” iti | te ete 'ndhrāḥ Pun- drāḥ S'aboraḥ Pulindāḥ Mithibāḥ ity udantāḥ bahavo bhavanti | Viś- vāmitraḥ Dasyuṇām bhūyāśthāḥ | sa ha uvācha Madhuchhandah panchaśata sarḍham “yad naḥ pitā sanjānate tasmāṁ tishṭhāmahe vayaṁ | puras tvā sarve kurnahe tvam anvancaco vayaṁ smasi” iti | atha ha Viśvāmitraḥ pratitaḥ putrāṁ tushṭaṁ “te vai putrāḥ pasumanto vīravanto bhavishya- tha | ye mānam me 'nugrihanto vīravantam akartta mā | pura-etrā vīravanto Devarātene Gāthiṇāḥ | sarve rādhyāḥ stha putrāḥ esha vaḥ sad- vivāchanam | esha vaḥ Kuśiṅkāḥ viro Devarātas tam anvita | yuṣhmāṁs daigam me upeta vidyāṁ yām u cha vidm see | te samyancho Viśvāmitraḥ sarve sakaṁ sarātayaḥ | Devarātaya tāsthire dhṛityai śrāinīthhyāya Gā- thināḥ | adhīyata Devarātō rikthayor ubhyayor rishiḥ | Jahnunarām cha- dhipatyeye daice eveda cha Gāthinām | “Sunaśśepa came to the side of Viśvāmitra. Ajīgarta, the son of Suyavasa, said, ‘Rishi, give me back my son.’ ‘No,’ said Viśvāmitra, ‘the gods have given him to me’ (devāḥ arāśata); hence he became Devarāta the son of Viśvāmitra. The Kāpīleyas and Bābhrovas are his descendants. Ajīgarta said to Viśvāmitra, ‘Come; let us both call
THE BRAHMANS AND KSHATTRYIAS.

(him) to us.' He (again) said (to his son), 'Thou art an Ángirasa, the son of Ajígartta, reputed a sage; do not, o rishi, depart from the line of thy ancestors; come back to me.' Sunaśśeṣa replied, 'They have seen thee with the sacrificial knife in thy hand—a thing which men have not found even among the Súdras; thou didst prefer three hundred cows to me, o Ángirasa.' Ajígartta rejoined, 'That sinful deed which I have done distresses me, my son; I abjure it to thee. Let the [three] hundreds of cows revert (to him who gave them).' Sunaśśeṣa answered, 'He who once does a sinful deed, will add to it another; thou hast not freed thyself from that iniquity, fit only for a Súdra. Thou hast done what cannot be rectified.' 'What cannot be rectified,' interposed Viśvāmitra; who continued, 'Terrible was the son of Suyava-sa as he stood about to immolate (thee) with the knife: continue not to be his son; become mine.' Sunaśśeṣa replied, 'Speak, o king's son (rāja-putra), whatever thou hast to explain to us, in order that I, though an Ángirasa, may become thy son.' Viśvāmitra rejoined, 'Thou shalt be the eldest of my sons, and thy offspring shall be the most eminent. Thou shalt receive my divine inheritance; with this (invitation) I address thee.' Sunaśśeṣa answered, 'If (thy sons) agree, then for my welfare enjoin on them to be friendly, that so, o chief of the Bharatas, I may enter on thy sonship.' Viśvāmitra then addressed his sons, 'Do ye, Madhuchhandas, Rishabha, Reṇu, Ashtaka, and all ye who are brothers, listen to me, and concede to him the seniority.' 18. Now Viśvāmitra had a hundred sons, fifty of whom were older than Madhuchhandas and fifty younger. Then those who were older did not approve (their father's proposal). Against them he pronounced (this

182 I follow here the tenor of the interpretation (which is that of the Commentator on the Sáṅkhāyaṇa Bráhmaṇa) given by Prof. Weber in his review of Dr. Haug's Aitareya Bráhmaṇa, in Indische Studien, ix. 316. Prof. Weber remarks that in the Bráhmaṇas the root *hu' si is employed to denote the opposing invitations of two persons who are seeking to bring over a third person to their own side; in proof of which he quotes Taitt. S. 6, 1, 6, 6, and S. F. Br. 3, 2, 4, 4, and 22. Profs. Roth, Wilson, and Müller, as well as Dr. Haug, understand the words to be addressed to Sunaśśeṣa by his father, and to signify "we, too (I and thy mother), call, or will call (thee to return to us)." But it does not appear that Sunaśśeṣa's mother was present. And it is to be observed that the next words uttered by Ajígartta, which are addressed to Sunaśśeṣa, are preceded by the usual formula sa ha uñcha Ajígarttaḥ Suyavasaṁ, "Ajígartta the son of S. said," which perhaps would not have been the case if both sentences had been addressed to the same person.

doom), ‘Let your progeny possess the furthest ends (of the country).’ These are the numerous border-tribes, the Andhras, Pundras, Sabaras, Pulindas, Mūtibas. Most of the Dasyus are sprung from Viśvāmitra. Madhuchhandas with the (other) fifty said, ‘Whatever our father determines, by that we abide. We all place thee in our front, and follow after thee.’ Then Viśvāmitra was pleased, and said to his sons, ‘Ye, my children who, shewing deference to me, have conferred upon me a (new) son, shall abound in cattle and in sons. Ye, my sons, the offspring of Gāthin, who possess in Devarāta a man who shall go before you, are all destined to be prosperous; he is your wise instructor. This Devarāta, o Kuśikas, is your chief; follow him. He will receive you as my inheritance, and obtain all the knowledge which we possess.’ All these sons of Viśvāmitra, descendants of Gāthin, submitted together in harmony and with good will to Devarāta’s control and superiority. The rishi Devarāta was invested with both possessions, with the lordly authority of the Jahnus, and with the divine Veda of the Gāthins.

On this legend Professor Möller (Anc. Sansk. Lit. pp. 415 f.) remarks, amongst other things, as follows: “So revolting, indeed, is the descrip-

154 See Weber, Ind. St. ix. p. 317 f., and Roth in his Lexicon, s.ev. anta and udantya.
155 This legend is perhaps alluded to in the Kāthaka Brāhmaṇa, 19, 11, quoted by Prof. Weber, Ind. St. iii. 478: Sūnasēpa vai etam Ajīgartaṁ Varuṇa-grihito’pahyaṁ | tayuḥ sa vai Varuṇa-pāsād amuciḥyata | “Sūnasēpa the son of Ajīgarta, when seized by Varuṇa, saw this (verse); and by it he was released from the bonds of Varuṇa.” Manu also mentions the story, x. 105: Ajīgartātaṁ sūtaṁ hantum upāsarpayo bhuhkṣhitah | na chūliyata pūpena khut-pratikāram āchāraya | “Ajīgarta, when famished, approached to slay his son; and (by so doing) was not contaminated by sin, as he was seeking the means of escape from hunger.” On this Kullūka annotates: Rishir Ajīgartākhyo bhuhkṣhitah san putram Sūnasēpahīma-nāmānāṁ svayaṁ vikṛitavān yajne go-śata-lākhāya yajna-yūpe baddheśu viṣāṣita bhūteḥ hantum prachakrama | na cha khut-pratikārthāṁ tathā kurvan pūpena liptah | etach cha Bhāvyiccha-brāhmaṇe Sūnasēpahīkhyāneḥ vuktam uktam | “A rishi called Ajīgarta, having, when famished, himself sold his son called Sūnasēpha, in order to obtain a hundred cows at a sacrifice, bound him to the sacrificial stake, and in the capacity of immolator was about to slay him. By doing so, as a means of escape from hunger, he did not incur sin. This is distinctly recorded in the Bhāvyica (Aitareya) Brāhmaṇa in the legend of Sūnasēpa.” The speakers in the Brāhmaṇa, however, do not take by any means so lenient a view of Ajīgarta’s conduct as Manu. (See Müller’s Anc. Sansk. Lit. p. 415.) The compiler of the latter work lived in an age when it was perhaps thought that a rishi could do no wrong. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa, ix. sect. 7, and sect. 16, verses 30–37 follows the Ait. Br. in the version it gives of the story; but, as we shall see in a subsequent section, the Rāmāyaṇa relates some of the circumstances quite differently.
tion given of Ajigartta's behaviour in the Brāhmaṇa, that we should rather recognize in him a specimen of the un-Āryan population of India. Such a supposition, however, would be in contradiction with several of the most essential points of the legend, particularly in what regards the adoption of Sunahśepa by Viśvāmitra. Viśvāmitra, though arrived at the dignity of a Brāhman, clearly considers the adoption of Sunahśepa Devarāta, of the famous Brahmanic family of the Āngirasas, as an advantage for himself and his descendants; and the Deva-rātas are indeed mentioned as a famous branch of the Viśvāmitras (V.P. p. 405, 23). Sunahśepa is made his eldest son, and the leader of his brothers, evidently as the defender and voucher of their Brahmanhood, which must have been then of very recent date, because Viśvāmitra himself is still addressed by Sunahśepa as Rāja-putra and Bhara-rata-pishabha." It must, however, be recollected that the story, as told in the Brāhmaṇa, can scarcely be regarded as historical, and that it is not unreasonable to suppose that the incidents related, even if founded on fact, may have been coloured by the Brahmanical prepossessions of the narrator. But if so, the legend can give us no true idea of the light in which Viśvāmitra's exercise of priestly functions was looked upon either by himself or by his contemporaries.

In Indische Studien, ii. 112-123, this story forms the subject of an interesting dissertation by Professor Roth, who arrives at the following conclusions:

"(i.) The oldest legend about Sunahśepa (alluded to in R.V. i. 24, 11-13,136 and R.V. v. 2, 7) knows only of his miraculous deliverance by divine help from the peril of death.

"(ii.) This story becomes expanded in the sequel into a narrative of Sunahśepa's threatened slaughter as a sacrificial victim, and of his deliverance through Viśvāmitra.

"(iii.) This immolation-legend becomes severed into two essentially distinct versions, the oldest forms of which are respectively represented by the stories in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, and the Rāmāyaṇa.

"(iv.) The latter becomes eventually the predominant one; but its proper central-point is no longer the deliverance from immolation, but

136 Compare also Rosen's remarks on the hymns ascribed to Sunaśepa; Rig-veda Sāhita, Annotationes, p. lv. He thinks they contain nothing which would lead to the belief that they have any connection with the legend in the Rāmāyaṇa and Ait. Br.
the incorporation of Śunah śepa, or (with a change of persons) of Rīchika, into the family of the Kuśikas. It thus becomes in the end a family-legend of the race of Viśvāmitra.

"There is thus no historical, perhaps not even a genealogical, result to be gained here. On the other hand the story obtains an important place in the circle of those narratives in which the sacerdotal literature expressed its views regarding the character and agency of Viśvāmitra."

In a passage of the Mahābhārata, Ādip. verses 3694 ff.,137 where the descendants of Pūru are recorded, we find among them Bharata the son of Dushyanta (verse 3709) from whom (1) Bhumanyu, (2) Suhotra, (3) Ajamīḍha, and (4) Jahnu are said to have sprung in succession (verses 3712–3722); and the last-named king and his brothers Vrajana and Rūpin are said to have been the ancestors of the Kuśikas (verse 3723: anvayāḥ Kuśikāḥ rājan Jahnor amita-tejasah | Vrajana-Rūpinah), who were therefore, according to this passage also, descended from Bharata (see above, p. 354). The Mahābhārata then goes on to relate that during the reign of Samvaraṇa, son of Jahnu’s eldest brother Riksha, the country over which he ruled was desolated by various calamities (verses 3725 f.). The narrative proceeds, verse 3727:

Abhyagman Bhāratāṁs chaiva sapatnānām balāni cha | chālayan vasudhāṁ chemām balena chaturanginā | abhyayat taṁ cha Pānchālyo vijitya tarasa mahīm | akshauhinibhir daśabhiḥ saenaṁ samare 'jayat | tataḥ sa-dārāḥ sāmātyaḥ sa-putrāḥ sa-suhrjjanaḥ | rājā Saṁvaraṇas tasmāt palāyata mahābhayaḥ | 3730. Sindhor nadasya mahato nivajye nyavanat tadā | nadi-vishaya-paryyante parvaṭasya samipataḥ | tatra-vasan bahūn kalāṇ Bhāratāḥ durgam asrītāḥ | teshāṁ nivashatuṁ tattra sahasram parivasarān | athābhhyagachhad Bhāratan Vaśisṭho bhagavan rishiḥ | tam āgatam pravatnena pratyudganyābhivādyata cha | aṛghyam abhyaḥramaṁ tasmai te sarve Bhāratās tadā | nivedya sarvam rishaye satkārenā svuṛchchhahe | tam āsane chopaviśiṭaṁ rājā vare seyaṁ tadā | "purohito bhavān no 'stu rājyāya pravatemahi" | 3735. "Om" ity evāṁ Vaśisṭho 'pi Bhāratān pratyapadyata | athābhhyasinchat sāmrājye sarva-kṣhatrasya Pauravam | vishāṇa-bhūtaṁ sarvasyāṁ prithivyāṁ iti nah śrutam | Bharatādhyuṣhitam pūrvaṁ so 'dhyatishthat puromtam | punar balibhrītaṁ chaiva chakre sarva-mahākṣitaḥ | 137 Referred to by Roth, Litt. u. Gesch. des Weda, pp. 142 ff., and Wilson, Rigveda, iii. p. 86.
"3727. And the hosts of their enemies also smote the Bhāratas. Shaking the earth with an army of four kinds of forces, the Pānchālya chief assailed him, having rapidly conquered the earth, and vanquished him with ten complete hosts. Then king Samvarana with his wives, ministers, sons, and friends, fled from that great cause of alarm; (3730) and dwelt in the thickets of the great river Sindhu (Indus), in the country bordering on the stream, and near a mountain. There the Bhāratas abode for a long time, taking refuge in a fortress. As they were dwelling there, for a thousand years, the venerable rishi Vasishṭha came to them. Going out to meet him on his arrival, and making obeisance, the Bhāratas all presented him with the arghya offering, shewing every honour to the glorious rishi. When he was seated the king himself solicited him, ‘Be thou our priest; let us strive to regain my kingdom.’ 3735. Vasishṭha consented to attach himself to the Bhāratas, and, as we have heard, invested the descendant of Pūrṇa with the sovereignty of the entire Kshattriya race, to be a horn (to have mastery) over the whole earth. He occupied the splendid city formerly inhabited by Bhārata, and made all kings again tributary to himself."

It is remarkable that in this passage the Bhāratas, who, as we have seen, are elsewhere represented as being so closely connected with Viśvāmitra, and are in one text of the Rig-veda (vii. 33, 6) alluded to as the enemies of Vasishṭha’s friends, should be here declared to have adopted the latter rishi as their priest. The account, however, need not be received as historical, or even based on any ancient tradition; and the part referring to Vasishṭha in particular may have been invented for the glorification of that rishi, or for the honour of the Bhāratas.

The 11th and 12th khandas of the second adhyāya of the Sarvasāra Upanishad (as we learn from Professor Weber’s analysis in Ind. St. i. 390) relate that Viśvāmitra was instructed on the identity of breath (prāṇa) with Indra, by the god himself, who had been celebrated by the sage on the occasion of a sacrifice, at which he officiated as hotṛ-priest, in a thousand Brāhati verses, and was in consequence favourably disposed towards him.

It is abundantly clear, from the details supplied in this section, that Viśvāmitra, who was a rājanya of the Bhārata and Kuśika families (Ait. Br. vii. 17 and 18), is represented by ancient Indian tradition as
the author of numerous Vedic hymns, as the domestic priest (puro-
hita) of king Sudās (Nir. ii. 24), and as officiating as a hotṛ at a
sacrifice of king Hariśchandra (Ait. Br. vii. 16). The Rāmāyaṇa
also, as we shall see in a future section, connects him with Triśanku,
the father of Hariśchandra, and makes him also contemporary with
Ambariṣa; and in the first book of the same poem he is said to have
visited king Daśaratha, the father of Rāma (Bālakanda, i. 20, 1 ff.).
As these kings were separated from each other by very long intervals,
Triśanku being a descendant of Ikśvāku in the 28th, Ambariṣa in the
44th,158 Sudās in the 49th, and Daśaratha in the 60th generation
(see Wilson’s Vishṇu Purāṇa, vol. iii. pp. 284, 303, 304, 313), it is
manifest that the authors of these legends either intentionally or
through oversight represented Viśvāmitra, like Vasishṭha (see above),
as a personage of miraculous longevity; and on either supposition
a great deal that is related of him must be purely fabulous. All the
authorities describe him as the son of Gāthin or Gādhi, the Anu-
kramaṇi, the Vishṇu Purāṇa, and the Harivaṇaṇa declaring also that
Gāthin was an incarnation of Indra, and thus asserting Viśvāmitra to
be of divine descent. It is not clear whether this fable is referred to
in R.V. iii. 53, 9, where Viśvāmitra is styled deva-jāḥ, “born of a god,”
or whether this verse may not have led to the invention of the story.
In either case the verse can scarcely have emanated from the rishi
himself; but it is more likely to be the production of one of his de-
sendants.159

158 According to the Rāmāyaṇa, i. 70, 41; ii. 110, 32, Ambariṣa was only 28th
from Ikśvāku. Compare Prof. Wilson’s note on these genealogies, V.P. iii. 313 ff.
159 The word deva-jāḥ, which, following Roth, s.v., I have translated “god-born,”
is taken by Sāyaṇa as dyotamānānāṁ tejanāṁ janayitā, “generator of shining
lights,” and appears to be regarded by him as referring to the creation of constel-
lations by Viśvāmitra, mentioned in the Rāmāyaṇa, i. 60, 21. Prof. Wilson renders
the phrase by “generator of the gods;” and remarks that “the compound is not
deva-jā, ‘god-born,’ nor was Viśvāmitra of divine parentage” (R.V. iii. p. 85, note 4).
This last remark overlooks the fact above alluded to of his father Gādhi being repre-
sented as an incarnation of Indra, and the circumstance that Prof. Wilson himself
(following Sāyaṇa) had shortly before translated the words prathama-jāḥ brahmaṇaḥ
in R.V. iii. 29, 16, as applied to the Kuśikas, by “the first-born of Brahman,” although
from the accent brahmaṇa here must be neuter, and the phrase seems to mean, as
I have rendered above, “the first-born of prayer.” The word jā is given in the
Nighaṇṭu as one of the synonyms of apatyā, “offspring;” and in R.V. i. 164, 15,
where it is coupled with rishayāḥ, the compound deva-jāḥ is explained by Sāyaṇa as
“born of the god,” i.e. the sun, and by Prof. Wilson as “born of the gods.” See
This verse (R.V. iii. 53, 9) which claims a superhuman origin for Viśvāmitra, and the following verses 11–13 of the same hymn, which assert the efficacy of his prayers, form a sort of parallel to the contents of R.V. vii. 33, where the supernatural birth of Vasishṭha (vv. 10 ff.), the potency of his intercession (vv. 2–5), and the sacred knowledge of his descendants (vv. 7 and 8), are celebrated.

As the hymns of Viśvāmitra and his descendants occupy so prominent a place in the Rig-veda Sanhitā, and as he is the alleged author of the text reputed the holiest in the entire Veda (iii. 62, 10), the Gāyatrī par excellence, there is no reason to doubt that, although he was a rūjanya, he was unreservedly acknowledged by his contemporaries to be both a rishi and a priest. Nothing less than the uniform recognition and employment of the hymns handed down under his name as the productions of a genuine “seer,” could have sufficed to gain for them a place in the sacred canon. It is true we possess little authentic information regarding the process by which the hymns of different families were admitted to this honour; but at least there is no tradition, so far as I am aware, that those of Viśvāmitra and his family were ever treated as antilegomena. And if we find that later works consider it necessary to represent his priestly character as a purely exceptional one, explicable only on the ground of supernatural merit acquired by ardent devotion, we must recollect that the course of ages had brought about a most material change in Indian society, that the sacerdotal function had at length become confined to the members of an exclusive caste, and that the exercise of such an office in ancient times by persons of the regal or mercantile classes had ceased to be intelligible, except upon the supposition of such extraordinary sanctity as was alleged in the case of Viśvāmitra.

It is worthy of remark that although the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (see above) declares that Sunaśṣēpa, as belonging to a priestly family, was called on to exercise the sacerdotal office immediately after his release, yet the anterior possession of divine knowledge is also ascribed to Viśvāmitra and the Gāthins, and that Sunaśṣēpa is represented as suc-
also R.V. ix. 93, 1 = S.V. i. 538. (Compare Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, for 1866, p. 387 ff.)

That many at least of these compositions were really the work of Viśvāmitra, or his descendants, is proved, as we have seen, by the fact that their names are mentioned in them.
ceeding to this sacred lore, as well as to the regal dignity of the race on which he became engrafted.

The fact of Viśvāmitra having been both a rishi and an officiating priest, is thus, as we have seen, and if ancient tradition is to be believed, undoubted. In fact, if we look to the number of Vedic hymns ascribed to him and to his family, to the long devotion to sacerdotal functions which this fact implies, and to the apparent improbability that a person who had himself stood in the position of a king should afterwards have become a professional priest, we may find it difficult to believe that although (as he certainly was) a scion of a royal stock, he had ever himself exercised regal functions. Professor Roth remarks (Litt. u. Gesch. p. 125) that there is nothing either in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, or in the hymns of the Rig-veda to shew that he had ever been a king. But on the other hand, as the same writer observes (p. 126), and as we shall hereafter see, there are numerous passages in the later authorities in which the fact of his being a king is distinctly, but perhaps untruly, recorded.

It is so well known, that I need scarcely adduce any proof of the fact, that in later ages Rājanyas and Vaiśyas, though entitled to sacrifice and to study the Vedas, were no longer considered to have any right to officiate as priests on behalf of others. I may, however, cite a few texts on this subject. Manu says, i. 88:

Adhyāpanam adhyayanaṁ yājanaṁ yājanaṁ tathā | dānam prati-
grahaṁ chaiva Brāhmaṇanāṁ akalpayat | 89. Prajñānāṁ rakṣaṇaṁ
dānam ījjā'ḥdyayanaṁ eva cha | vishayeshv aprasaktiṁ cha kṣhatric
yasya samāsataḥ | 90. Paśūnāṁ rakṣaṇaṁ dānam ījjā'ḥdyayanaṁ eva
taḥ | vaṇikpathaṁ kusidaṁ cha Vaiśyasya kṛṣhim eva cha | 91. Ekam
eva tu Śudrasya prabhuḥ karma samādiṣat | etesām eva varṇanāṁ suśrū-
shām anasūyayā | 88. He (Brahmā) ordained teaching, study, sacrificing, officiating for others at sacrifices, and the giving and receiving of gifts, to be the functions of Brāhmans. 89. Protection of the people, the giving of gifts, sacrifice, study, and non-addiction to objects of sense he assigned as the duties of the Kṣatatriya. 90. The tending of cattle, giving of gifts, sacrifice, study, commerce, the taking of usury, and agriculture he appointed to be the occupations of the Vaiśya. 91. But the

161 May not R.V. iii. 43, 5 (quoted above), however, be understood to point to something of this kind?
lord assigned only one duty to the Sudra, that of serving these other three classes without grudging.

Similarly it is said in the second of the Yajna-paribhāṣā Sūtras, translated by Professor M. Müller (at the end of the ninth volume of the Journal of the German Oriental Society, p. xliii.), "that sacrifice is proper to the three classes, the Brāhman, Rājanya, and also the Vaiśya." 162 Prof. Müller also refers to Kātyāyana’s Srauta Sūtras, of which i. 1, 5 and 6 are as follows:

5. Angahinásrotriya - shanḍa - śādra - varjam | 6. Brāhmaṇa-rājanya- vaiśyāṇāṁ śruteḥ | "Men, 163 with the exception of those whose members

162 Prof. Müller does not give the original text.

163 In one of these Sutras of Kātyāyana (i. 1, 4) and its commentary a curious question (one of those which the Indian authors often think it necessary to raise and to settle, in order that their treatment of a subject may be complete and exhaustive) is argued, viz. whether the lower animals and the gods have any share in the practice of Vedic observances; or whether it is confined to men. The conclusion is that the gods cannot practise these rites, as they are themselves the objects of them, and as they have already obtained heaven and the other objects of desire with a view to which they are practised (tatra devānāṁ devatāntarābhavīd anadhikāraḥ | na hy ātmānam uḍāśya tyāgaḥ sanbhavati | kinccha | devōs cha prūpta-svargūda-kānaḥ | na cha teṣāṁ kineḥd avāpta evam adiṣṭaḥ arthaṁ karmāni kurente | ). As regards the right of the lower animals to sacrifice, although the point is decided against them on the ground of their only "looking to what is near at hand, and not to the rewards of a future world" (te hy āśānam eva chetayante na pāraṇukikam phalam); still it is considered necessary seriously to obviate a presumption in their favour that they seek to enjoy pleasure and avoid pain, and even appear to indicate their desire for the happiness of another world by seeming to observe some of the Vedic prescriptions: "Nānu uktaṁ śunāḥ chaturdāśyām upavāsa-darśanāṁ syenasya ca ashtāmyam upavāsa-darśanāṁ cha te 'pī pāraṇukikam jñanti īti | tat katham avagyante "te dharmārtham upavasanti" īti | ye hi veda-smṛti-purāṇāḥ phalānti eva jñanti yaḥ "anena karmāṇā idam phalam amutra prāpyate" īti | na cha ete vedōḍikam phalānti nāpy anyyobhyaḥ āgamayanti | tena sūstrārtham avideśāṁ phalam āmaṇahkam akānīmayataḥ kathāṁ tat-sūdhaneḥ karma kuryaḥ | tasmād na dharmārtham upavasanti īti | karmarthāṁ tarhy etēṣāṁ upavāsaḥ uchyate | rogāḥ aruchir eṣām | tarhi nyaya-kāle kathāṁ rogāḥ | uchyate | niyata-kāle api rogāḥ bhavanti yathā trīṣyaka-cha- turthikādi-jvarāḥ | adhānā ca ete | " But do not some say that ‘from a dog having been noticed to fast on the fourteenth day of the month, and a hawk on the eighth, they also have a knowledge of matters connected with a future life?’ But how is it known that these dogs and hawks fast from religious motives? For it is only those who read the Vedas, Smṛitis, Purāṇas, etc., who are aware that by means of such and such observances, such and such rewards will be obtained in another world. But these animals neither read the sacred books for themselves, nor ascertain their contents from others. How then, ignorant as they are of the contents of the scriptures, and devoid of any desire for future rewards, can they perform those rites which are the means of attaining them? It is therefore to be concluded that they do not fast from religious motives. But why, then, do they fast? We reply, because from sickness they have a disinclin-
are defective, those who have not read the Veda, eunuchs, and Śūdras, have a right to sacrifice. 6. It is Brāhmans, Rājanyas, and Vaiśyas (only who) according to the Veda (possess this privilege).”

But how do they happen to be sick on certain fixed days? We answer, there are also certain diseases which occur on fixed days, as tertian and quartan agues. Another reason why the lower animals cannot sacrifice is that they are destitute of wealth (and so unable to provide the necessary materials).”

“And yet,” Prof. Müller remarks (ibid), “concessions were made (to other and lower classes) at an early period. One of the best known cases is that of the Rathakāra. Then the Nishādasthapati, though a Nishāda chief and not belonging to the three highest classes was admitted to great sacrifices, e.g. to the gāvedhukacharu.”

The S'atap. Br. i, 1, 4, 12, has the following words: Tāni vai etāni chāteväri vācaḥ “ehi” iti brāhmaṇasya “āghaḥ” “ādṛeva” vaiśasya cha rājanyabandho cha “ādḥa-va” iti śūdrasya | “[In the formula, havishkṛtya ehi, ’come, o oblation-maker,’ referred to in the previous paragraph, and its modifications] these four (different) words are employed to express ’come’: ehi, ’come,’ in the case of a Brāhmaṇ; āghaḥ, ’come hither,’ in the case of a Vaiśya; ādṛeva, ’hasten hither,’ in the case of a Rājanya-bandhu, and ādhaṁ, ’run hither,’ in the case of a Śūdra.” On this Prof. Weber remarks, in a note on his translation of the first adhyāya of the first book of the S'. P. Br. (Journ. Germ. Or. Soc. iv. p. 301): “The entire passage is of great importance, as it shews (in opposition to what Roth says in the first vol. of this Journal, p. 83) that the Śūdras were then admitted to the holy sacrifices of the Arians, and understood their speech, even if they did not speak it. The latter point cannot certainly be assumed as a necessary consequence, but it is highly probable; and I consequently incline to the view of those who regard the Śūdras as an Arian tribe which immigrated into India before the others.” See above, p. 141, note 261, and Ind. Stud. ii. 194, note, where Prof. Weber refers to the Mahābhārata, S'antip. verses 2304 ff. which are as follows: Svāhākāra-vasāḥkāra mantraḥ śūdre na vidyate | tasmāḥ ēhùdṛaḥ pākayojnair yawjetāvatavān svayam | pūrṇopātramayīm āhūḥ pākayojnasya daksinām | śūdraḥ Paijavyo nūma sahasrānāṁ ātuṁ dādau | Aināḍṛgnyena vidhīnena daksinām iti nāh śrutam | “The Svāhākāra, and the Vāṣṭākāra, and the mantras do not belong to a Śūdra.” Wherefore let a man of this class sacrifice with pākayojnas, being incapacitated for (Vedic) rites (śranta-vratopāya-hūnaḥ | Comm.). They say that the gift (daksinā) proper for a pākayojna consists of a full dish (pūrṇopātramayī). A Śūdra called Paijavana gave as a present a hundred thousand (of these pūrṇopātras) after the Aināḍṛgnyya rule.” Here, says Prof. Weber, “the remarkable tradition is recorded that Paijavana, i.e. Sudās, who was so famous for his sacrifices, and who is celebrated in the Rig-veda as the patron of Vivasmita and enemy of Vasishtha, was a Śūdra.” In the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, vii. 11, 24, the duties of a Śūdra are described to be “submissiveness, purity, honest service to his master, sacrifice without mantras, abstinence from theft, truth, and the protection of cows and Brāhmans” (śūdrasya annatikā sauchāṁ sevā śrūmīṁ anuvāyāḥ | amantra-yaññaḥ hy anṣeyām satyaṁ go-vipa-ra-kāshuṇam |). The Commentator defines amantra-yaññaḥ thus: namaskāreyāniva pancha-yaññaṁ uṣṭhānām, “the practice of the five sacrifices with obeisance,” and quotes Yajnavalkya. See also Wilson’s Vishnu Purāṇa, vol. iii. p. 87, and notes; Müller’s Anc. Sansk. Lit. p. 203; the same author’s Essay, at the end of the ninth vol. of the Journ. Germ. Or. Soc. p. lxxii.; and Bohthingk and Roth’s Lexicon, s.v. pākayojna.
According to the Ait. Br. vii. 19, "the Brāhmaṇ alone of the four castes has the right of consuming things offered in sacrifice" (etāh vai prajāh hutādo yad brāhmaṇāḥ | atha etāh ahutādo yad rājanyo vaiśyaḥ śūdraḥ). And yet, as Prof. Müller observes, it is said in the Satap. Br. v. 5, 4, 9: Chatvāro vai varṇāḥ brāhmaṇo rājanyo vaiśyaḥ śūdro na ha eteshāṁ ekasāhana bhavati yaḥ somaṁ vamati | sa yad ha eteshāṁ ekasāhit syāt syād ha eva prāyāschittīḥ | "There are four classes, the Brāhmaṇ, Rājanya, Vaiśya, and Śūdra. There is no one of these who vomits (i.e., I suppose, dislikes) the soma. If anyone of them however should do so, let there be an atonement."

Professor Weber, by whom also these words are quoted (Ind. St. x. 12), remarks that "they leave open the possibility of Rājanyas, Vaiśyas, and even Śūdras partaking of the soma, the only consequence being that they must as an expiation perform the Sautramañ̄i rite."

In the twenty-first of the Yajna-paribhāṣa Sūtras, translated by Müller, p. xlvii., it is declared that the priestly dignity belongs to the Brāhmaṇs; and it is laid down by the Indian authorities that even when the sacrifice is of a kind intended exclusively for Kshattriyas, the priest must still be a Brāhmaṇ and not a Kshattriya, the reason being that men of the former class only can eat the remains of the sacrifice (see Kātyāyana's Sr. Sūtras, i. 2, 8): Brāhmaṇāḥ ritejo bhaksya-pratisedhād itarayoḥ, "the Brāhmaṇs only are priests, because the other two castes are forbidden to eat (the remains of the sacrifice)"). See also Weber, Ind. St. x. pp. 17 and 31, and the passages of the Ait. Br. viii. 24 and 27, referred to in pages 30 and 31: 24. Na ha vai apurohitasya rājno devāḥ annam adanti | tasmād rājā yaksamagō brāhmaṇam puro dadhita | "The gods do not eat the food offered by a king who has no purohitā. Wherefore (even) when not about to sacrifice, the king should put forward a Brāhmaṇ (as his domestic priest)." 27. Yo ha vai trīn purohitāṁs trīn purodhātrīṁ veda sa brāhmaṇāḥ purohitāḥ | sa vadeḥ purodhāyai | Agnir vā ca purohitāḥ prithī ca purodhātā yāyur vā ca purohitā ’ntarikṣam purodhātā ādityo vā ca purohitā dyauḥ purodhātā | esha ha vai purohito yaḥ evaṁ veda atha sa tirohoto yaḥ evaṁ na veda | tasya rājā mitraṁ bhavati dvishantam apabdhave | yasyaivaṁ vedvān brāhmaṇo rāṣṭra-gopaḥ purohitāḥ | kshattrena kshattraṁ jayati balena balam abhute | yasyaivaṁ vedvān brāhmaṇo rāṣṭra-gopaḥ purohitāḥ | tasmai viśaḥ sanjānte sammukhāḥ ekamanasaḥ | yasyaivaṁ vedvān brāhmaṇo
rāṣṭra-gopāḥ puruḥitaḥ | "The Brāhman who knows the three purophitas, and their three pointers, is a (proper) puruhiita, and should be nominated to this office. Agni is one puruhiita, and the earth appoints him; Vāyu another, and the air appoints him; the Sun is a third, and the sky appoints him. He who knows this is a (proper) puruhiita; and he who does not know this is to be rejected. (Another) king becomes the friend of the prince who has a Brāhman possessing such knowledge for his puruhiitas and the protector of his realm; and he vanquishes his enemy. He who has a Brāhman possessing etc. (as above) conquers (another's) regal power by (his own) regal power, and acquires another's force by (his own) force. With him who has a Brāhman etc. (as above) the people are openly united and in harmony."

I add another passage from the same Brāhmaṇa, which might also have been properly introduced in an earlier chapter of this work (chapt. i. sect. iii.) as it relates to the creation of the four castes:

Ait. Br. vii. 19. Prajāpati yajnam asrijata | yajnāṁ srishtam anu brahma-kshattre asrijyetaṁ | brahma-kshattre anu deeyayaḥ prajāḥ asrijyanta hutadaśa cha ahutadaśa cha brahma eva anu hutadaśa kshattram anu ahutadaśa | etāḥ vai prajāḥ hutado yad brāhmaṇaḥ | atha etāḥ ahutado yad rājanyo vaisyāḥ śūdraḥ | tābhya yajnāḥ udakramat | tam brahma-kshattre aneitāṁ yāny eva brahmaṇaḥ āyudhāni tair brahma aneit yāni kshetrasya tam (? tait) kshattram | etāni vai brahmaṇaḥ āyudhāni yad yajnāyudhāni | atha etāni kshetrasya āyudhāni yad aśe-rathaḥ kavachaḥ āhu-dhava | tam kshattram anavāpya nyavarttata | āyudhebhyaḥ ha sma asya vijamānaḥ parāṁ eva eti | atha enam brahma aneit | tam āpnot | tam āptēḥ parastād nirudhya atishṭhat | sa āptēḥ parastād niruddhas tishṭhan jnāteva svāny āyudhāni brahma upavarttata | tasmād ha apy etarhi yajno brahmasya eva brahmaṇesu pratisht hitaḥ | atha etarh kshattram aneitāḥḥat tad abraivid "upa ma āśmin yajne ṣvayasa" iti | tat "tathā" ity abraivist "tad vai nidhāya svāny āyudhāni brahmaṇaḥ eva āyudhāir brahmaṇo rūpeṇa brahma bhūteva yajnam upavarttava" iti | "tathā" iti tat kshattrāṁ nidhāya svāny āyudhāni brahmaṇaḥ eva āyudhāir brahmaṇo rūpeṇa brahma bhūteva yajnam upavarttata | tasmād ha apy etarhi kṣhattrīyo yajamāno nidhāya eva svāny āyudhāni brahmaṇaḥ eva āyudhāir brahmaṇo rūpeṇa brahma bhūteva yajnam upavarttata |

"Prajāpati created sacrifice. After sacrifice, Brāhmān (sacred know-
ledge) and Kṣāttra (regal power) were created. After these, two kinds of creatures were formed, viz.: those who eat, and those who do not eat, oblations. After Brāhmān came the eaters of oblations, and after Kṣāttra those who do not eat them. These are the eaters of oblations, viz. the Brāhmans. Those who do not eat them are the Rājanya, the Vaiśya, and the Śūdra. From these creatures sacrifice departed. Brāhmān and Kṣāttra followed it, Brāhmān with the implements proper to itself, and Kṣāttra with those which are proper to itself. The implements of Brāhmān are the same as those of sacrifice, while those of Kṣāttra are a horse-chariot, armour, and a bow and arrows. Kṣāttra turned back, not having found the sacrifice; which turns aside, afraid of the implements of Kṣāttra. Brāhmān followed after it, and reached it; and having done so, stood beyond, and intercepting it. Being thus found and intercepted, sacrifice, standing still and recognizing its own implements, approached to Brāhmān. Wherefore now also sacrifice depends upon Brāhmān, upon the Brāhmans. Kṣāttra then followed Brāhmān, and said, 'invite me (too to participate) in this sacrifice.' Brāhmān replied, 'so be it: then laying aside thy own implements, approach the sacrifice with the implements of Brāhmān, in the form of Brāhmān, and having become Brāhmān.'

The two principles or functions represented by the Brāhmans and Kṣāttriya respectively.


This idea may be further illustrated by a reference to several passages adduced by Professor Weber, Ind. St. x. 17, who remarks: "Hence every Rājanya and Vaiśya becomes through the consecration for sacrifice (dīkṣā) a Brāhmaṇ during its continuance, and is to be addressed as such in the formula employed," and cites S. P. Br. iii. 2, 1, 39 f., part of which has been already quoted above, in p. 136, note; and also Ait. Br. vii. 23: Sa ha dīkṣhamūnah eva brāhmaṇatām abhyupaiti | "He a king, when consecrated, enters into the condition of a Brāhmaṇ." See the rest of the section and sections 24, 25, and 31 in Dr. Haug's translation. The S. P. Br. xiii. 4, 1, 3, says, in opposition to the opinion of some, that an asvamedha, which is a sacrifice proper to Rājanyas, should be begun in summer, which is their season: tad vai vasante eva abhyārāheta | vasanto vai brāhmaṇasya rīṭah | yath u vai kai cha yajate brāhmaṇi-bhūya eva eva yajate | "Let him commence in spring, which is the Brāhmaṇ's season. Whosoever sacrifices do so after having as it were become a Brāhmaṇ." So too Kātyāyana says in his S'rauta Sūtras vii. 4, 12: "Brāhmaṇa" ity eva vaiśya-rūjana-yayor api | "The word Brāhmaṇa is to be addressed to a Vaiśya and a Rājanya also." On which the Commentator annotates: Vaiśya-rūjana-yayor api yajne 'dīkṣito 'yam brāhmaṇah' ity eva vaktavyam | na "dīkṣito 'yam kṣatriyo vaiśya vē" iti | "The formula 'This Brāhmaṇ has been consecrated' is to be used at the sacrifice of a Vaiśya
Kshättra rejoined, 'Be it so,' and, laying aside its own implements, approached the sacrifice with those of Brāhmāṇ, in the form of Brāhmāṇ, and having become Brāhmāṇ. Wherefore now also a Kshattriya when sacrificing, laying aside his own implements, approaches the sacrifice with those of Brāhmāṇ, in the form of Brāhmāṇ, and having become Brāhmāṇ."

The Mahābhārata, Śāntip. verses 2280 f. distinctly defines the duty of a Kshattriya in reference to sacrifice and sacred study: Kshattriya-asyāpi yo dharmas tamb te vakshyāmi Bhārata | dadyād rājan na yācheta yajeta na cha yājayet | nādhyaṁ pade adhiyāta prajāś cha parīpālayet | "I will tell thee also the duties of a Kshattriya. Let him give, and not ask (gifts); let him sacrifice, but not officiate for others at sacrifices; let him not teach, but study; and let him protect the people."

It is clear that these passages which restrict the right of officiating ministerially at sacrifices to the members of the Brahmanical order, represent a very different state of opinion and practice from that which prevailed in the earlier Vedic age, when Viśvāmitra, a Rājanya, and his relatives, were highly esteemed as the authors of sacred poetry, and were considered as perfectly authorized to exercise sacerdotal functions.

The result of the conflict between the opposing interests represented by Vasishṭha and Viśvāmitra respectively, is thus described by Professor and a Rājanya also; and not the words 'this Rājanya, or this Vaiśya, has been consecrated.'"

189 It appears from Arrian that the Greeks were correctly informed of this prerogative of the Brāhmans. He says, Indica, ch. xi.: Kal δοτε εἴδη θεοί, εξεγγυηθείς ἀντρες θεοίς τῶν τινί σοφιστῶν τοῖς γίνεται, ὡς δυκάς ἐκλείπεις κεχαρισμένα τοῖς θεοῖς θυσίας. "And whosoever sacrifices in private has one of these sophists" (so the highest of the classes, here said to be seven in number, is designated) "as director of the ceremony, since sacrifice could not otherwise be offered acceptably to the gods." Arrian makes another assertion (ibid. xii.) which, if applied to the time when he wrote (in the second Christian century), is not equally correct. After observing that the several classes were not allowed to intermarry, nor to practice two professions, nor to pass from one class into another, he adds: Μοῦνον σφίς ανέτασι σοφιστήν ἐκ πάντως κέννοις γενέσθαι δεί τοῖς μαθηματικοῖς τοῖς σοφιστήσι τῷ πρῶτον, τὰ πάνταν τὰλειψώτατα. "Only it is permitted to a person of any class among them to become a sophist; for the life of that class is not luxurious, but the most toilsome of all." However indubitably true the first part of this sentence may have been in the age of Viśvāmitra, it cannot be correctly predicated of the age of Arrian, or even of the period when India was invaded by Alexander the Great. The mistake may have arisen from confounding the Buddhists with the Brāhmans, or from supposing that all the Brahmanical Indians, who adopted an ascetic life, were regarded as "sophists."
Roth at the close of his work on the literature and history of the Veda, which has been so often quoted, p. 141: "Vasishṭha, in whom the future position of the Brahmans is principally foreshadowed, occupies also a far higher place in the recollections of the succeeding centuries than his martial rival; and the latter succumbs in the conflict out of which the holy race of Brahmapārtta was to emerge. Vasishṭha is the sacerdotal hero of the new order of things. In Viśvāmitra the ancient condition of military shepherd-life in the Punjab is thrown back for ever into the distance. This is the general historical signification of the contest between the two Vedic families, of which the literature of all the succeeding periods has preserved the recollection."

Sect. VII.—Do the details in the last two sections enable us to decide in what relation Vasishṭha and Viśvāmitra stood to each other as priests of Sudās?

It appears from the data supplied in the two preceding sections that both Vasishṭha and Viśvāmitra are represented as priests of a king called Sudās. This is shewn, as regards the former rishi (see pp. 319 ff., above), by R.V. vii. 18, 4, 5, and 21–25; and vii. 33, 1–6, where he is said to have interceded with Indra for Sudās, who, as appears from verse 25 of the second of these hymns, was the son of Pijavana. A similar relation is shewn by R.V. iii. 53, 9–13 to have subsisted between Viśvāmitra and Sudās (see above, p. 342); and although Sudās is not in that passage identified with the king who was Vasishṭha’s patron, by the addition of his patronymic, we are told in the Nirukta, ii. 24, that he was the same person, the son of Pijavana. There is therefore no doubt that, according to ancient tradition, the two rishis were both priests of the same prince. It further appears that the Bharatas, with whom, as we have seen, Viśvāmitra was connected, are in R.V. vii. 33, 6 referred to as in hostility with Sudās and his priest. Are we then to conclude that the one set of facts excludes the other—that the two rishis could not both have been the family-priests of Sudās?

There is no reason to arrive at such an inference. Vasishṭha and Viśvāmitra could not, indeed, have been the domestic priests of Sudās at one and the same period. But they may have been so at different
times; and the one may have supplanted the other. It is, however, very
difficult to derive from the imperfect materials supplied in the passages
to which I have referred any clear conception of the shape and course
which the contest between these two rivals took, or to fix the periods
at which they respectively enjoyed their patron’s favour. Prof. Roth
thinks\textsuperscript{170} that some light is thrown on this obscure subject by the
different parts of the 53rd hymn of the third mandala of the Rig-veda.
This composition, as it stands, contains, as he considers, fragments of
hymns by Viśvāmitra or his descendants, of different dates; and the
verses (9–13), in which that rishi represents himself and the Kauśikas
as being the priests of Sudās, are, in his opinion, earlier than the con-
cluding verses (21–24),\textsuperscript{171} which consist of imprecations directed against
Vasishṭha. These last verses, he remarks, contain an expression of
wounded pride, and threaten vengeance against an enemy who had
come into possession of some power or dignity which Viśvāmitra him-
self had previously enjoyed. And as we find from one of his hymns
(the 53rd) that he and his adherents had at one time led Sudās to
victory, and enjoyed a corresponding consideration;—while from Vasish-
ṭha’s hymns it is clear that he and his family had also been elevated in
consequence of similar claims to a like position;—it would seem to
result that Viśvāmitra had cursed Vasishṭha for this very reason that he
had been supplanted by him. The former with his Kuśikas had through
the growing influence of his rival been driven away by Sudās to the
Bharatas the enemies of that prince and of the Trītus; and then

\textsuperscript{170} See Litt. und Gesch. des Weda, pp. 121 ff.
\textsuperscript{171} I have (above, p. 343) characterized these verses as obscure and have left them
untranslated. The portions of the following version which are printed in italics are
doubtful: verse 22. “He (or, it) vexes \textit{(turns the edge of)} even an axe; and breaks
even a \textit{scord}. A \textit{sothing} cauldron, even, o Indra, when \textit{ever-heated}, casts out foam.
23. O men, no notice is taken of the arrow. They lead away the \textit{intelligent} (\textit{lodha})
looking upon him as a beast. Men do not, however, pit a hack to run against a racer;
they do not lead an ass before horses. 24. These sons of Bharata, o Indra, desire
separation, not vicinity. They constantly urge the horse \textit{as if to a distance}; they carry
about the \textit{bow} in the battle.” The reader may consult Prof. Wilson’s translation R.V.
vol. iii. p. 89 f., as well as Roth’s Litt. u. Gesch. des Weda, p. 109 f. In his Illustra-
tions of the Nirukta, p. 42, Roth conjectures that both \textit{lodha} and \textit{paśu}, in verse 23,
may denote animals of different natures, and that the clause may mean something to
the same effect as “they look on the wolf as if it were a hare.” In his Lexicon, \textit{s.w.}
\textit{paśu}, he takes that word to denote a head of cattle (ein Stück Vieh) as a term of
contempt. He takes \textit{jayavāja}, in verse 24, to mean “having the impulsive force (?)
(Schnell-Kraft) of a bow-string.”
vowed vengeance against their enemies. Roth remarks that if this conjecture appears too bold, which he does not allow, there is no alternative but to regard verses 9-11 of R.V. iii. 53, as interpolated, and to hold that Visvāmitra had always been allied with the Bharatas. But, as he urges, in a period such as that which the hymns of the Veda represent to us—a time of feud and foray among the small neighbouring tribes, when the power of the leaders of families and petty chiefs was unlimited, when we observe that the ten kings were allied against Sudās—in a period of subdivided dominion like this it would be far more surprising to find a family so favoured by the gods as that of Visvāmitra or Vasishṭha in continued and undisturbed possession of influence over any one of these chieftains, than to see mutual aggression, hostility, and vindictiveness, prevailing even among families and clans united to one another by community of language and manners. It is further evident from later tradition, as Roth remarks, that Vasishṭha and his family had not always been the objects of Sudās's favour; but had, on the contrary, been at some time or other sufferers from his enmity or that of his house; and in proof of this he refers to the passage which has been cited above (p. 328) from Sāyaṇa's note on R.V. vii. 32, and the Sātyāyana and Taṇḍya Brāhmaṇas, as there quoted; and also to the 176th adhyāya of the Ādiparvan of the Mahābhārata, verses 6696 ff., which will be adduced in a future section.

According to Roth's view (p. 124) the alienation between Sudās and Vasishṭha fomented by Visvāmitra was only of temporary duration, and we must, therefore, understand that according to his view, the former rishi and his family remained eventually victors in the contest for influence between themselves and their rivals.

Professor Weber, in a note appended to an article by Dr. A. Kuhn in page 120 of the first volume of his Indische Studien, expresses a different opinion. "The testimonies," he says, "adduced by Roth, pp. 122 ff., according to which Sudās appears in the Epic age as hostile to Brahmanical interests, stand in opposition to his assertion that Vasishṭha's family finally banished Visvāmitra and the Kuśikas from the court of that prince. The enmity between the latter and Vasishṭha, the prototype of Brahmanhood, is thus by no means of temporary duration (Roth, p. 124), but the very contrary." The passages cited by Roth, which Weber here claims as supporting his
own view, are Manu, vii. 41 (see above, p. 296), the Anukramaṇī with the Śaṭyāyana and Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇas quoted in p. 328, and the 126th and following sections of the Ādip. of the M. Bh. which will be added hereafter. To these may be added the text from the Kaushitakī Brāhmaṇa, cited in p. 328. If Sudāś became ultimately reconciled to Vasishṭha, and re-instanted him and his relatives in their position of court priests, to the exclusion of the rival family of Viśvāmitra, it seems hard to understand, according to Professor Weber’s argument, how that prince’s name should have been handed down by tradition as one of the most prominent examples of impiety displayed in resistance to Brahmanical pretensions. It is, however, to be observed that, except in the text of Manu, it is the descendants of Sudāś, and not the king himself, who are charged with the outrages committed against Vasishṭha’s family; and that in the passage of the M. Bh. above referred to (Ādip. vv. 7669 ff.) the son of Sudāś is represented as becoming ultimately reconciled to Vasishṭha.\(^{172}\) And if the passages, which have been cited above from the Rig-veda (pp. 330 f.) in allusion to Sudāś’s deliverance by the gods, refer to a real person, and to the

\(^{172}\) It is also worthy of remark that the Anūṣāsanap. of the M.Bh. contains a conversation between Vasishṭha and Saudāsa (the son, or one of the descendants of, Sudāś) about the pre-eminent purity and excellence of cows, verse 3732: Etaśmin eva kāle tu Vasishṭham rishi-suttamam | Ikhāvākva-vamśījo rījā Saudāsa vadhataṁ vareḥ | sarva-taka-charaṁ siddhaṁ brāhma-kosāṁ sanātanaṁ | purohitam abhi-praṭhūṁ abhividgopaśeṣakrame | Saudāsa uśeṣa | trilokye bhagavan kiṃsavit pavi-trāṁ kathyaṁ ‘nagha | yat kīrttyan saṁi marṭtyah prīṣmayat puyam uttpamam | “At this time the eloquent king Saudāsa, sprung from the race of Ikhāvāku, proceeded, after salutation, to make an enquiry of his family-priest Vasishṭha, the eternal saint, the most excellent ofrishis, who was able to traverse all the world, and was a treasure of sacred knowledge: ‘What, o venerable and sinless man, is declared to be the purest thing in the three worlds, by constantly celebrating which one may acquire the highest merit?’” Vasishṭha in reply expatiates at great length on the merit resulting from bestowing cows, and ascribes to these animals some wonderful properties, as that they are the “support of all beings” (pratishṭhāḥ bhūtānām, verse 3736) “the present and the future” (pūṣo bhūtaṁ cha bhāvyayā cha, 3737), and describes the cow as “pervading the universe, mother of the past and future” (yāyā sarvam idam vyāptaṁ jagat sthūvara-jangamam | tām dhenuṁ śirasā vande bhūta-bhāvyayaṁ mātaram, 3799). The sequel is thus told in verse 3801: Varam idam iti bhūmido (bhūmīpaḥ) vibhīntya pravaram riḥer ekanāṁ tato maḥātām | yasyaṁ jataṁ niyataṁ avidbhujya subhā cha go-dhanam āptavāṁ lokān | “The great, self-subduing king, considering that these words of the rishi were most excellent, lavished on the Brāhmans very great wealth in the shape of cows, and obtained the worlds.”—So here we find the son of Saudāsa extolled as a saint.
same individual with whom we are at present concerned, they are diffi-
cult to reconcile with these traditions in the Brāhmaṇas, Mahābhārata, and Purāṇas; inasmuch as they are not said to be the productions of Viśvāmitra or his descendants, and as they necessarily imply that Sudās was a pious prince who worshipped the popular deities in the way pre-
scribed by the rishis by whom he was commemorated, since the latter would not otherwise have celebrated him in their hymns as a con-
spicuous object of divine favour. Tradition, too, as we have seen
(p. 268) represents Sudās to have been the author of a Vedic hymn. The verses of the 104th hymn of the seventh book which I have quoted
(above, p. 327) do not appear to contribute any further aid towards the solution of the question under consideration. Assuming that they con-
tain a curse aimed at Viśvāmitra we have no means of ascertaining when they were uttered; whether the charge preferred against Vasiś-
tha preceded or followed the ascendancy of his rival.

We seem, therefore, to possess no sufficient data for settling the question of the relations in which Vasiśtha and Viśvāmitra respectively stood to king Sudās, further than that they both appear, from the hymns of the Rig-veda, to have been, at one period or another, his family priests; but which of the two was the first, and which the last, to enjoy the king’s favour, must, according to all appearance, remain a mystery.

SECT. VIII.—Story of Triśanku.

I shall now proceed to adduce the different legends in the Purāṇas, the Rāmāyaṇa, and the Mahābhārata, in which Vasiśtha and Viśvā-
imtra are represented as coming into conflict.

In the third chapter of the fourth book of the Vishṇu Purāṇa (Wilson, vol. iii. pp. 284 ff.) we find a story about a king Satyavrata, called also Triśanku, the 26th in descent from Ikshvāku, who had become degraded to the condition of a Chaṇḍāla, about whom it is briefly related, iv. 3, 13:

Deśāda-vārshikyām anāvrishtyāṁ Viśvāmitra - kalatrāpatya - poshaṁ-
thaṁ chaṇḍāla - pratigraha - pariharaṇāya cha Jāhnavi - tira - nyagrodhe
mṛga-māṁsām anuṣīnaṁ babandha | 14. Paritūṣṭeṇa cha Viśvāmitreṇa
sa-śārīraḥ svargam āropitaḥ | "During a twelve years’ drought he daily
suspended deer’s flesh for the support of Viśvāmitra’s wife and children
on a nyagrodha-tree on the banks of the Ganges, intending by this means to spare them the (humiliation of) receiving a gift from a Chaṇḍāla; and was in consequence raised bodily to heaven by Viśvāmitra, who was gratified (with his conduct).”

This story is told at greater length in the Harivaṃśa (sections 12 and 13) where Vasishṭha also is introduced. I have already (p. 337) remarked on the super-human longevity ascribed to this sage, who is represented as contemporary both with Ikṣhvāku, and with his descendants down to the sixty-first generation. But Indian mythology, with its boundless resources in supernatural machinery, and in the doctrine of transmigration, can reconcile all discrepancies, and explain away all anachronisms, making any sage re-appear at any juncture when his presence may be required, another and yet the same.

The Harivaṃśa states that Satyavrata (Triśanku) had been expelled from his home by his father for the offence of carrying off the young wife of one of the citizens under the influence of a criminal passion (verse 718. Yena bhāravyā hṛtā pūrvān krtodevāh parasya vai | 720. Jahāra kāmāt kanyāṁ sa kanyachit puravāsinah); and that Vasishṭha did not interfere to prevent his banishment. His father retired to the woods to live as a hermit. In consequence of the wickedness which had been committed, Indra did not rain for a period of twelve years. At that time Viśvāmitra had left his wife and children and gone to practice austerities on the sea-shore. His wife, driven to extremity by want, was on the point of selling her second son for a hundred cows, in order to support the others; but this arrangement was stopped by the intervention of Satyavrata, who liberated the son when bound, and

173 In the Mahābh. Sūntip. verses 5330 ff. (referred to by Weber, Ind. St. i. 475, note) there is a story of Viśvāmitra determining to eat dog’s flesh in a period of famine between the end of the the Tretā-age and the beginning of the Dvāpara; and holding a conversation on this subject with a Chaṇḍāla. The circumstance is referred to in Manu, x. 108: Kusudhārtaś cattūn abhyāyād Viśvāmitraḥ āpa-yājhanīm | Chaṇḍāla-hastād ādadā dharmadharma-vichakshanaḥ | “And Viśvāmitra, who knew right and wrong, resolved to eat a dog’s thigh, taking it from the hand of a Chaṇḍāla.”

174 See in Ind. Stud. ii. 121 ff. Professor Roth’s remarks on the peculiar relation in which he regards this story as standing to that of Sūnasēpa, as given in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. The various incidents in the one present in many respects a curious parallel to those of the other, which he considers can hardly be accidental; and he thinks this version of the legend of Triśanku may have arisen out of a transformation and distortion of that of Sūnasēpa.
maintained the family by providing them with the flesh of wild animals: and according to his father’s injunction, consecrated himself for the performance of a silent penance for twelve years (verse 732. Upāṃsa - eratam āsthāya dīkṣāhīn devādaśa - vārṣhikim | pitur niyogād evahat tasmin vana-gate nripe). The story proceeds thus:

Verse 733. Ayodhyāṃ chaiva rāṣṭraṇāḥ cha tathaiva vantaḥpuram muniḥ | yājyopādhyāya-sambandhād Vaśīṣṭhāḥ paryarakhāta | Satyavrataś tu bālyād vai bhāvino 'rthasya vā balat | Vaśīṣṭhāḥ bhyaḍhitakam manyuṃ dhārayāmāsa nityāda | 735. Pitrā hi taṃ tadā rājyaṭ tyajyamānāṃ svam ātmanām | na vārayāmāsa munir Vaśīṣṭhāḥ kāraṇena ha | pānigrahaya-mantrāṇām nishṭāḥ syāt svapane padā | na cha Satyavrataś tasmād dhūrtacān svapane padā | jānan dharmān Vaśīṣṭhāḥ tu na mām trāttiti Bhārata | Satyavrataś tadā roshaḥ Vaśīṣṭhāḥ manaśa 'karot | guṇa-buddhyā tu bhagavān Vaśīṣṭhāḥ kiritvācaṃś tādā | na cha Satyavrataś tasya tu upāṃsūṃ abudhyata | . . . . 740. Tena tv idāniṃ vahata dīkṣāṃ taṃ dūrvahāṃ bhuvī | “kulasya nishkritisā tāta kriśā sā vai bhaved” iti | na taṃ Vaśīṣṭhāḥ bhagavān pitrā tyaktāṃ nyavārayat | abhishekṣhāmy ahāṁ putram āṣeyt evaṃ matir muneḥ | sa tu devadāsa-varshāṇī taṃ dīkṣāṃ udevahaṃ bali | avidyamāne māṁsa tu Vaśīṣṭhāyā mahātmanāḥ | sarva-kāma-dughāḥ dogdhriṃ dādarśa sa nṛpaṭmaṇaḥ | taṃ vai krodhāḥ cha mohāḥ cha śramaḥ chaiva kshudhādītaḥ | daśa-dharma-gato rāja jagāhā Janamejaya | . . . . 745. Tuch cha māṃsāṃ svayaṃ chaiva Visvāmitrasya chātmanā | bhogayāmāsa taḥ chhrutvā Vaśīṣṭhāḥ 'py asya chukrudeh | . . . . 750. Visvāmitras tu dāraṇāṃ āgato bharaṇye krite | sa tu taṃṣai varam prādād muniḥ pritas Triśankaśe | ehhandymāno vareṇātha varaṃ evaṃ nṛpaṭmaṇaḥ | saśāviro vraje svargam ity evaṃ yāchito varah | anāvrishtī Bhaye tasmin gate devādaśa-vārṣhike | pitreyā 'bhishchyaḥ rājye tu yājśyāmāsa taṃ muniḥ | mihataṃ devatānāṃ cha Vaśīṣṭhāyā cha Kaṭaḥkāh | saśāvirām tadā taṃ tu divam āropayat prabhuh | 733. “Meanwhile Vaśīṣṭhāḥ, from the relation subsisting between the king (Satyavrata’s father) and himself, as disciple175 and spiritual preceptor, governed the city of Ayodhyā, the country, and the interior apartments of the royal palace. But Satyavrata, whether through folly or the force of destiny, cherished constantly an increased indignation against Vaśīṣṭhāḥ, who for a (proper) reason had not interposed to pre-

175 Literally “the person in whose behalf sacrifice was to be performed.”
vent his exclusion from the royal power by his father. "The formulas of the marriage ceremonial are only binding," said Satyavrata, "when the seventh step has been taken," and this had not been done when I seized the damsel: still Vaśiṣṭha, who knows the precepts of the law, does not come to my aid." Thus Satyavrata was incensed in his mind against Vaśiṣṭha, who, however, had acted from a sense of what was right. Nor did Satyavrata understand (the propriety of) that silent penance imposed upon him by his father. . . . 740. When he had supported this arduous rite, (he supposed that) he had redeemed his family position. The venerable muni Vaśiṣṭha did not, however, (as has been said) prevent his father from setting him aside, but resolved to install his son as king. When the powerful prince Satyavrata had endured the penance for twelve years, he beheld, when he was without flesh to eat, the milch cow of Vaśiṣṭha which yielded all objects of desire; and under the influence of anger, delusion, and exhaustion, distressed by hunger, and failing in the ten duties [the opposites of which are then enumerated] he slew her . . . (745) and both partook of her flesh himself, and gave it to Viśvāmitra's sons to eat. Vaśiṣṭha hearing of this, became incensed against him," and imposed on him the name of Triṣāṅku as he had committed three sins (verses 747-749). "750. On his return home, Viśvāmitra was gratified by the support which his wife had received, and offered Triṣāṅku the choice of a boon. When this proposal was made, Triṣāṅku chose the boon of ascending bodily to heaven. All apprehension from the twelve years' drought being now at an end, the muni (Viśvāmitra) installed Triṣāṅku in his father's kingdom, and offered sacrifice on his behalf. The mighty Kauśika then, in spite of the resistance of the gods and of Vaśiṣṭha, exalted the king alive to heaven."

The legend of Triṣāṅku is also related, though differently, in the Bālakāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa; but as it is there introduced as a portion of the history of Viśvāmitra's various contests with Vaśiṣṭha recorded in the 51st to 65th sections of that book, I shall reserve it till I take up that narrative.

176 "The next ceremony is the bride's stepping seven steps. It is the most material of all the nuptial rites; for the marriage is complete and irrevocable so soon as she has taken the seventh step, and no sooner." Colebrooke's Misc. Ess. i. 218, where further details will be found.
SECT. IX.—Legend of Hariśchandra.

The son of Triśanku, the subject of the preceding story, was Hariśchandra, whose name is mentioned in the Vishṇu P., but without any allusion to the events of his life. According to the Mārkandeya Purāṇa, however, he gave up his whole country, and sold his wife and son, and finally himself, in satisfaction of Viśvāmitra’s demands for money. The following is a summary of the story as there told, book i. sections 7–9. We may perhaps regard it as having in part a polemical import, and as intended to represent Viśvāmitra, the Kshatttriya rival of the Brāhmans, in the most unfavourable colours. The sufferings of Hariśchandra, his wife, and son, are very pathetically depicted, and the effect of the various incidents is heightened with great artistic skill. The story, in fact, appears to me one of the most touching to be found in Indian literature. Hariśchandra, the Purāṇa tells us, was a royal rishi (rājarṣi) who lived in the Tretā age, and was renowned for his virtues, and the universal prosperity, moral and physical, which prevailed during his reign. On one occasion, when hunting, the king heard a sound of female lamentation which proceeded, it appears, from the Sciences who were becoming mastered by the austerely-fervid sage Viśvāmitra, in a way they had never been before by anyone else; and were consequently crying out in alarm at his superiority. In fulfilment of his duty as a Kshatttriya to defend the weak, and inspired by the god Ganesa, who had entered into him, Hariśchandra exclaimed (i. 7, 12) “What sinner is this who is binding fire in the hem of his garment, while I, his lord, am present, resplendent with force and fiery vigour?” He shall today enter on his long sleep, pierced in all his limbs by arrows, which, by their discharge from my bow, illuminate all the quarters of the firmament” (12. Ko’yam bādhṇāti vastrante pācakam pāpa-krīṇ narāḥ | baloshṇa-tejasā dipte mayi patyāv upasthite | 13. So ‘dya mat-kārmukā- | kshepa - vidipita - digantaraiḥ | śarair vibhinna - sarvāṅgo dirghanidrām | pṛavekṣhyatī |). Viśvāmitra was provoked by this address. In consequence of his wrath the Sciences instantly perished, and Hariśchandra, trembling like the leaf of an aśvattha tree, submissively represented that

177 The same story is told in the Padma Purāṇa also. See Wilson’s V.P. vol. iii. p. 287, and note. The glory of Hariśchandra is described in the M.Bh. Sabhūp. verses 489 ff.
he had merely done his duty as a king, which he defined as consisting in the bestowal of gifts on eminent Brāhmans and other persons of slender means, the protection of the timid, and war against enemies. Viśvāmitra hereupon demands a gift as a Brāhman intent upon receiving one. The king offers him whatever he may ask: Gold, his own son, wife, body, life, kingdom, good fortune (hiranyām vā swarṇaṁ vā putraḥ patrī kalevaram | prāṇāḥ rājyaḥ puraṁ lakṣmīṁ yad abhipretam ātmānaḥ |). The saint first requires the present for the Rājasūya sacrifice. On this being promised, and still more offered, he asks for the empire of the whole earth, including everything but Hariśchandra himself, his wife and son, and his virtue which follows its possessor wherever he goes 178 (i. 7, 28. Vīnā bhārīyaṁ cha putraṁ cha sarīraṁ cha tvaṁ tavaṁgha | 29. Dharmaṁ cha saraṁ dharmaṁ jña yo yāntam anugachhati). Hariśchandra joyfully agrees. Viśvāmitra then requires him to strip off all his ornaments, to clothe himself in the bark of trees, and to quit the kingdom with his wife Śaivyā and his son. When he is departing the sage stops him and demands payment of his yet unpaid sacrificial fee. The king replies that he has only the persons of his wife, his son, and himself left. Viśvāmitra insists that he must nevertheless pay; and that “unfulfilled promises of gifts to Brāhmans bring destruction” (i. 7. 35. Viśeshato brāhmaṇanāṁ hanty adattam pratiśrutam). The unfortunate prince, after being threatened with a curse, engages to make the payment in a month; and commences his journey with a wife unused to such fatigues, amid the universal lamentations of his subjects. While he lingers, listening to their affectionate remonstrances against his desertion of his kingdom, Viśvāmitra comes up, and being

178 Compare Manu’s very striking verses, viii. 17, and iv. 239 ff., which may be freely rendered as follows:

“Our virtue is the only friend that follows us in death;
All other ties and friendships end with our departing breath.
Nor father, mother, wife, nor son beside us then can stay,
Nor kinsfolk:—virtue is the one companion of our way.
Alone each creature sees the light, alone the world he leaves;
Alone of actions, wrong or right, the recompense receives.
Like log or clod, beneath the sod their lifeless kinsman laid,
His friends turn round and quit the ground; but virtue tends the dead.
Be then a hoard of virtue stored, to help in day of doom;
By virtue led, we cross the dread, immeasurable gloom.”

incensed at the delay and the king’s apparent hesitation, strikes the queen with his staff, as she is dragged on by her husband. All this Harišchandra endures with patience, uttering no complaint. Then the five Viśvedevas, merciful gods, exclaimed, “To what worlds shall this sinner Viśvāmitra go, who has thrust down this most excellent of sacrificers from the royal dignity? Whose faith shall now sanctify the soma-juice poured out with recitation of texts at the great sacrifice, that we may drink it, and become exhilarated?” (i. 7, 62. Ataṁ viśve tātā devāḥ pancha prāhuḥ kripālavah | Viśvāmitraḥ supāpo 'yaṁ lokāṁ kāṁ samacāpyati | 63. Yanāyaṁ yajeanāṁ śreshṭhaṁ sva-rājyaṁ avaro-pitāḥ | kanya vā śradāhayā pūtam sutaṁ somam mahādheve | pītā vayam prayāsyāno mudam mantra-purussaram |). Viśvāmitra heard what they said, and by a curse doomed them to become men; he relented, however, so far as to exempt them from having offspring, and from other family ties and human weaknesses, and promised that they should eventually be restored to their pristine position as gods. They in consequence became partially incarnate as the five Pāṇḍus, the sons of Draupadī. Resuming the story of Harišchandra, the writer tells us that he then proceeded with his wife and little son to Benares, imagining that this divine city, as the special property of Siva, could not be possessed by any mortal. Here he found the relentless Viśvāmitra waiting for him, and ready to press his demand for the payment of his sacrificial gift, even before the expiration of the full period of grace. In this extremity Saivyā the queen suggests with a sobbing voice that her husband should sell her. On hearing this proposal Harišchandra swoons, then recovers, utters lamentations, and swoons again, and his wife, seeing his sad condition, swoons also. While they are in a state of unconsciousness, their famished child exclaims in distress, “O father, father, give me bread; O mother, mother, give me food: hunger overpowers me; and my tongue is parched” (i. 8, 35. Tātā tātā dadasvān- nam ambāma bhojanaṁ dada | kshud me balavatī jātā jihdvagraṁ śushyate tathā). At this moment Viśvāmitra returns, and after recalling Harišchandra to consciousness by sprinkling water over him, again urges payment of the present. The king again swoons, and is again restored. The sage threatens to curse him if his engagement is not fulfilled by sunset. Being now pressed by his wife, the king agrees to sell her, adding, however, “If my voice can utter such a wicked word, I do
what the most inhuman wretches cannot perpetrate” (i. 8, 48 f. Nṛśaṁsair api yat kartūm na śakyaṁ tat karomy aham | yadi me śakyate vāṁ vaktum īḍṛk sudurvacah). He then goes into the city, and in self-accusing language offers his queen for sale as a slave. A rich old Brāhmaṇ offers to buy her at a price corresponding to her value, to do his household work. Hariśchandra’s heart was torn, and he could make no reply. The Brāhmaṇ paid down the money, and was dragging away the queen by the hair of her head, when her little son Rohitāśva, seeing his mother about to be taken away from him, began to cry, and laid hold of her skirts. The mother then exclaims: i. 8, 59, “Muncharyya munaḥ māṁ tāvad tevat pāśyamy aham śiśum | durlabhahm darśanaṁ tata punar aṣya bhavishyati | 60. Paśyaihi vatsa māṁ evam māṁ vratam āgyatam | māṁ ma śpraṅkhīṁ rāja-puttra asprīśya ‘haṁ tavādhunā’ | 61. Tataḥ sa bālaḥ sahasā drīṣṭevā kriṣṭāṁ tu mātaram | samabhāyadvad ambeti rudan sāsra-veleksanyah | 62. Tam āgataṁ dvijah kṛtā bālam abhyāhanat padā | vadaṁ tathāpi so ‘mbeti naivāmunchata mātaram | 63. Rājakaptya vrācha | “prasādaṁ kuru me nātha kriṣṭeś- 
man cha bālakam | kṛitā ‘pi nāham bhavato vinaināṁ kṛyya-sādhikā | 64. Ittham mamālpasabhāgyāyah prasāda-samukho bhava | māṁ saṁyojaya bālene vatseneva payasvinīm” | 65. Brāhmaṇah vrācha | “grihyatām vittam etat te diyatāṁ bālako mama” | “ś Let me go, let me go, venerable sir, till I look upon my son. I shall hardly ever behold him again. Come, my darling, see thy mother now become a slave. Touch me not, young prince; I may no longer be handled by thee.’ Seeing his mother dragged away, the child ran after her, his eyes dimmed with tears, and crying ‘mother.’ The Brāhmaṇ purchaser kicked him when he came up; but he would not let his mother go, and continued crying ‘mother, mother.’ The queen then said to the Brāhmaṇ, ‘Be so kind, my master, as to buy also this child, as without him I shall prove to thee but a useless purchase. 64. Be thus merciful to me in my wretchedness; unite me with my son, like a cow to her calf.” The Brāhmaṇ agrees: ‘Take this money and give me the boy.’” When his wife and son were being carried away, Hariśchandra broke out into laments: i. 8, 68. Yāṁ na vāyur na cādityo nendur na cha pri-thag-jaṇaḥ | drīśṭavantaḥ purā patnīṁ seyaṁ dāsīteva āgaṇā | 69. Sūrya-vāṁśa-prasūto ‘yāṁ sukumāra-karānguliḥ | samprāpto vikrayam

179 The whole of this reads like a scene from “Uncle Tom’s Cabin.”
bālo dhīn mām astu suḍūrmatīṁ | "‘She, my spouse, whom neither air, nor sun, nor moon, nor stranger had beheld, is now gone into slavery. This my son, a scion of the solar race, with his delicate hands and fingers, has been sold. Woe to me, wicked wretch that I am.’" After the Brāhmaṇ had gone out of sight with his purchases, Viśvāmitra again appeared and renewed his demands; and when the afflicted Hariśchandra offered him the small sum he had obtained by the sale of his wife and son, he angrily replied, i. 8, 74: Kṣattrabandho mame-māṁ tvam sadṛśāṁ yajna-dakṣināṁ | manyase yadi tat kṣipram pāśya tvam me bālam param | 75. Tapasō 'ttra sutaplasya brāhmaṇasyāyāmala-
sya cha | mat-prabhācasya chograsya ādhyātyayānasya cha | "‘If, miserable Kṣattriya, thou thinkest this a sacrificial gift befitting my deserts, thou shalt soon behold the transcendent power of my ardent austere-fervour, of my spotless Brāhmaṇhood, of my terrible majesty, and of my holy study.’" Hariśchandra promises an additional gift, and Viśvāmitra allows him the remaining quarter of the day for its liquidation. On the terrified and afflicted prince offering himself for sale, in order to gain the means of meeting this cruel demand, Dharma (Righteousness) appears in the form of a hideous and offensive Chaṇḍāla, and agrees to buy him at his own price, large or small. Hariśchandra declines such a degrading servitude, and declares that he would rather be consumed by the fire of his persecutor's curse than submit to such a fate. Viśvāmitra however again comes on the scene, asks why he does not accept the large sum offered by the Chaṇḍāla; and, when he pleads in excuse his descent from the solar race, threatens to fulminate a curse against him if he does not accept that method of meeting his liability. Hariśchandra implorēs that he may be spared this extreme of degradation, and offers to become Viśvāmitra's slave in payment of the residue of his debt; whereupon the sage rejoins, "If thou art my slave, then I sell thee as such to the Chaṇḍāla for a hundred millions of money" (i. 8, 95. Yadi preshyo mama bhavān chaṇḍālaya tato mayā | dāsa-bhāsam anuprāpto datto vittārbudena vai |). The Chaṇḍāla, delighted, pays down the money, and carries off Hariśchandra, bound, beaten, confused, and afflicted, to his own place of abode. Morn-
ing, noon, and evening the unfortunate prince repeats these words: i. 8, 99. Bālā dina-mukhi dṛiṣṭvā bālāṁ dina-mukham puraḥ | māṁ smarate asukhāvīṣṭā "mochayishyati nau nripaḥ | 100. Upātta-vitto
vîprâya datte vîtam ato 'dhikam' | na sà mām mṛga-sāvakshī vetti pāpātaram kritam | 101. Rāja-māṣaḥ suhṛt-tyāgo bhārīyā-tanaya-vikrayaḥ | prāptā chaṇḍālata cheyam aho duḥkha-paramparaḥ | "My tender wife, dejected, looking upon my dejected boy, calls me to mind while she says, 'The king will ransom us (100) after he has gained money, and paid the Brāhmaṇ a larger sum than he gave for us.' But my fawn-eyed spouse is ignorant that I have become yet more wretched than before. 101. Loss of my kingdom, abandonment of friends, sale of my wife and son, and this fall into the condition of a Chaṇḍāla,—what a succession of miseries!" Hariśchandra is sent by the Chaṇḍāla to steal grave-clothes in a cemetery (which is described at tedious length, with all its horrors and repulsive features), and is told that he will receive two-sixths of the value for his hire; three-sixths going to his master, and one-sixth to the king. In this horrid spot, and in this degrading occupation, he spent, in great misery, twelve months, which seemed to him like a hundred years (i.e. 127. Evaṁ dvādaśa-māsās tu nītāḥ śāta-samopamāḥ). He then falls asleep and has a series of dreams suggested by the life he had been leading (śmaśānābhīṣa-yogena, verse 129). After he awoke, his wife came to the cemetery to perform the obsequies of their son, who had died from the bite of a serpent (verses 171 ff.). At first the husband and wife did not recognize each other, from the change in appearance which had been wrought upon them both by their miseries. Hariśchandra, however, soon discovers from the tenor of her lamentations that it is his wife, and falls into a swoon; as the queen does also when she recognizes her husband. When consciousness returns, they both break out into lamentations, the father bewailing in a touching strain the loss of his son, and the wife the degradation of the king. She then falls on his neck, embraces him, and asks "whether all this is a dream, or a reality, as she is utterly bewildered;" and adds, that "if it be a reality, then righteousness is unavailing to those who practise it" (verse 210. Rājan svapno 'tha tathyaṁ vā yad etad manyate bhavān | tat kathyatām mahābhāga mano vai muh- yate mama | 211. Yady etad evaṁ dharmajna nāsti dharme sahayatā ). After hesitating to devote himself to death on his son's funeral pyre without receiving his master's leave, (as such an act of insubordination might send him to hell) (verses 215 ff.), Hariśchandra resolves to do so, braving all the consequences, and consoling himself with the hopeful
anticipation: verse 224. 

Yadi dattaṁ yadi hutaṁ guravo yadi toshitaḥ | 
paratva sangamo bhūyāt puttrenā saka cha tvayā | "If I have given gifts, and offered, sacrifices, and gratified my religious teachers, then may I be reunited with my son and with thee (my wife) in another world."

The queen determines to die in the same manner. When Hariśchandra, after placing his son’s body on the funeral pile, is meditating on the lord Hari Nārāyaṇa Krīṣṇa, the supreme spirit, all the gods arrive, headed by Dharma (Righteousness), and accompanied by Viśvāmitra. Dharma entreats the king to desist from his rash in-

180 In the following verses of the Atharva-veda a hope is expressed that families may be re-united in the next world: vi. 120, 3. Yattra suhūrddah suhṛdo madanti vihāya rogaṁ taneṣaḥ svayyāḥ | asloṇāḥ angair ahrutīḥ svarge yattra pasyena pitarau cha putrān | "In heaven, where our friends, and intimates live in blessedness, having left behind them the infirmities of their bodies, free from lameness or distortion of limb,—may we behold our parents and our children."

ix. 5, 27. Yā puṣram patiḥ vittvā athānanaṁ vindate ‘param | panchaundanaṁ evo ajñaaddāto na vi yosathā | 28. Samānala ke bhavati punarbhucā ‘parah patiḥ | yo ‘jam panchaundanaṁ dakshiyājyottishāṁ daṁcit | "When a woman has had one husband before, and takes another, if they present the ajña panchaundana offering they shall not be separated. 28. A second husband dwells in the same (future) world with his re-wedded wife, if he offers the ajña panchaundana, illuminated by presents." xii. 3, 17. Svargam lokam abhi no nayūśi saṁ jāyāya saha putraḥ syāma | "Mayest thou conduct us to heaven; may we be with our wives and children." xviii. 3, 23. Svāṁ gacchatu te mano adha pitṛin upa agra va | "May thy soul go to its own (its kindred) and hasten to the fathers." From the texts cited by Mr. Colebrooke "on the duties of a faithful Hindu widow," (Misc. Ess. 115 ff.) it appears that the widow who becomes a sati (i.e. burns herself with her husband’s corpse, or, in certain cases, afterwards) has the promise of rejoining her lord in another life, and enjoying celestial felicity in his society. In order to ensure such a result in all cases it was necessary either that both husband and wife should have by their lives merited equal rewards in another existence, or that the heroism of the wife, in sacrificing herself on her husband’s funeral-pile should have the vicarious effect of expiating his offences, and raising him to the same heavenly region with herself. And it is indeed the doctrine of the authorities cited by Mr. Colebrooke that the self-immolation of the wife had this atoning effect. But in other cases where the different members of a family had by their actions during life merited different kinds of retribution, they might, according to the doctrine of the transmigration of souls current in later ages, be re-born in the shape of different animals, and so rendered incapable of any mutual communication after death. In regard to the absence of any traces of the tenet of metempsychosis from the earliest Indian writings, see Professor Weber’s remarks in the Journ. of the Germ. Or. Soc. ix. 327 ff. and the abstract of them given in Journ. Roy. As. Soc. for 1865, pp. 365 ff.

181 An attempt is here made, verses 234 f., to give the etymology of Viśvāmitra: Viśva-trayaṇa yo mātrom kartum na 'vākitāḥ purā | Viśvāmitra tu te māttirām ish-taṁ ṣaḥhaṛttum ichhāti | "That Viśvāmitra, whom the three Viśvas formerly could not induce to be their friend, wishes to offer thee his friendship, and whatsoever thou desirést."
tention; and Indra announces to him that he, his wife, and son have conquered heaven by their good works. Ambrosia, the antidote of death, and flowers, are rained by the god from the sky; and the king’s son is restored to life and the bloom of youth. The king, adorned with celestial clothing and garlands, and the queen, embrace their son. Harischandra, however, declares that he cannot go to heaven till he has received his master the Chaṇḍāla’s permission, and has paid him a ransom. Dharma then reveals to the king that it was he himself who had miraculously assumed the form of a Chaṇḍāla. The king next objects that he cannot depart unless his faithful subjects, who are sharers in his merits, are allowed to accompany him to heaven, at least for one day. This request is granted by Indra; and after Visvāmitra has inaugurated Rohitāśva the king’s son to be his successor, Harischandra, his friends and followers, all ascend in company to heaven. Even after this great consummation, however, Vasishṭha, the family-priest of Harischandra, hearing, at the end of a twelve years’ abode in the waters of the Ganges, an account of all that has occurred, becomes vehemently incensed at the humiliation inflicted on the excellent monarch, whose virtues and devotion to the gods and Brāhmaṇs he celebrates, declares that his indignation had not been so greatly roused even when his own hundred sons had been slain by Visvāmitra, and in the following words dooms the latter to be transformed into a crane: i. 9, 9. Tasmād durātmā brahma-devī prājnānām avoropitāḥ | mach-chhāpopahato mūḍhāḥ sa vakate vam avāpsyati | “Wherefore that wicked man, enemy of the Brāhmaṇs, smitten by my curse, shall be expelled from the society of intelligent beings, and losing his understanding shall be transformed into a Vaka.” Visvāmitra reciprocates the curse, and changes Vasishṭha into a bird of the species called Ārī. In their new shapes the two have a furious fight,182 the Ārī being of the portentous height of two thousand yojanas (= 18000 miles), and the Vaka of 3090 yojanas. They first assail each other with their wings; then the Vaka smites his antagonist in the same manner, while the Ārī strikes with his talons. Falling mountains, overturned by the blasts of wind raised by the

182 On the subject of this fight the Bhāgavata Purāṇa has the following verse: ix. 7, 6. Traiśaṅkavo Harischandro Visvāmitra- Vasishṭhayoh | yan-nimittam abhūd yuddham pavahinor bahu-vārshikam | “The son of Trisāṅku was Harischandra, on whose account Visvāmitra and Vasishṭha in the form of birds had a battle of many
flapping of their wings, shake the whole earth, the waters of the ocean overflow, the earth itself, thrown off its perpendicular, slopes downwards towards Pātāla, the lower regions. Many creatures perish by these various convulsions. Attracted by the dire disorder, Brahmā arrives, attended by all the gods, on the spot, and commands the combatants to desist from their fray. They were too fiercely infuriated to regard this injunction: but Brahmā put an end to the conflict by restoring them to their natural forms, and counselling them to be reconciled: i. 9, 28. Na chāpi Kauśika-śreshṭhas tasya rājno 'parādhyaṃ | svarga-prāptikarō brahman upakāra-pade sthitah | 29. Tapa-vighnasya karttārau kāma-krodha-vasāṅ gatau | parityajatā bhadrān no brahma hi prachuram balam | ‘The son of Kuśika has not inflicted any wrong on Hariśchandra: inasmuch as he has caused the king’s elevation to heaven he stands in the position of a benefactor. 29. Since ye have yielded to the influence of desire and anger ye have obstructed your austere fervour; leave off, bless you; the Brahmanical power is transcendent.’ The sages were accordingly pacified, and embraced each other.”

This interesting legend may be held to have had a double object, viz. first to portray in lively colours the heroic fortitude and sense of duty exhibited by Hariśchandra and his wife in enduring the long series of severe trials to which they were subjected; and secondly, to represent Viśvāmitra in an unamiable light, as an oppressive asserter of those sacerdotal prerogatives, which he had conquered for himself by his austerities, to place him in striking contrast with the genuine Brāhman Vasīśthā who expresses strong indignation at the harsh procedure of his rival, and to recall the memory of those conflicts between years duration.” On this the Commentator remarks: Viśvāmitra rājasūya-dakshīṇa-śahalena Hariśchandra-sya sara-svaṃ apakṛitya yūtayūmāsa | tach chhrutēśa kupito Vasīśṭho'pi Viśvāmitrau “teem ārī bhava” iti vaśāpā | so 'pi “teem vako bhava” iti Vasīśṭham āsāpā | tayo cha yuddham abhūd iti prasiddam | “Viśvāmitra under pretence of taking a present for a rajasūya sacrifice, stripped Hariśchandra of all his property, and afflicted him. Vasīśṭha hearing of this, became incensed, and by an imprecation turned him into an Ārī. Viśvāmitra retorted the curse and changed Vasīśthā into a Vāka. And then a battle took place between them, as is well known.” Here it will be seen that the Commentator changes the birds into which the rishis were transformed, making Viśvāmitra the Ārī and Vasīśṭha the Vāka.

183 It is true that the Brāhman rishi Durvāsas also is represented as a very irascible personage. See vol. iv. of this work, pp. 165, 169, 208, 407; and Weber’s Ind. St. iii. 398.
the Brāhmaṇs and Kshatriyas, which were exemplified in the persons of these two sages, of whom the one is said to have been made the “lord of Brāhmaṇs” (Vaśishtham tisāṁ viprāṇām, M. Bh. Sāntip. v. 4499), and the other is declared in the story before us to have been the “enemy of the priests.”

SECT. X.—Contest of Vaśishṭhā and Viśvāmitra according to the Mahābhārata.

In the Ādi Parvan of the Mahābhārata, verses 6638 ff., we find another legend, in the Brahmanical interest, regarding the same two great personages, which begins with a panegyric on Vaśishṭhā, at the expense of the rival rishi:

6638. Brahmāṇo mānasāḥ putro Vaśishtho ’rundhāti-patīḥ | tāpasa
nirjītavā saśvad ajevaḥ amaraṁ aṣṭi | kāma-krodhaṁ ubhau yasya charanau
saṁvavāhatuḥ | yas tu nochchhedanaṁ chakre Kuśikānām udāra-dhiḥ |
Viśvāmitrāparādhena dhārayan manyum uttamaṁ | 6640. Putra-vyasaṁ
santaptahā śaktimāṇ apya aṣakta-vat | Viśvāmitra-vināśāya na chakre karma
darunam | mritāṁ śa puṇar āharat tum yaḥ sa putrāṁ Yama-ksheyat
kritāntāṁ nātichakrrāma velāṁ iev mahodadhiḥ | yam prāpya vijitātmā-
nam mahātmānaṁ narādhiḥ | Ikshvākavo mahāpālāḥ lebhīre prāvīṁ
imāṁ | purohitam imam prāpya Vaśishṭhāṁ rishi-sattamam | ijīre kra-
tubhiḥ chāiva nripās te Kuru-nandanaṁ | sa hi tāṁ yājāyāmaṁ sarvān
nripati-sattamān | brahmārṇaḥ Pāṇḍava-śrēṣṭha Vṛihaspātīr īvāmarān | 6645. Tasmād dharmā-pradhānātmā veda-dharma-vid ippītaḥ | brahmāṇo
guṇavān kaśchit purodhaḥ pariḍīṣayātām | kṣattriyaṇābhijātāna prithi-
viṁ jeto nāḥ ācārāḥ rājyaṁ pārtha rājyaḥ kāryāḥ mahiṁ
mahīḥ jīgīṣhataḥ rajāna brahma kāryam purassaram | . . . 6666. Kṣattriyo
ḥam bhavāṁ vipras tapāḥ-svādhīṇaṁ-sūdhanāḥ | brahmāṇesu kuto vīry-
yām praśāntesu dhīrātāmasu | arubdēna garāṁ yas tvāṁ na daśā-ma
mepitam | sva-dharmaṁ na prahāṣyāmi neshyāmi chanalena gam | . . .
6679. “Sthāyatām” iti tach eṣhūrteśa Vaśiśthasya payasvīṁ | ārā-
dhvāṃchita-sīro-griteḥ prābhābham raudra-darsanā | 6680. Krodha-raktē-
kaṇāṁ sā gaur hambhā-rama-ghana-svanā | Viśvāmitrasya tat sainyaṁ
vyadrāvayata sarvasāḥ | kāśagā-daṇḍābhiḥata kājayānāṁ tandastataḥ |
krodha-raktekaṇāṁ krodham bhūya eva samudadhe | āditya iva maṛhyānē
ekrodha-dīpta-vapur babhau | angūra-varsham muncantit mūhur bālādhi
to
mahat | asrijat Pahlavān puchhāt prasravād Drāvidān Sakān | yoni-
deshāc cha Yavanān sakriteḥ S'avarān bahān | . . . . 6691. Drishṭvā tad
mahād āścharayam brahma-tejo-bhavam tadā | Viśvāmitraḥ kshattrā-bhāvād
nirvigno vākyam abravit | "dhig balaṁ kshattriya-balām brahma-tejo-
balām balām | balābalāṁ vinīchitya tapaḥ eva param balam" | sa rājyaṁ
uphitam utsrijya tāṁ cha diptāṁ nripa-śriyam | bhogāṁs cha prīṣṭhātaḥ
krivā tapasy eva mano dadhe | sa gatvā tapasā siddhim lokān vishtabhya
tejasa | 6695. Tatāpa sarvān diptaujāḥ brahmanatvam avāptavān | api-
bach cha tataḥ somam Indreṇa saha Kauśikāḥ | 6638. "Vaśisṭhā," a Gandharva informs Arjuna, "was the mind-
born son of Brahmā and husband of Arundhati. By his austere fer-
vour, lust and anger, invincible even by the immortals, were constantly
vanquished and embraced his feet. Restraining his indignation at the
wrong done by Viśvāmitra, he magnanimously abstained from exter-
minating the Kuśikas. 6640. Distressed by the loss of his sons, he
acted, although powerful, like one who was powerless, and took no

184 Arundhati is again mentioned as the wife of Vaśisṭhā, in the following lines of the
M. Bh. Adīp. 7351 f. addressed to Draupadī: Yathendrīṇi Harihaye Ścūhā chaiva
Vībhūvasau | Rohinī cha yathā Some Damayanī yathā Nale | yathā Vaśīrvavye
Bhadrā Vaśisṭhā chōpy Arundhati | yathā Nārāyaṇe Lakṣmīn tathā team bhava
bhartirishu | "What Indrāṇī is to Indra, Śvāhā to the Sun, Rohinī to the Moon,
Damayanī to Nala, Bhadrā to Kuvera, Arundhati to Vaśisṭhā, and Lakṣmī to
Nārāyaṇa, that be thou to thy husbands." She is again noticed in verses 8455 ff. :
Svaretā chōpy kalyāṇī sarvā-bhūteshu viśrutā | Arundhati mahātmānam Vaśisṭhām
paryantakata | visuddha-bhāvac atyantaṁ sadā priya-hite ratam | saptarśi-madhya-
gāmā viram avamene cha tam munim | apadyāyena sa tena dhūmrūṣa-suma-prabhā
lakṣyā t' lakṣyā nābhīrūpā nimittam eva paśyati | "The faithful and beautiful Arun-
dhati, renowned among all creatures, was suspicious about the great Vaśisṭhā, whose
nature was eminently pure, who was devoted to the welfare of those he loved, who
was one of the seven rishis, and heroic; and she despised the muni. In con-
sequence of these evil surmisings, becoming of the dusky colour of smoke, both to be seen
and not to be seen, devoid of beauty, she looks like a (bad) omen." This version of the last
line is suggested by Prof. Aufrecht. The Commentator explains it thus: "Nimittam"
bhartur lakṣmanām "eva paśyati" kapaṭena | atah eva "nābhīrūpā prachanna-
veshā | tena hetum "lakṣyā 't lakṣyā cha" | "She regards as it were i.e. by guile
'the omen' afforded by her husband's (bodily) marks, hence she assumed a disguise,
and was 'both to be seen and not to be seen.'" 185 As regards the magnanimous character here assigned to Vaśisṭhā, I quote a
passage from the Viśnu Purāṇa, i. 9, 16 ff., where the irascible Durvasās (to whom
I lately referred, and who is said, in verse 2, to be a partial incarnation of Śiva,
Śankarasyānāk), addressing Indra, who, he conceived, had insulted him, thus
speaks of that sage's amiable temper, as contrasted with his own fierce and revengeful
disposition: 15. Nāhām kripālu-ḥridayo na cha mām bhajate kshāma | anye te mun-
dreadful measures for the destruction of Viśvāmitra. To recover those sons from the abode of Yama, he would not overstep fate, as the ocean respects its shores. Having gained this great self-mastering personage, the kings of Ikshvāku’s race acquired (the dominion of) this earth. Obtaining this most excellent of rishis for their family-priest, they offered sacrifices. This Brāhman-rishi officiated as priest for all those monarchs, as Vṛhaspati does for the gods. 6645. Therefore let some desirable, virtuous Brāhma, with whom righteousness is the chief thing, and skilled in Vedic observances, be selected for this office. Let a well-born Ksatriya, who wishes to subdue the earth, first of all appoint a family-priest in order that he may augment his dominion. Let a king, who desires to conquer the earth, give precedence to the Brahmanical power.” The Gandharva then, at Arjuna’s request, goes on (verses 6650 ff.) to relate the “ancient story of Vaśishṭha” (vaśishṭham ākhyānam purāṇam) and to describe the cause of enmity between that rishi and Viśvāmitra. It happened that the latter, who was son of Gādhi, king of Kāṇyakubja (Kanouj), and grandson of Kuśika, when out hunting, came to the hermitage of Vaśishṭha, where he was received with all honour, entertained together with his attendants with delicious food and drink, and presented with precious jewels and dresses obtained by the sage from his wonder-working cow, the fulfiller of all his desires. The cupiditity of Viśvāmitra is aroused by the sight of this beautiful animal (all of whose fine points are enumerated in the legend), and he offers Vaśishṭha a hundred million cows, or his kingdom, in exchange for her. Vaśishṭha, however, replies that he is unable to part with her even in return for the kingdom. Viśvāmitra then tells him that he will enforce the law of the stronger: 6665. “I am a Ksatriya, thou art a Brāhma, whose functions are austere fervour, and sacred study. How can there be any vigour in Brāhmans who are calm and self-restrained? Since thou dost not give up to me, in exchange for a

\[
yāyaḥ S'akra Durvāsasam acehi muṃ | Gautamādibhir anayais teṇau gareṇau ṣapādito mudhau | akshānti-ṣūra-ṣevasuṇa Durvāsasam acehi muṃ | 17. Vaśishṭhādyinir dayā-ṣūraḥ stotrāin kurvadbhir uchchakauḥ | gareṇau gato 'si yenaicau māṃ athādyāvav- 
\[
manyaśe | 15. “I am not tender-hearted: patience lodges not in me. Those munis are different: know me to be Durvāsas. 16. In vain hast thou been rendered proud by Gautama and others: know me to be Durvāsas, whose nature and whose entire substance is irascibility. 17. Thou hast become proud through the loud praises of Vaśishṭha and other merciful saints, since thou thus contemnest me to-day.”
\]
hundred million of cows, that which I desire, I shall not abandon my own class-characteristic; I will carry away the cow by force.” Vaśishṭha, confident, no doubt, of his own superior power, tells him to do as he proposes without loss of time. Viśvāmitra accordingly seizes the wonder-working cow; but she will not move from the hermitage, though beaten with whip and stick, and pushed hither and thither. Witnessing this, Vaśishṭha asks her what he, a patient Brāhmaṇ, can do? She demands of him why he overlooks the violence to which she is subjected. Vaśishṭha replies: “Force is the strength of Kshattriyas, patience that of Brāhmans. As patience possesses me, go, if thou pleasest” (6676. Kshattriyāṇāṃ balaṁ tejo brāhmaṇānāṁ kṣamā balam | kṣamā māṁ bhajate yasmāt gamyatāṁ yadi rochate). The cow enquires if he means to abandon her; as, unless he forsakes her, she can never be carried off by force. She is assured by Vaśishṭha that he does not forsake her, and that she should remain if she could. “Hearing these words of her master, the cow tosses her head aloft, assumes a terrific aspect, (6680) her eyes become red with rage, she utters a deep bellowing sound, and puts to flight the entire army of Viśvāmitra. Being (again) beaten with whip and stick, and pushed hither and thither, she becomes more incensed, her eyes are red with anger, her whole body, kindled by her indignation, glows like the noonday sun, she discharges showers of fire-brands from her tail, creates Pahlavas from the same member, Drāviḍas and Sakas, Yavaasas, Sabaras, Kāñchis, Sarabhas, Pauṇḍras, Kirātas, Sinhalas, Vaśas, and other tribes of armed warriors from her sweat, urine, excrement, etc., who assail Viśvāmitra’s army, and put it to a complete rout. 6692. “Beholding this great miracle, the product of Brahmanical might, Viśvāmitra was humbled at (the impotence of) a Kshattriya’s nature, and exclaimed, ‘Shame on a Kshattriya’s force; it is the force of a Brāhmaṇ’s might that is force indeed.’ Examining what was and was not force, and (ascertaining) that austere fervour is the supreme force, he abandoned his prosperous kingdom and all its brilliant regal splendour; and casting all enjoyments behind its back, he devoted himself to austerity. Having by this means attained perfection, and Brāhmaṇhood, he arrested the worlds by his fiery vigour, and disturbed them all by the blaze of his glory; and at length the Kauśika drank soma with Indra.”

136 See above, p. 342, and note 134.
The same legend is repeated in the Salyaparvan, verses 2295 ff.:

Tathā cha Kaustikas tata tapo-nityo jñendriyāḥ | tapasā eva suta tepena brähmanatvam avāptavyān | Gādhir nāma mahān āsit kshattriyaḥ prathito bhuvī | tasya putro 'bhavad rājjan Visvāmitraḥ pratāpavān | sa rājā Kaustikas tata mahāyogy abhavat kila | sa putram abhishichyātha Visvāmitram mahātapāḥ | deha-nyāse manaḥ chakre tam uchchha pranatāḥ pra-jāḥ | "na gantayam mahāprājna trāhi chāsāṃ mahābhayāt" | evam uktaḥ pratyuvācha tato Gādhiḥ prajās tataḥ | "visvasya jagato gopta bhavishyatī suta mama" | 2300. Ity uktvā tu tato Gādhir Visvāmitraṁ nivesya cha | jagāna tridivam rājan Visvāmitro 'bhavad nripaḥ | na sa śakoti prithivīṁ yatnavān api rakshitum | tataḥ śuśrava rājā sa rakṣha-sebhīyo mahābhayaṁ | niryayau nagarāch āpi chatur-anga-balānvitaḥ | sa yātvā dāram adhveṇām Vaśishṭhāsramam abhyagat | tasya te saṁitkāḥ rājāṁs chakrus tattprālayān bahūn | tatas tu bhagavān vipro Vaśishṭho Brahmanaḥ sutaḥ | daḍriśe 'tha tataḥ sarvam bhajyāmcgam mahāvanam | tasya krudduḥ mahārāja Vaśishṭho muni-sattamaḥ | 2305. "Śriyasa Su- varān ghorān" iti svām gām uvācha ha | tathokta sa 'srijat dhenuḥ puruśān ghora-dārsanān | te cha tad balam āśādya bahṣasnāḥ sarvato diśam | tach chhrutva vidrutam saṁyām Visvāmitras tu Gādhiḥaḥ | tapaḥ param manyamānas tapasy eva mano dādhe | so 'smiṁs tirtha-vare rājjan Sarasvatīyaḥ samāhitāḥ | niyamais chopavāsaī cha karsheyān deham ātmanāḥ | jalāhāro vāyubhakshaḥ parṇāhāraḥ cha so 'bhavat | tathā sthan-dīla-sāgya cha ye chāne niyamāḥ prithak | asakrit tasya devaṁ tu vrata-vighnam prachakrire | 2310. Na chāyā niyamād buddhir apayāti mahātmānaḥ | tatha pareṇa yatnena taptvā bahu-vidhaṁ tapaḥ | tejasā bhāska- rākāro Gādhiḥaḥ samapadyata | tapasā tu tathā yuktam Visvāmitram Pitāmahah | amanyata mahātejāḥ vara-do varam anvya tat | sa tu vare varaṁ rājan "syām aham brāhmanas te" iti | tadheti chābravīd Brahma sarva-loka-pitāmahah | sa labdhvā tapasopraya brāhmanatvam mahāyasāḥ | vihacāra mahiṁ kṛṣṭeṣuṁ kṛitākāmaṁ suropanah |

"2295. So too the Kausika, constant in austerities, and subduing his senses, acquired Brähmanhood by the severity of his exercises. There was a great Kshattriya named Gādhi, renowned in the world, whose son was the powerful Visvāmitra. This Kausika prince (Gādhi) was greatly addicted to contemplation (mahāyogī) : and after having installed his son as king, he resolved to abandon his corporal existence. His subjects, however, submissively said to him, 'Do not go, o great sage, but deliver
us from our great alarm.' He replied, 'My son shall become the protector of the whole world.' 2300. Having accordingly installed Viśvāmitra, Gādhi went to heaven, and his son became king. Viśvāmitra, however, though energetic, was unable to protect the earth. He then heard that there was great cause of apprehension from the Rākshasas, and issued forth from the city, with an army consisting of four kinds of forces. Having performed a long journey, he arrived at the hermitage of Vaśishtha. There his soldiers constructed many dwellings. In consequence the divine Brāhman Vaśishtha, son of Brahmā, beheld the whole forest being cut up; and becoming enraged, he said to his cow, (2305) 'Create terrible Savaras.' The cow, so addressed, created men of dreadful aspect, who broke and scattered in all directions the army of Viśvāmitra. Hearing of this rout of his army, the son of Gādhi devoted himself to austerities, which he regarded as the highest (resource). In this sacred spot on the Sarasvati he macerated his body with acts of self-restraint and fastings, absorbed in contemplation, and living on water, air, and leaves, sleeping on the sacrificial ground, and practising all the other rites. Several times the gods threw impediments in his way; (2310) but his attention was never distracted from his observances. Having thus with strenuous effort undergone manifold austerities, the son of Gādhi became luminous as the sun; and Brahmā regarded his achievements as most eminent. The boon which Viśvāmitra chose was to become a Brāhman; and Brahmā replied, 'So be it.' Having attained Brāhmanhood, the object of his desire, by his severe austerities, the renowned sage traversed the whole earth, like a god.'

We have already seen how the power of austere fervour (tapas) is exemplified in the legend of Nahusha (above, pp. 308 ff.). In regard to the sense of this word tapas, and the potency of the exercise which it denotes, I may refer to my articles in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1865, p. 348 f., and for 1864, p. 63, as well as to the fourth volume of this work, pp. 20 ff. and 288; and to pp. 23 and 28 of the present volume. In further illustration of the same subject I quote the following panegyric upon tapas from Manu, xi. 234 ff. where, however, the word cannot have the same sense in all the verses:

Tapo-mūlam idaṁ sarvaṁ daiva-mānushakaṁ sukham | tapo-madhyaṁ budhaṁ proktāṁ tapo'ntaṁ veda-dārsībhīḥ | 235. Brāhmaṁṣya tapo jña-naṁ tapaḥ ksattraṁ sakhaṁ | vaiśyasya tu tapo vārtā tapaḥ śudra-
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"234. All the enjoyment, whether of gods or men, has its root, its centre, and its end in tapas; so it is declared by the wise who have studied the Veda. 235. Knowledge is a Brähman’s tapas; protection that of a Kshatriya; traffic that of Vaisya; and service that of a Sudra. 236. It is by tapas that rishis of subdued souls, subsisting on fruits, roots, and air obtain a vision of the three worlds with all things moving and stationary. 237. Medicines, health, science, and the various divine conditions are attained by tapas alone as their instrument of acquisition. 238. Whatever is hard to be traversed, or obtained, or reached, or effected, is all to be accomplished through tapas, of which the potency is irresistible. 239. Both those who are guilty of the great sins, and all other transgressors, are freed from sin by fervid tapas. 240. Worms, serpents, insects, beasts, birds, and beings without motion attain to heaven through the force of tapas. 241. Whatever sin men commit by thought, word, or bodily acts, by tapas they speedily consume it all, when they become rich in devotion. 242. The gods both accept the sacrifices and augment the enjoyments of the Brähman who has been purified by tapas. 243. It was by tapas that Prajapati the lord created this scripture; and through it that the rishis obtained the Vedas. 244. Such is the great dignity which the gods ascribe to tapas, beholding its transcendent merit."

I return for a moment to the story of Vasishtha and his cow.

Lassen remarks (Ind. Alt. 2nd ed. i. 631, note) that Atharvan is given
in the Lexicons as a name of Vasishṭha (see Wilson’s Dictionary, s.v.). Weber (Ind. St. i. 289) quotes from Mallinātha’s Commentary on the the Kirāṭārjuniya the following words: Atharvanas tu mantroddhāro Vasishṭhena kriṣṭaḥ ity āgamaḥ! “There is a passage of scripture to the effect that the mantras of the Atharvan were selected by Vasishṭha.” In Bühltingk and Roth’s Lexicon, s.v. Atharvan, it is noticed that the eleventh hymn of the fifth book of the Atharva-veda contains a conversation between Atharvan and Varuṇa about the possession of a wonderful cow bestowed by the latter on the former; and it is remarked that this circumstance may explain the subsequent identification of Atharvan with Vasishṭha. Prof. Roth, however (Diss. on the A.V., Tübingen, 1865, p. 9), thinks the two sages are distinct. The cow is spoken of in A.V. vii. 104, as the “brindled cow given by Varuṇa to Atharvan which never lacked a calf” (priśiniḥ dhenuṁ Varuṇena dattām Athar-vane nitya-vatsām). The following is the curious hymn referred to:


187 This is the reading proposed by Professor Aufrecht instead of punarmagha tvam, which is found in Roth and Whitney’s edition of the A.V.
11. Devō devāya grīnate vayodāh vipro viprāya stwate sumedhāh | ajjano hi Varuṇa svadhācann Atharvāṇam pitaram
deva-bandhum | tasmai u rādhaḥ kriṃuhi supraśastaṃ sakha no asi para-
maś cha bandhuh |

1. (Atharvan speaks) "How hast thou, who art mighty in energy, declared before the great deity, how before the shining father (that the cow was mine)? Having bestowed a brindled cow (on me) as a sacrificial gift, thou hast resolved in thy mind to take her back. 2. (Varuṇa replies) It is not through desire that I revoke the gift; I drive hither this brindled cow that I may contemplate her. But by what wisdom, o Atharvan, in virtue of what nature, doest thou know the nature of beings? 3. (Atharvan answers) In truth I am profound in wisdom; in truth by my nature I know the nature of beings. Neither Dāsa nor Āryya can hinder the design which I shall undertake. 4. There is none other wiser or sager in understanding than thou, o self-dependent Varuṇa. Thou knowest all creatures; even the man of deep devices is afraid of thee. 5. Thou, o self-dependent Varuṇa, o wise director, knowest all creatures. What other thing is beyond this atmosphere? and what is nearer than that remotest thing, o thou unerring? 6. (Varuṇa replies) There is one thing beyond this atmosphere; and on this side of that one there is that which is near though inaccessible. Knowing that thing I declare it to thee. Let the glory of the niggards be cast down; let the Dāsas sink downward into the earth. 7. (Atharvan rejoins) Thou, o Varuṇa, sayest many evil things of those who revoke their gifts. Be not thou numbered among so many niggards; let not men call thee illiberal. 8. (Varuṇa replies) Let not men call me illiberal; I restore to thee, o worshipper, the brindled cow. Attend with all thy powers at every hymn in my honour among all the tribes of men. 9. (Atharvan answers) Let hymns ascend to thee among all the tribes of men. Give me that which thou hast taken from me; thou art to me an intimate friend of seven-fold value. 10. We two have a common bond, o Varuṇa, a common descent. I know what this common descent of ours is. (Varuṇa answers) I give thee that which I

Professor Aufrecht thinks that Dyaus, 'the Heaven,' is denoted by maha āsu-
rāya, and that pītra haraye, if the correct reading, can only mean the Sun, the word hari being several times applied to that great luminary. I am otherwise indebted to Prof. A. for the correct sense of this line, and for other suggestions.
have taken from thee. I am thy intimate friend of seven-fold vīra who, myself a god, confer life on thee a god [or priest, devāya] with praisest me, an intelligent sage on thee a sage. (The poet says) Thou, self-dependent Varuṇa, hast begotten our father Atharvan, a kinsman of the gods. Grant to him most excellent wealth; thou art our friend and most eminent kinsman."

Sect. XI.—The same, and other legends, according to the Rāmāyana.

The story told in the preceding section is related at greater length in chapters 51–65 189 of the Bālakāṇḍa, or first book, of the Rāmāyana, of which I shall furnish an outline, noting any important variations from, or additions to, the account in the Mahābhārata, and at the same time giving an abstract of the other legends which are interwoven with the narrative. There was formerly, we are told, a king called Kuśa, son of Prajāpati, who had a son called Kuśanābha, who was father of Gādhi, the father of Viśvāmitra. The latter ruled the earth for many thousand years. On one occasion, when he was making a circuit of the earth, he came to Vaśishṭha's hermitage, the pleasant abode of many saints, sages, and holy devotees (chapter 51, verses 11–29), where, after at first declining, he allowed himself to be hospitably entertained with his followers by the son of Brahmā (ch. 52). Viśvāmitra (ch. 53), however, coveting the wondrous cow, which had supplied all the dainties of the feast, first of all asked that she should be given to him in exchange for a hundred thousand common cows, adding that "she was a gem, that gems were the property of the king, and that, therefore, the cow was his by right" (53, 9. Rataṃ hi bhagavann etad rataḥ-hāri cha pārthivah | 10. Tasmād me ābalāṁ dehi maaṃśhā dharmato devā). On this price being refused, the king advances immensely in his offers, but all without effect. He then proceeds (ch. 54)—very ungratefully and tyrannically, it must be allowed—to have the cow removed by force, but she breaks away from his attendants, and rushes back to her master, complaining that he was deserting her. He replies that he was not deserting her, but that the king was

189 These are the sections of Schlegel's and the Bombay editions, which correspond to sections 52–67 of Gorresio's edition.
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...1 more powerful than he. She answers, 54, 14: \textit{Na balam kshata-

gasyaḥur brāhmaṇaḥ balavāmbaraḥ | brahmaṁ brahmaṁ dīveyaṁ

hātrāḥ cha balabattaram | aprameyam balam tubhyam na tvaya bal-

avattaram | Viśvāmitra mahāvīryo tejas tava durāsadam | niyunksheva mām

mahātejas tevaṃ brahma-bala-samhritam | tasya darpam balam yatnāṁ

nāsayāmi durātmanāḥ | “Men do not ascribe strength to a Kshattriya :

the Brāhmans are stronger. The strength of Brāhmans is divine, and

superior to that of Kshattriyas. 15. Thy strength is immeasurable.

Viśvāmitra, though of great vigour, is not more powerful than thou.

Thy energy is invincible. Commission me, who have been acquired by

thy Brahmanical power, and I will destroy the pride, and force, and

attempt of this wicked prince.”} 190 She accordingly by her bellowing

creates hundreds of Pahlavas, who destroy the entire host \textit{(nāsayaṁ

balaṁ saran, verse 19) of Viśvāmitra, but are slain by him in their

turn. Sakas and Yavanas, of great power and valour, and well armed,

were then produced, who consumed the king’s soldiers,\textit{191} but were

routed by him. The cow then (ch. 55) calls into existence by her

bellowing, and from different parts of her body, other warriors of

various tribes, who again destroyed Viśvāmitra’s entire army, foot

soldiers, elephants, horses, chariots, and all. A hundred of the mo-
narch’s sons, armed with various weapons, then rushed in great fury

on Vaśishṭha, but were all reduced to ashes in a moment by the blast

of that sage’s mouth.\textit{192} Viśvāmitra, being thus utterly vanquished and

humbled, appointed one of his sons to be regent, and travelled to the

Himalaya, where he betook himself to austerities, and thereby obtained

a vision of Mahādeva, who at his desire revealed to him the science

of arms in all its branches, and gave him celestial weapons with which,

elated and full of pride, he consumed the hermitage of Vaśishṭha, and

put its inhabitants to flight. Vaśishṭha then threatens Viśvāmitra and

\textit{190 Compare Manu, xi. 32: }\textit{Sva-viṁśat vīra-viṁśat cha sva-viṁśat

balavattaram | tasmāt suvaṁciva vīryaṁ migṛhiṁśat arin deyāḥ | “Of the two, his own, and a king’s

might, let a Brāhmaṇ know that his own is superior. By his own might alone, there-

fore, let him restrain his enemies.”}

\textit{191 We had been before told that they had been killed, so that this looks like a

slaying of the slain, as no resuscitation of the army is alluded to.}

\textit{192 On this the Commentator remarks that “though these princes were Kshattriyas,

they were not actual kings, and had acted tyrannically; so that a very slight expiation

was required for killing them” (kṣhattriyate ṣṭi prithivi-patitvāḥhāvāt tad-badhe

alpa-prāyaścittam utataśyiteḥ cha |).}
uplifts his Brahmanical mace. Viśvāmitra, too, raises his fiery weapon and calls out to his adversary to stand. Vaśishṭha bids him to show his strength, and boasts that he will soon humble his pride. He asks:

\(56, 4\) Kva cha to kṣhattriya-balam kva cha brahma-balam mahat \| pāśya brahma-balaṁ dieyam mama kṣhattriya-pāṁśana \| tasyāstram Gādhiputra-sya ghoram āgneyam udyatam \| brahma-dāṇḍena tach chhāntam agner vegaḥ ivāṁbhasaḥ | 'What comparison is there between a Kṣhattriya's might, and the great might of a Brāhma? Behold, thou contemptible Kṣhattriya, my divine Brahmanical power.' The dreadful fiery weapon uplifted by the son of Gādhi was then quenched by the rod of the Brāhma, as fire is by water." Many and various other celestial missiles, as the nooses of Brahmā, Kāla (Time), and Varuṇa, the discus of Vishṇu, and the trident of Śiva, were hurled by Viśvāmitra at his antagonist, but the son of Brahmā swallowed them up in his all-devouring mace. Finally, to the intense consternation of all the gods, the warrior shot off the terrific weapon of Brāhmā (brāhmāstra); but this was equally ineffectual against the Brahmanical sage. Vaśishṭha had now assumed a direful appearance: \(58, 18\) Roma-kūpesu sarveśu Vaśishṭhasya ma-hātmanah \| marīchyaḥ iev aśnippetur agner dhūmākulaṁciraśtaḥ \| prājevalad brahma-dāṇḍas cha Vaśishṭhasya karodyataḥ \| vidhumah iva kālāgnir Yama-dāṇḍaḥ ivāparah | "Jets of fire mingled with smoke darted from the pores of his body; \(19\) the Brahmanical mace blazed in his hand like a smokeless mundane conflagration, or a second sceptre of Yāma." Being appeased, however, by the munis, who proclaimed his superiority to his rival, the sage stayed his vengeance; and Viśvāmitra exclaimed with a groan: \(56, 23\) Dhiḥ balam kṣhattriya-balam brahma-tejo-balām balam \| ekena brahma-dāṇḍena sarvastrāṇi hatāni me | "Shame on a Kṣhattriya's strength: the strength of a Brahman's might alone is strength: by the single Brahmanical mace all my weapons have been destroyed.'" No alternative now remains to the humiliated monarch, but either to acquiesce in this helpless inferiority, or to work out his own elevation to the Brahmanical order. He embraces the latter alternative: \(56, 24\) Tad etat prasamākshyāham prasannendriya-mānasah \| tapo mahat samāsthāye yad vai brahmāteva-kārayan | "Having pondered well this defeat, I shall betake myself, with composed senses and mind,

\[1\] The Bombay edition has vidhumah. Schlegel's and Gorresio's editions have sadhumah, "enveloped in smoke."
to strenuous austere fervour, which shall exalt me to the rank of a Brāhmaṇ."

Intensely vexed and mortified, groaning and full of hatred against his enemy, he travelled with his queen to the south, and carried his resolution into effect; (ch. 57) and we are first of all told that three sons Havishyanda, Madhusyanda, and Dṛḍhishatru were born to him. At the end of a thousand years Brahmā appeared, and announced that he had conquered the heaven of royal sages (rājrāshis); and, in consequence of his austere fervour, he was recognised as having attained that rank. Viśvāmitra, however, was ashamed, grieved, and incensed at the offer of so very inadequate a reward, and exclaimed:

"I have practised intense austerity, and the gods and rishis regard me only as a rājrāshi!" 194 Austerities, it appears, are altogether fruitless!"


194. The Viśvū Purāṇa, iii. 6, 21, says: "There are three kinds of rishis: Brāhmaṇärṣis, after them Devārṣis, and after them Rājrāṣis" (jneyāḥ brahmārṣayāḥ pūream tebhya devārṣayaḥ punah | rājrāṣayaḥ punas tebhyaḥ rishi-prakṛityās trayaḥ |). Böhtlingk and Roth, s.v. rishi, mention also (on the authority of the vocabulary called Trikāṇḍāśeṣha) the words māhārṣi (great rishi), pārūmarṣi (most eminent rishi), ērūrṣi (secondary rishi), and kēṅdarṣi, who is explained s.v. to be a teacher of a particular portion (kōṅḍa) of the Veda. Devārṣis are explained by Professor Wilson (V.P. iii. p. 68, paraphrasing the text of the Viśvū Purāṇa), to be "sages who are demi-gods also;" Brahmārṣis to be "sages who are sons of Brah-mā or Brahmans;" and Rājrāṣis to be "princes who have adopted a life of devotion." In a note he adds: "A similar enumeration is given in the Vāyu, with some additions: Rāshi is derived from rish, 'to go to,' or 'approach;,' the Brahmārṣis, it is said, are descendants of the five patriarchs, who were the founders of races or gotras of Brahmans, or Kasāpaya, Vāṣiṣṭha, Angiras, Atri, and Bṛigu; the Devārṣis are Nara and Nārāyaṇa, the sons of Dharma; the Bālakhīlaya, who sprang from Kratu; Kardama, the son of Pulaha; Kuvēra, the son of Pulastya; Achala, the son of Pra-tyūṣha; Nārada and Purvata, the sons of Kasāpaya. Rājrāṣis are lksahvāku and other princes. The Brahmārṣis dwell in the sphere of Brahmā; the Devārṣis in the region of the gods; and the Rājrāṣis in the heaven of Indra." Brahmārṣis are evidently rishis who were priests; and Rājrāṣis, rishis of kingly extraction. If so, a Devārṣi, having a divine character, should be something higher than either. Professor Roth, following apparently the Trikāṇḍāśeṣha, defines them as "rishis dwelling among the gods." I am not aware how far back this classification of rishis goes in Indian literature. Roth, s.vv. rishi, brahmārṣi and devārṣi does not give any references to these words as occurring in the Brāhmaṇas; and they are not found in the hymns of the R.V. where, however, the "seven rishis" are mentioned. Regarding rājrāṣis see pp. 206 ff. above.
this disappointment, he had ascended one grade, and forthwith recommenced his work of mortification.

At this point of time his austerities were interrupted by the following occurrences: King Triśanku, one of Ikshvāku’s descendants, had conceived the design of celebrating a sacrifice by virtue of which he should ascend bodily to heaven. As Vāsiṣṭha, on being summoned, declared that the thing was impossible (aśakyaṁ), Triśanku travelled to the south, where the sage’s hundred sons were engaged in austerities, and applied to them to do what their father had declined. Though he addressed them with the greatest reverence and humility, and added that “the Ikṣvākus regarded their family-priests as their highest resource in difficulties, and that, after their father, he himself looked to them as his tutelary deities” (57, 22. Ikṣvākūnāṁ hi sarveśhām purodhaḥ paramā gatiḥ | tasmād anantaram sarve bhavanto daivatam mama), he received from the haughty priests the following rebuke for his presumption: (58, 2) Pratyākhyāto ’si durbuddhe guruṇā satyavādinā | tam katham samatikramya sākhāntaram upeyivān | 3. Ikṣvākūnāṁ hi sarveshām purodhaḥ paramā gatiḥ | na chātikramitum śakyaṁ vachanaṁ satyavādināḥ | 4. “Aṣakyaṁ” iti chorācha Vāsiṣṭho bhagavān rishiḥ | tam vayaṁ vai samāhartaṁ kratuṁ śaktāḥ katham tava | 5. Bālisas tvāṁ nara-śreshṭha gamyatāṁ va-puram punah | yājane bhagavān śaktas trailokyasyāpi pārthiva | avamānaṁ katham kartuṁ tasya śakhyāmahe vayaṁ | “Fool, thou hast been refused by thy truth-speaking preceptor. How is it that, disregarding his authority, thou hast resorted to another school (śakha)?” 185 3. The family-priest is the highest oracle of all the Ikṣvākus; and the command of that veracious personage cannot be transgressed. 4. Vāsiṣṭha, the divine rishi, has declared that ‘the thing cannot be’; and how can we undertake thy sacrifice? 5. Thou art foolish, king; return to thy capital. The divine (Vāsiṣṭha) is competent to

185 It does not appear how Triśanku, in asking the aid of Vāsiṣṭha’s sons after applying in vain to their father, could be charged with resorting to another śakha (school), in the ordinary sense of that word: as it is not conceivable that the sons should have been of another Sākhā from the father, whose cause they espouse with so much warmth. The Commentator in the Bombay edition explains the word sākhāntaram as =yājanādinā rakṣākāntaram, “one who by sacrificing for thee, etc., will be another protector.” Gorresio’s Gaṇḍa text, which may often be used as a commentary on the older one, has the following paraphrase of the words in question, ch. 60, 3 Mūlam utṣriyā kasmāt tvāṁ śākhāse ichhāsi lambitum | “Why, forsaking the root, dost thou desire to hang upon the branches.”
act as priest of the three worlds; how can we shew him disrespect?" Triśanku then gave them to understand, that as his preceptor and "his preceptor's sons had declined compliance with his requests, he should think of some other expedient." In consequence of his venturing to express this presumptuous intention, they condemned him by their imprecation to become a Chaṇḍāla (58, 7. "Pratyākhyāto bhagavata guru-putraś tathaiva cha | anyām gatim gamisyāmi seasti vo 'stu tapodhānāḥ" | rishi-putrāś tu tach chhrutvā vākyāṇa ghorabhīsamhitam | śepuḥ parama-sankruddhāś "chaṇḍālatavaṁ gamisyasi")}. As this curse soon took effect, and the unhappy king's form was changed into that of a degraded outcast, he resorted to Viśvāmitra (who, as we have seen, was also dwelling at this period in the south), enlarging on his own virtues and piety, and bewailing his fate. Viśvāmitra commiserated his condition (ch. 59), and promised to sacrifice on his behalf, and exalt him to heaven in the same Chaṇḍāla-form to which he had been condemned by his preceptors' curse. "Heaven is now as good as in thy possession, since thou hast resorted to the son of Kuśika" (59, 4. Guru-sāpa-kri-taṁ rūpaṁ yad idam tvayi varittate | anena saha rūpaṇa saśarīro gamisyasi | hasta-prūptam aham manye svargaṁ tava narādhipa | yas tvāṁ Kauśikam āgamyam śarayaṁ śravayaṁ gataḥ |). He then directed that preparations should be made for the sacrifice, and that all the rishis, including the family of Vasishṭha, should be invited to the ceremony. The disciples of Viśvāmitra, who had conveyed his message, reported the result on their return in these words: (59, 11) Sruteva te vachanaṁ sarve samāyanti deijyatah | sarve-deśeshu chaṇḍāchhaṁ varjyitē Mahodayam | Vāśishṭhaṁ tach chhataṁ sarvaṁ krodha-paryakulaksharam | yad uvācha vacho ghorauṁ śriṇu tvam muni-punaga | "kshatriyo yājako āsya chaṇḍālasya viśeṣatāh | kathāṁ sadasī bhoktāro havis tasya surasrayah | brāhmaṇaṁ vā mahātmāno bhukteva chaṇḍāla-bhojanam | kathāṁ svargaṁ gamisyanti Viśvāmitreṇa pūlitāḥ" | etad vachana-naishthuryyam uṣchuḥ saṁrakta-lochanāḥ | Vāśishṭhaṁ muni-sārdūla sarve saha-mahodayāḥ | "Having heard your message, all the Brāhmans are assembling in all the countries, and have arrived, excepting Mahodaya (Vāśishṭha?). Hear what dreadful words those hundred Vāśishṭhas, their voices quivering with rage, have uttered: "How can the gods and rishis 194 con-

---

194 The rishis as priests (rīteā) would be entitled to eat the remains of the sacrifice, according to the Commentator.
sume the oblation at the sacrifice of that man, especially if he be a Chaṇḍāla, for whom a Kṣattriya is officiating-priest? How can illustrious Brāhmans ascend to heaven, after eating the food of a Chaṇḍāla, and being entertained by Viśvāmitra? These ruthless words all the Vaiśīṣṭhas, together with Mahodaya, uttered, their eyes inflamed with anger.” Viśvāmitra, who was greatly incensed on receiving this message, by a curse doomed the sons of Vaiśīṣṭha to be reduced to ashes, and reborn as degraded outcasts (mṛitapāḥ) for seven hundred births, and Mahodaya to become a Nīshāda. Knowing that this curse had taken effect (ch. 60), Viśvāmitra then, after eulogizing Triśanku, proposed to the assembled rishis that the sacrifice should be celebrated. To this they assented, being actuated by fear of the terrible sage’s wrath. Viśvāmitra himself officiated at the sacrifice as yaṁjaka; and the other rishis as priests (ritejāḥ) (with other functions) performed all the ceremonies. Viśvāmitra next invited the gods to partake of the oblations: (60, 11) Nābhyagaman yadā tattra ṛgārthāṁ sarva-devatāḥ | tataḥ kopa-samāvishto Viśvāmitro mahāmuniḥ | srucam udyamya sakrodhas Triśankum idam abravit | “paśya me tapaso vīryāṁ svārjitaṁya nareśvara | eṣha tvām svāsāriṇeṇa nayāmi svargam ojasā | dushprāpyaṁ svāsāriṇeṇa svargaṁ gachchha nareśvara | svārjitaṁ kinchid apy osti maya hi tapasāḥ phalam | “When, however, the deities did not come to receive their portions, Viśvāmitra became full of wrath, and raising aloft the sacrificial ladle, thus addressed Triśanku: ‘Behold, o monarch, the power of austere fervour acquired by my own efforts. I myself, by my own energy, will conduct thee to heaven. Ascend to that celestial region which is so arduous to attain in an earthly body. I have surely earned some reward of my austerity.’” Triśanku ascended instantly to heaven in the sight of the munis. Indra, however, ordered him to be gone, as a person who, having incurred the curse of his spiritual preceptors, was unfit for the abode of the celestials;—and to fall down headlong to earth (60, 17. Triśanko gachha bhūyasy tvāṁ nāsi svarga- kritālayaḥ | guruśāpa-hato mūḍha pata bhūnim avāk-śirāḥ ). He accordingly began to descend, invoking loudly, as he fell, the help of his spiritual patron. Viśvāmitra, greatly incensed, called out to him to stop: (60, 20) Šuṭo brahma-tapo-yogāt Prajāpatir icāparaḥ | sasāṁjja dakshire bhāge saptarṣhīṇ aparāṁ punah | dakshināṁ diśam āṣthāya

137 This means as adhvaryu according to the Commentator.
rishi-madhya mahāyasāḥ | nakshattra-mālam aparām asrijat krodha-
mūrchhitaḥ | anyam Indraṁ karisyāmi loko vā vyād anindrakaḥ | daiva-
tāṇy api sa krodhāt svashtuṁ samupachakrame | Then by the power
of his divine knowledge and austere fervour he created, like another
Prajāpati, other Seven Rishis (a constellation so called) in the southern
part of the sky. Having proceeded to this quarter of the heavens, the
renowned sage, in the midst of the rishis, formed another garland of
stars, being overcome with fury. Exclaiming, 'I will create another
Indra, or the world shall have no Indra at all,' he began, in his rage,
to call gods also into being.' The rishis, gods (Suras), and Asuras now
became seriously alarmed and said to Viśvāmitra, in a conciliatory tone,
that Triśanku, "as he had been cursed by his preceptors, should not be
admitted bodily into heaven, until he had undergone some lustration"
(60, 24. Ayaṁ rājā mahābhāga guru-śāpa-parikshataḥ | saśarito diceṁ
yātum nārhaty akṛita-pāvanaḥ |). The sage replied that he had given
a promise to Triśanku, and appealed to the gods to permit his protegé
to remain bodily in heaven, and the newly created stars to retain their
places in perpetuity. The gods agreed that "these numerous stars
should remain, but beyond the sun's path, and that Triśanku, like an
immortal, with his head downwards, should shine among them, and be
followed by them," adding "that his object would be thus attained, and
his renown secured, and he would be like a dweller in heaven" (60,
29. Evam bhavatu bhadrāṁ te tishthantu etāṁ sarvasāḥ | gagane tāṇy
anekāṁ vaiśvānara-pathād vahiḥ | nakshattraṁ muni-kṛṣṇha teṣhu
jyottishshu jāyvalan | aeśā-sirās Triśankus cha tishthatu amara-sannī-
bhaḥ | anuyāasyanti chaitāṁ jyotiṁshi nrīpa-sattamam | kṛītārthaṁ kīrt-
timantaṁ cha svarga-loka-gataṁ yathā |). Thus was this great dispute
adjusted by a compromise, which Viśvāmitra accepted.

This story of Triśanku, it will have been observed, differs materially
from the one quoted above (p. 375 ff.) from the Harivaṁśa; but brings
out more distinctly the character of the conflict between Vaśishṭha and
Viśvāmitra.

When all the gods and rishis had departed at the conclusion of the

196 I follow Schlegel's text, which differs verbally, though not in substance, both
from the Bombay edition and from Gorresio's.

197 The last compound word akṛita-pāvanaḥ, "without lustration," is given by
Schlegel and Gorresio. The Bombay edition has instead of it eva tapodhana, "o sage
rich in austerity."
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sacrifice, Viśvāmitra said to his attendant devotees: (61, 2) Mahān evahā pravṛttā 'yaṁ dakṣiṇāṁ āsthitā disam | disam anyām prapat-syāmas tattra tapasyāmhe tapah | "This has been a great interruption [to our austerities] which has occurred in the southern region: we must proceed in another direction to continue our penances." He accordingly went to a forest in the west, and began his austerities anew. Here the narrative is again interrupted by the introduction of another story, that of king Ambārisha, king of Ayodhya, who was, according to the Rāmāyaṇa, the twenty-eighth in descent from Ikshvāku, and the twenty-second from Ātriṣeṅku. (Compare the genealogy in the Rāmāyaṇa, i. 70, and ii. 110, 6 ff., with that in Wilson's Vishnu Purāṇa, vol. iii. pp. 260 ff. 280, 284 ff. and 303; which is different.) Viśvāmitra is nevertheless represented as flourishing contemporaneously with both of these princes. The story relates that Ambārisha was engaged in performing a sacrifice, when Indra carried away the victim. The priest said that this ill-omened event had occurred owing to the king's bad administration; and would call for a great expiation, unless a human victim could be produced (61, 8. Prāyāsaśhitam mahad hy etad naraṁ vā purushaṁ ṛṣhah | ānayasaṁ pāśuṁ viṁśṭrāṁ vāyat karma pravartatate |). After a long search the royal-rishi (Ambārisha) came upon the Brāhma-rishi Richika, a descendant of Bṛigu, and asked him to sell one of his sons for a victim, at the price of a hundred thousand cows. Richika answered that he would not sell his eldest son; and his wife added that she would not sell the youngest: "eldest sons," she observed, "being generally the favourites of their fathers, and youngest sons of their mothers" (61, 18. Prāyena hi nara-śresṭhā jyestāḥ pitrīṣhau vallā- bhaḥ | mātrīnaṁ cha kanyāṁsas tasmād rakshe kanyasam |). The second son, Sunaśsepa, then said that in that case he regarded himself as the one who was to be sold, and desired the king to remove him. The hundred thousand cows, with ten millions of gold-pieces and heaps of jewels, were paid down, and Sunaśsepa carried away. As they were passing through Pushkara (ch. 62) Sunaśsepa beheld his maternal uncle Viśvāmitra (see Rāmāyaṇa, i. 34, 7,200 and p. 352 above) who was engaged in austerities there with otherrishis, threw himself into his arms,

200 Purvaśū bhagīni chūpi mama Rāghave suvaratā | nāmnā Śatyaśatī nāma Richika pratipātū | "And I have a religious sister older than myself called Śatyaśatī, who was given in marriage to Richika."
and implored his assistance, urging his orphan, friendless, and helppless
state, as claims on the sage’s benevolence (62, 4. Na me’sti mātā na
pitā jnātayo bāndhavaḥ kutah | träṭum arhasi mām saumya dharmena
muni-pungava | . . . 7. Na me nātho hy anāthasya bhava bhavyena chet-
tasa |). Viśvāmitra soothed him; and pressed his own sons to offer
themselves as victims in the room of Sūnasāṣeṇa. This proposition met
with no favour from Madhushyanda and the other sons of the royal
hermit, who answered with haughtiness and derision: (62, 14) Kathaṁ
ātma-sutān hitvā trāyase ’nya-sutān vibho | akāryyam ieva pāśyāmah svā-
māṁsam ieva ṭhōjane | “How is it that thou sacrificest thine own sons,
and seekest to rescue those of others? We look upon this as wrong, and
like the eating of one’s own flesh.” The sage was exceedingly wroth
at this disregard of his injunction, and doomed his sons to be born in
the most degraded classes, like Vaśishṭha’s sons, and to eat dog’s flesh,
for a thousand years. He then said to Sūnanśeṇa: (62, 19) Pavitra-
pāśaṁ ābaddho rakta-mālyānulepanah | Vaishnavaṁ yūpam āśūdyā vāg-
bhir Agniṁ udāhara | ime cha gāthaṁ deśa dieyā gāyethāṁ muni-puṭtraka
| Ambariṣhasya yajne ’smiṁs tataḥ siddhim avāṭasya | “When thou art
bound with hallowed cords, decked with a red garland, and anointed
with unguefts, and fastened to the sacrificial post of Viṣṇu, then ad-
dress thyself to Agni, and sing these two divine verses (gāthāḥ), at the
sacrifice of Ambariṣha; then shalt thou attain the fulfilment [of thy
desire].” Being furnished with the two gāthās, Sūnasāṣeṇa proposed
at once to king Ambariṣha that they should set out for their destina-
tion. When bound at the stake to be immolated, dressed in a red gar-
ment, “he celebrated the two gods, Indra and his younger brother
(Viṣṇu), with the excellent verses. The Thousand-eyed (Indra) was
pleased with the secret hymn, and bestowed long life on Sūnasāṣeṇa”
(62, 25. Sa baddho vāgbhir agrāyābhīr abhitusṭaeva vai surau | Indram
Indrāṇujaṁ chaiva yathāvad muni-puṭrakaḥ | tasmai prītāḥ sahaṣrākhas

201 The word is written thus in Schlegel’s and Gorresio’s editions. The Bombay
edition reads Madhucchanda.

202 Schlegel and Gorresio read svamāṁsam, “one’s own flesh,” which seems much
more appropriate than śva-māṁsam, “dog’s flesh,” the reading of the Bombay edition.

203 Gorresio’s edition alone reads śva-māṁsa-crittayaḥ, “subsisting on your own
flesh,” and makes this to be allusion to what the sons had just said and a punishment
for their impertinence (64, 16. Yasmūt śva-māṁsam uddishṭaṁ yuṣmābhīr avamanyā
māṁ).
King Ambarīsha also received great benefits from this sacrifice. Viśvāmitra meanwhile proceeded with his austerities, which he prolonged for a thousand years.

At the end of this time (ch. 63) the gods came to allot his reward; and Brahmā announced that he had attained the rank of a rishi, thus apparently advancing an additional step. Dissatisfied, as it would seem, with this, the sage commenced his task of penance anew. After a length of time he beheld the nymph (Apsāras) Menākā, who had come to bathe in the lake of Pushkara. She flashed on his view, unequalled in her radiant beauty, like lightning in a cloud (63, 5. Rūpenāpratimāṁ tattra vidyutaṁ jalaṁ yathā). He was smitten by her charms, invited her to be his companion in his hermitage, and for ten years remained a slave to her witchery, to the great prejudice of his austerities. At length he became ashamed of this ignoble subjection, and full of indignation at what he believed to be a device of the gods to disturb his devotion; and, dismissing the nymph with gentle accents, he departed for the northern mountains, where he practised severe austerities for a thousand years on the banks of the Kauśikī river. The gods became alarmed at the progress he was making, and decided that he should be dignified with the appellation of great rishi (māhārshi); and Brahmā, giving effect to the general opinion of the deities, announced that he had conferred that rank upon him. Joining his hands and bowing his head, Viśvāmitra replied that he should consider himself to have indeed completely subdued his senses, if the incomparable title of Brāhman-rishi were conferred upon him (63, 31. Brahm-arshi-śabdam atulaṁ svārjitoiḥ karmabhīḥ śubhaiḥ | yadi me bhagavān āha tato 'haṁ vijitendriyaḥ |). Brahmā informed him in answer, that he had not yet acquired the power of perfectly controlling his senses; but should make further efforts with that view. The sage then began to put himself through a yet more rigorous course of austerities, standing with his arms erect, without support, feeding on air, in summer exposed to five fires (i.e. one on each of four sides, and the sun overhead), in the rainy season remaining unsheltered from the wet, and in

204 I have alluded above, p. 358, note, to the differences which exist between this legend of Sūnāśeṣa and the older one in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.
205 Compare Mr. Leckie’s History of Rationalism, vol. i, p. 86.
winter lying on a watery couch night and day. This he continued for a thousand years. At last Indra and the other deities became greatly distressed at the idea of the merit he was storing up, and the power which he was thereby acquiring; and the chief of the celestials desired (ch. 64) the nymph Rāmbhā to go and bewitch him by her blandishments. She expressed great reluctance to expose herself to the wrath of the formidable muni, but obeyed the repeated injunction of Indra, who promised that he and Kandarpa (the god of love) should stand by her, and assumed her most attractive aspect with the view of overcoming the sage's impassibility. He, however, suspected this design, and becoming greatly incensed, he doomed the nymph by a curse to be turned into stone and to continue in that state for a thousand years. The curse took effect, and Kandarpa and Indra slunk away. In this way, though he resisted the allurements of sensual love, he lost the whole fruit of his austerities by yielding to anger; and had to begin his work over again. He resolved to check his irascibility, to remain silent, not even to breathe for hundreds of years; to dry up his body; and to fast and stop his breath till he had obtained the coveted character of a Brāhman. He then (ch. 65) left the Himālāya and travelled to the east, where he underwent a dreadful exercise, unequalled in the whole history of austerities, maintaining silence, according to a vow, for a thousand years. At the end of this time he had attained to perfection, and although thwarted by many obstacles, he remained unmoved by anger. On the expiration of this course of austerity, he prepared some food to eat; which Indra, coming in the form of a Brāhman, begged that he would give him. Viśvāmitra did so, and though he had none left for himself, and was obliged to remain fasting, he said nothing to the Brāhman, on account of his vow of silence. 65, 8. Tasyānuechhvasamānasāya mūrdhni dhūno vyajāyata | 9. Trailokyaṁ yena sambhrāntam ātāpitam ivābhavat | . . . . 11. “Bhubbhiḥ kāraṇair deva Viśvāmitro mahāmuniḥ | lobhitāḥ krodhitaḥ chaiva tapasā chābhyerdhate | . . . . 12. Na diyate yadi te asya manasa yad abhīpsitam | 13. Vināśayati trailokyaṁ tapasā sa-charācharam | vyākulaś

206 On this the Commentator remarks that this incident shews that anger is more difficult to conquer than even lust (etena kāmād api krodho durjeyah iti śūchitam).

207 The Commentator, however, suggests that the sudden sight of Rambhā may at first have excited in him some feelings of this kind (āpātato Rambhā-darśana-prāvirityā kāmenāpi tapah-kāhayaḥ).
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cha disåh sarañh na cha kinchit prakåsate | 14. Sågarañh kahubhitåh sarve vistryante cha sharatañh | prakampate cha vasudåh våyur våthå sankulañh | 15. Brahman na pratijåñîmo nàstiko jåyate janañh | ... 16. Buddhåh na kurute yàrad nàse deve mahàmunåh | 17. Tåvat prasådåyo bhagavån aqñiråpo mahådyutiñh | ... 19. Brahmarshe svagatañ te 'stu tapasa småh sutoshitåh | 20. Bråhmånyam tapasogrena pråptañasi Kauåsika | dirgham åyus che te brahman dadåmi sa-marud-gañåh | 21. ... svasti pråpnui bhadrañ gachha saumya yathåsukham | ... 22. ... bråhmånyam yådi me pråptañ dirgham åyus tathaiva cha | 23. Oåmkåro 'tha vashaåtkåro vedås cha varayanu måm | kshattrå-vedå-vidåm sreshthå brahma-vedå-vidåm api | 24. Brahma-putro Våsiñhå måm evañ vådatu deva-tåh | ... 25. Tåtañ prasådåto decait Våsiñhå japañåm varañ | sakhyañh chakåra brahmashir "evam aste" iti chåbravít | 26. "Brahmashìcàm na sandehåh sarañm sampadyate tava" | ... 27. Viåvåmitro 'pi dharmåtmå labdhåvå brahmanyam uttamañ | puåjyåmåsa brahmashirå Våsiñhåm japañåm varañ | "As he continued to suspend his breath, smoke issued from his head, to the great consternation and distress of the three worlds." The gods, rishis, etc., then addressed Brahåma: "The great muni Viåvåmitra has been allured and provoked in various ways, but still advances in his sanctity. If his wish is not conceded, he will destroy the three worlds by the force of his austerity. All the regions of the universe are confounded, no light anywhere shines; all the oceans are tossed, and the mountains crumble, the earth quakes, and the wind blows confusedly. 15. We cannot, o Brahåma, guarantee that mankind shall not become atheistic. ... 16. Before the great and glorious sage of fiery form resolves to destroy (everything) let him be propitiated." ... The gods, headed by Brahåma, then addressed Viåvåmitra: "Hail Brahåman rishi, we are gratified by thy austerities; o Kauåsika, thou hast, through their intensity, attained to Brahmanhood. I, o Brahåman, associated with the Maruts, confer on thee long life. May every blessing attend thee; depart wherever thou wilt." The sage, delighted, made his obeisance to the gods, and said: 'If I have obtained Brahmånhood, and long life, then let the mystic monosyllable (òåmkåra) and the sacrificial formula (våshåtkåra) and the Vedas recognise me in that capacity. And let Våsiñåtha, the son of Brahåma, the most eminent of those who are skilled in the Kshattrå-vedå, and the Brahma-vedå (the knowledge of the Kshattriya and the Brahmanical disciplines), address me simi-
Accordingly Vaśishṭha, being propitiated by the gods, became reconciled to Viśvāmitra, and recognised his claim to all the prerogatives of a Brāhman rishi. . . . Viśvāmitra, too, having attained the Brahmanical rank, paid all honour to Vaśishṭha.” Such was the grand result achieved by Viśvāmitra, at the cost of many thousand years of intense mortification of the body, and discipline of the soul. During the course of the struggle he had manifested, as the story tells us, a power little, if at all, inferior to that of Indra, the king of the gods; and as in a former legend we have seen King Nahusha actually occupying the throne of that deity, we cannot doubt that—according to the recognised principles of Indian mythology—Viśvāmitra had only to recommence his career of self-mortification in order to raise himself yet higher than he had yet risen, to the rank of a devarshi, or divine rishi (if this be, indeed, a superior grade to that of brahmarsih), or to any other elevation he might desire. But, as far as the account in the Rāmāyana informs us, he was content with his success. He stood on a footing of perfect equality with his rival Vaśishṭha, and became indifferent to further honours. In fact, it was not necessary for the purpose of the inventors of the legend to carry him any higher. They only wished to account for his exercising the prerogatives of a Brāhman; and this had been already accomplished to their satisfaction.

In the story of Sakuntalā, however, as narrated in the Mahābhārata, Ādiparvan, sixty-ninth and following sections, we are informed that, to the great alarm of Indra, Viśvāmitra renewed his austerities, even long after he had attained the position of a Brāhman, verse 2914: Tapyamānaḥ kila purā Viśvāmitra mahat tapaḥ | subhrīsam tāpayaṁmaśa Sakraṁ sura-gaṇeśvaram | tapasā dipta-viryyo'yaṁ sthānād māṁ chya-vayed iti | “Formerly Viśvāmitra, who was practising intense austerities, occasioned great distress to Sakra (Indra), the lord of the deities, lest by the fiery energy so acquired by the saint he himself should be cast down from his place.” Indra accordingly resorted to the usual device of sending one of the Apsaras, Menakā, to seduce the sage by the display of her charms, and the exercise of all her allurements, “by beauty, youth, sweetness, gestures, smiles, and words” (verse 2920, Rāpa-yauvana-mādhuryya-cheṣṭita-smita-bhāṣhitaiḥ), into the indulgence of sensual love; and thus put an end to his efforts after increased sanctity. Menakā urges the dangers of the mission arising from the great power
and irascibility of the sage, of whom, she remarked, even Indra himself was afraid, as a reason for excusing her from undertaking it; and refers to some incidents in Visvamitra’s history, verse 2923: Mahabhagav |

Vaishistham yaḥ putraiv ishtar vyayojayat | kshattrajataś cha yaḥ pur |

vam abhavad brahmaṇa balāt | sauchārtham yo nadiṁ chakre durgamām |

bahubhir jalaṁ | yāṁ tāṁ punyatamāṁ loke Kauśikitī vidur janāḥ |

2925. Bābhāra yatrasya purā kāle duṣge mahātmanaḥ | dārān Matango dharmātmā rājarṣi vyādhataṁ gataḥ |

atita-kāle durbhikṣhe abhyetya punar āśramam | muniḥ Pāreti nadyāḥ vai nāma chakre tadā prabhuḥ |

Matangam yājayānchakre yatra prita-manāḥ scayam | tvaṁ cha somam bhayād yasya gataḥ pātuṁ sureśvara |

chakārāṇyaṁ cha lokaṁ vai krud-dho nakshattra-sampadā | pratisravaṇa-pūrvaṁi nakshatrāṇi chakāra |

yāḥ | guru-sāpa-hatsbyāpi Trisankuḥ saraṇaṁ dadau | “2923. He deprived the great Vaishistha of his beloved sons; and though born a Kshatrito, he formerly became a Brähman by force. For the purpose of purification he rendered the holy river, known in the world as the Kauśikī, unfordable from the mass of water. 2925. His wife was once maintained there in a time of distress by the righteous rājarṣi Matanga, who had become a huntsman; and when the famine was past, the muni returned to his hermitage, gave to the river the name of Pārā, and being gratified, sacrificed for Matanga on its banks; and then thou thyself, Indra, from fear of him wentest to drink his soma. He created, too, when incensed, another world, with a garland of stars, formed agreeably to his promise, and gave his protection to Trisanku, even when smitten by his preceptor’s curse.” Menaka, however, ends by saying that she cannot decline the commission which has been imposed upon her; but begs that she may receive such succour as may ensure her success. She accordingly shows herself in the neighbourhood of Visvamitra’s hermitage. The saint yields to the influence of love, invites her to become his companion, and as a result of their intercourse Sakuntala is born. The Apsaras then returns to Indra’s paradise.

Sect. XII.—Other accounts, from the Mahābhārata, of the way in which Visvamitra became a Brähman.

In the Udyogaparvan of the Mahābhārata, sections 105–118, a story is told regarding Visvamitra and his pupil Gālava, in which a different
account is given of the manner in which Visvamitra attained the rank of a Brâhman; viz. by the gift of Dharma, or Righteousness, appearing in the form of his rival. M. Bh. Udyogap. 3721: Visvamitraṁ tapasyantam Dharmaṁ jijnāsayā purā | abhyāgachhat svayam bhūte Vaishis̄tho bhagavān rishiḥ | . . . 3728. Atha varsha-śate pūrṇe Dharmah punar upāgamat | Vaishis̄thān veyām āsthāya Kauśikam bhojaneparyā | sa drish̄ṇe ādhyābhaktam dhriyamāṇam maharshinā | tish̄ṇatā vāyubhakshena Visvāmitreṇa dhimataḥ | pratigrihyam tato Dharmas tathāvayam śiśitaḥ navam | bhuktvā “prito 'smi viprarshe” tam uktvā sa munir gataḥ | kshattrā-bhāvād apagato brāhmanatvam upagataḥ | Dharmasya vachanāt prito Visvāmitras tathā 'bhavat | “Dharma, assuming the personality of the sage Vaishis̄tha, once came to prove Visvamitra, when he was living a life of austerity;” and after consuming some food, given him by other devotees, desired Visvamitra, who brought him some freshly cooked charu, quite hot, to stand still for the present. Visvamitra accordingly stood still, nourished only by air, with the boiled rice on his head. “The same personage, Dharma, in the same disguise, reappeared after a hundred years, desiring food, and consumed the rice (still quite hot and fresh), which he saw supported upon the hermit’s head, while he himself remained motionless, feeding on air. Dharma then said to him, ‘I am pleased with thee, o Brâhman rishi;’ and went away. Visvamitra, having become thus transformed from a Kshattriya into a Brâhman by the word of Dharma, was delighted.”

In the Anuśāsanaparvan of the Mahābhārata, we have another reference to the story of Visvamitra. King Yudhis̄thira enquires of Bhishma (verse 181) how, if Brâhmanhood is so difficult to be attained by men of the other three castes, it happened that the great Kshattriya acquired that dignity. The prince then recapitulates the chief exploits of Visvāmitra: 183. Tena hy amita-viryena Vaishis̄thasya mahātmanāḥ | hatam putra-sataṁ sadyas tapasā ‘pi pitamahā | yatudhānaṁ cha bahavo rākṣasās tigma-tejasāḥ | manyunā ”vishta-dehena srishtāḥ kālantakopamāḥ | 185. Mahān Kusika-vānāśa cha brahmaṣḍi-sata-sankulaḥ | sthāpito nara-loke ‘smin vidvān brāhmaṇa-sanyutah | Rishīkasyāṃmaṇa chaiva Sunahṣepho mahātapāḥ | vimokṣhito mahāsattrāt pābutām apy upagataḥ | Hariśchandra-kratau devāṁs tadhayīteva “tma-tejasā | putratām anusamprāpto Visvāmitrasya dhimataḥ | nābhicādayato jyeṣṭhān Devaratāṁ nara-
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dhipa | puttrāḥ panchāśad evāpi šaptāḥ śvapachatam gataḥ | Trisankur bandhubhir muktaḥ Aikṣevākuḥ priti-pūreckam | avak-sirāḥ divaṁ nīto dakshiṇām āśrito diśam | . . . tato vighnakari chaiva Panchachūḍā su-

sammatā | Rambhā nāmāpsarāḥ sāpād yasya śāilatevam āgataḥ | tathaiv-
sva bhayād baddhayā Vasishṭhāḥ salile purā | ātmānām mañjayan śrimān vipāsāḥ punar utthitaḥ | “For he destroyed Vasishṭha’s hundred sons
by the power of austere-fervour; when possessed by anger, he created
many demons, fierce and destructive as death; he (185) established
the great and wise family of the Kuśikas, which was full of Brāhmans
and hundreds of Brāhman rishis; he delivered Sunaśsepha, son of
Richīka, who was on the point of being slaughtered as a victim, and
who became his son, after he had, at Hariśchandra’s sacrifice, through
his own power, propitiated the gods; he cursed his fifty sons who
would not do homage to Devarāta, (adopted as) the eldest, so that they
became outcastes; through affection he elevated Trisanku, when for-
saken by his relations, to heaven, where he remained fixed with his
head downwards in the southern heavens; (191) . . . he changed the
troublesome nymph Rambhā, known as Panchachūḍā, by his curse into
a form of stone; he occasioned Vasishṭha through fear to bind and throw
himself into the river, though he emerged thence unbound;” and
performed other deeds calculated to excite astonishment. Yudhishṭhira
ends by enquiring, “how this Kshattriya became a Brāhman without
transmigrating into another body” (197. Dehantaram anāsāvyā kathaṁ
sa brāhmaṇo ‘bhavat ’). In answer to this question, Bhīṣma (verses
200 ff.) deduces the descent of Viśvāmitra from Ajaṁḍha, of the race
of Bharata, who was a pious priest, or sacrificer (yajvā dharma-bhūttām
taraḥ), the father of Jahnū, who again was the progenitor of Kuśika,
the father of Gāḍhi; and narrates the same legend of the birth of Viś-
vāmitra, which has been already extracted from the Viṣṇu Purāṇa (see
above, pp. 349 f.). The conclusion of the story as here given is, that the
wife of Richīka bore Jamadagni, while “the wife of Gāḍhi, by the grace
of the rishi, gave birth to Viśvāmitra, who was a Brāhman rishi, and an
utterer of the Veda; who, though a Kshattriya, attained to Brāhman-
hood, and became afterwards also the founder of a Brāhman race” (246.
Viśvāmitraṁ chājanayad Gāḍhi-bhāṛyyā yaśasvini | risheḥ prasādād ra-

jendra brahmarshhim brahmaśadinam | tato brahmanatāṁ yato Viśvāmitro

mahātapaḥ | kṣhattriyah so ’py atha tathā brahma-vaṁśasya kārakaḥ |)}
of which the members are detailed, including the great rishi Kapila. In regard to the mode in which Viśvāmitra was transformed from a Kshattriya into a Brāhman, we are only told that he belonged to the former class, and that “Rīchikā infused into him this exalted Brāhma-nhood” (259. Tathaiva kshattriyo rājaṃ Viśvāmitro mahātapāḥ | Rīchikenāhitam brahma param etad Yudhishṭhirā |).

This version of the story is different from all those preceding ones which enter into any detail, as it makes no mention of Viśvāmitra having extorted the Brahmical rank from the gods by force of his austerities; and ascribes his transformation to a virtue communicated by the sage Rīchikā.

I have above (p. 296 f.) quoted a passage from Manu on the subject of submissive and refractory monarchs, in which reference is made to Viśvāmitra’s elevation to the Brahmanical order. Nothing is there said of his conflict with Vaśishṭha, or of his arduous penances, endured with the view of conquering for himself an equality with his rival. On the contrary, it is to his submissiveness, i.e. to his dutiful recognition of the superiority of the Brāhmans, that his admission into their class is ascribed. Kullūka, indeed, explains the word submissiveness (vināya) to mean virtue in general; but the contrast which is drawn between Prithu, Manu, and Viśvāmitra, on the one hand, and Veṇa, Nahusha, Sudās, and Nīmi, the resisters of Brahmical prerogatives (as all the legends declare them to have been), on the other, makes it tolerably evident that the merit which Manu means to ascribe to Viśvāmitra is that of implicit submission to the spiritual authority of the Brāhmans.

Sect. XIII.—Legend of Saudāsa.

In the reign of Mitrasaha, also called Saudāsa, and Kalmāshapāda, the son of Sudāsa, and the descendant of Triśanku in the twenty-second generation (see p. 337, above), we still find Vaśishṭha figuring in the legend, as the priest of that monarch, and causing him, by an imprecation, to become a cannibal, because he had, under the influence of a delusion, offered the priest human flesh to eat. I shall not extract the

299 The names in this list differ considerably from those given above, p. 352, from the Harivaṃśa.
version of the story given in the Vishnu Purana in detail (Wilson, V.P. vol. iii. pp. 304 ff.), as it does not in any way illustrate the rivalry of Vasishtha and Visvamitra.

The Mahabharata gives the following variation of the history (Adiparvan, sect. 176): “Kalmashapada was a king of the race of Ikshvaku. Visvamitra wished to be employed by him as his officiating priest; but the king preferred Vasishtha” (verse 6699. Akamayat tama vyayarte Visvamitra pratapavan | sa tu rajam mahatmanam Vasishtham rishi-sattamam |). It happened, however, that the king went out to hunt, and after having killed a large quantity of game, he became very much fatigued, as well as hungry and thirsty. Meeting Saktri, the eldest of Vasishtha’s hundred sons, on the road, he ordered him to get out of his way. The priest civilly replied (verse 6703: Mama pathah maharaja dharmah esha sanatanah | rajna sarveshu dharmeshu deyaha pathah devayate | “The path is mine, O king; this is the immemorial law; in all observances the king must cede the way to the Brähman.” Neither party would yield, and the dispute waxing warmer, the king struck the muni with his whip. The muni, resorting to the usual expedient of offended sages, by a curse doomed the king to become a man-eater. “It happened that at that time enmity existed between Visvamitra and Vasishtha on account of their respective claims to be priest to Kalmashapada” (verse 6710. Tato yaju-nimitta tama Visvamitra-Vasishhayoh | vairam asit tada tam tu Visvamitra neapadyata |). Visvamitra had followed the king; and approached while he was disputing with Saktri. Perceiving, however, the son of his rival Vasishtha, Visvamitra made himself invisible, and passed them, watching his opportunity. The king began to implore Saktri’s elecency: but Visvamitra wishing to prevent their reconciliation, commanded a Rakshasa (a man-devouring demon) to enter into the king. Owing to the conjoint influence of the Brähman-rishi’s curse, and Visvamitra’s command, the demon obeyed the injunction. Perceiving that his object was gained, Visvamitra left things to take their course, and absented himself from the country. The king having happened to meet a hungry Brähman, and sent him, by the hand of his cook (who could procure nothing else), some human flesh to eat, was cursed by him also to the same effect as by Saktri. The curse, being now augmented in force, took effect, and Saktri himself was the first victim, being eaten up by the king. The same fate
befell all the other sons of Vaśisṭha at the instigation of Viśvāmitra: 6736. S'aktrim taṁ tu mritaṁ drishtetva Viśvāmitraṁ punah punah | Vaśisṭhāsaiva putresku tadd rakṣah sandideśa ha | sa tān S'aktry-avarān putrān Vaśisṭhāsya mahātmanaḥ | bhakṣhayāmāsa sankrūddhaḥ siṁhah kahudra-
mrigam iva | Vaśisṭho ghatītān śrutav Viśvāmitrenā tān sutān | dhāra-
yāmāsa taṁ śokam mahādirī iva medinim | chakre chātma-vināśaya buddhīṁ sa muni-sattamaḥ | na tv eva Kauśikochhedam mene matimatāṁ varah | 6740. Sa Meru-kūtād ātmānam mumochara bhagavān rishiḥ | gīres tasya śilāyāṁ tu tula-rāśāv ivāpatat | na mamāra cha pātena sa yadā tena Pāṇḍava | tadā 'gimī ēddham bhagavān saṁvīcēsa mahāvane | taṁ tadā susamiddha 'pī na dadāha hutāsanāha | dīpyamāno 'py amitra-gna śito 'gnir abhavat tataḥ | sa samudrama abhiprekṣhayā sokāvīṣṭo mahāmu-
nīḥ | baddhva kaṇṭha śilāṁ gurūṁ nipāpata tadā 'mbhasī | sa samudrorn-
mi-tegena sthale nyastō mahāmuniḥ | jagāma sa tataḥ khinnah punar evārnamam prati | 6745. Tato drishtevā 'śrama-padaṁ rahitaṁ tāih sutair muniḥ | nirjagāma sudukkhaṁtattāh punah apy āśramāt tataḥ | so 'pasyat saritam pūrṇāṁ pravīt-kāle navambhasā | evrisādhān bhumīdhan pārtha harantiṁ tira-jān bahun | atha chintāṁ samāpedo punah kaurava-nan-
dana | 'ambhasy asyaṁ nimajjeyam' iti duḥkha-samanvitaḥ | tataḥ pāsais tadā 'tmaṇam gādham baddhēca mahāmuniḥ | tasyāḥ jale mahānadyāḥ
nimamajja sudukkhitāḥ | atha chhiṭṭva nadi pāsāṁs tasyāṁ-bala-suḍana | sthala-sthāṁ tam rishim kriṭvā vīpāsaṁ samavāṣijat | 6750. Uttātāra
tataḥ pāsais viruktāḥ sa mahān rishiḥ | Vipāṣeti cha nāmasyāḥ nadyās chakre mahān rishiḥ | . . . . 6752. Drishtevā sa punar evarshir nadiṁ
haimavatīṁ tadā | chandragraḥavatīṁ bhīmaṁ tasyāḥ srotasya apātayat | sā tam aṇig-samāṁ vipram anuchintaṁ sarid varā | śatadhā vidrutā yas-
māṁ śatadruṁ iti viśrutā | . . . . 6774. Saudāso 'ham mahābhāga yāyās
te muni-sattama | asmin kāle yad ishṭaṁ te brūhi kiṁ karvāṇi te | Vaśisṭha 
uvocha | vrīttam etad yathā-kālaṁ gacchha rājya prāśādhi vai |
brāhmaṇaṁs tu manushyendra ma 'vamanasthaṁ kudāchana | rājā uccaḥ | 
nāvamaṁsyo mahābhāga kudācchid brāhmaṇarśabhān | tvam-nidēse sthitah
samyak pūjavyishyamy ahaṁ dvijān | Ikṣvākaṁ śa yenāham anṛṇah
syāṁ dvijottama | tat tvattā prāptum ichhāṁ sarva-veda-vidāṁ vara |
apatyam īpeitam mahāyāṁ dātum arhasi sattama | "Perceiving Saktri to
be dead, Viśvāmitra again and again incited the Rākshasa against
the sons of Vaśisṭha; and accordingly the furious demon devoured those
of his sons who were younger than Saktri, as a lion eats up the small
beasts of the forest. On hearing of the destruction of his sons by Viśvāmitra, Vasishṭha supported his affliction, as the great mountain sustains the earth. He meditated his own destruction, but never thought of exterminating the Kaṇūṇakas. 6740. This divine sage hurled himself from the summit of Meru, but fell upon the rocks as if on a heap of cotton. Escaping alive from his fall, he entered a glowing fire in the forest; but the fire, though fiercely blazing, not only failed to burn him, but seemed perfectly cool. He next threw himself into the sea with a heavy stone attached to his neck; but was cast up by the waves on the dry land. He then went home to his hermitage; (6745) but seeing it empty and desolate, he was again overcome by grief and went out; and seeing the river Vipāśa which was swollen by the recent rains, and sweeping along many trees torn from its banks, he conceived the design of drowning himself into its waters: he accordingly tied himself firmly with cords, and threw himself in; but the river severing his bonds, deposited him unbound (vipāsa) on dry land; whence the name of the stream, as imposed by the sage. 6752. He afterwards saw and threw himself into the dreadful Satadru (Sutlej), which was full of alligators, etc., and derived its name from rushing away in a hundred directions on seeing the Brāhman brilliant as fire. In consequence of this he was once more stranded; and seeing he could not kill himself, he went back to his hermitage. After roaming about over many mountains and countries, he was followed home by his daughter-in-law Adṛśyāntī, Saktri’s widow, from whose womb he heard a sound of the recitation of the Vedas, as she was pregnant with a child, which, when born, received the name of Parāśara, verse 6794. Learning from her that there was

209 See above (pp. 327 ff.), the passages quoted from the Brāhmaṇas, about the slaughter of Vasishṭha’s sons. In the Panchaviṃśa Br. (cited by Prof. Weber, Ind St. i. 32) Vasishṭha is spoken of as puttra-hataḥ.

210 The Nirukta, ix. 26, after giving other etymologies of the word Vipāś, adds a verse: Pāśāḥ asyām evapāśyaṇa Vasishṭhāsyā mūmūrṣhataḥ | tasmād Vipāś ucyate pūrveṃ āsīṁ Uruṇjīrā | “In it the bonds of Vasishṭha were loosed, when he was on the point of death: hence it is called Vipāś. It formerly bore the name of Uruṇjīrā.” It does not appear whether or not this verse is older than the Mahābhārata. On this text of the Nirukta, Durga (as quoted by Prof. Müller, Rig-veda, ii. Pref. p. liv.) annotates: Vasishṭhāḥ kīla nimatam asyaṁ munāraṇaḥ puttra-maranaḥ-sakūrttaḥ pāśair ātmānam baddhavā | tasya kīla te pāśāḥ asyām evapāśyaṇa evamuchyanta udakena | “Vasishṭha plunged into it, after binding himself with bonds, wishing to die when grieved at the death of his sons. In it (the river) his bonds were loosed by the water.”
thus a hope of his line being continued, he abstained from further attempts on his own life. King Kalmāshapāda, however, whom they encountered in the forest, was about to devour them both, when Vaśiṣṭha stopped him by a blast from his mouth; and sprinkling him with water consecrated by a holy text, he delivered him from the curse by which he had been affected for twelve years. The king then addressed Vaśiṣṭha thus: "'Most excellent sage, I am Saudāsa, whose priest thou art: what can I do that would be pleasing to thee?" Vaśiṣṭha answered: 'This which has happened has been owing to the force of destiny: go, and rule thy kingdom; but, o monarch, never contempt the Brāhmans.' The king replied: 'Never shall I despise the most excellent Brāhmans; but submitting to thy commands I shall pay them all honour. And I must obtain from thee the means of discharging my debt to the Ikshvākus. Thou must give me the offspring which I desire.'" Vaśiṣṭha promised to comply with his request. They then returned to Ayodhya. And Vaśiṣṭha having been solicited by the king to beget an heir to the throne (verse 6787. Rājnas tasyājnayā devi Vaśiṣṭham upachakrame | maharshiḥ saumviḍāṁ kriteva sambābhava tayā saha | devyā divyena vidhiṇā Vaśiṣṭhaḥ bhagavān rishiḥ), the queen became pregnant by him, and brought forth a son at the end of twelve years. This extraordinary proceeding, so contrary to all the recognized rules of morality, is afterwards (verses 6888–6912) explained to have been necessitated by the curse of a Brāhmaṇī, whose husband Kalmāshapāda had devoured when in the forest, and who had doomed him to die if he should attempt to become a father, and had foretold that Vaśiṣṭha should be the instrument of propagating his race (verse 6906: Patnīṁ rītāv anuprāpya sadyas tyākṣhyasi jīvitam | yasya charsher Vaśiṣṭhasya tvayā putrāḥ vināśitāḥ | tena sangamya te bhāryaḥ tanayāṁ janayishyati). 211

212 This incident is alluded to in the Adip., section 122. It is there stated that in the olden time women were subject to no restraint, and incurred no blame for abandoning their husbands and cohabiting with anyone they pleased (verse 4719. Aññeritāṁ kīśa purā striyāḥ āsan varūnem | kūma-chāra-vihiṁyay eva tva mantriḥ saha śāru-hūsa | āśūm eva gayeke kararāṇānuṁ kaumārūṁ subhoṁ paṁ | niḥdṛmaṁ bhūd varūroho sa hi dharmāṁ purā t'oḥavat, compare verse 4729). A stop was, however, put to this practice by Uddālaka Svetaketu, whose indignation was on one occasion aroused by a Brāhmaṇī taking his mother by the hand, and inviting her to go away with him, although his father, in whose presence this occurred, informed him that
The Mahabhárata has a further legend, regarding Viśvāmitra's jealousy of Vaśishthha, which again exhibits the former in a very odious light, and as destitute of the moral dispositions befitting a saint, while Vaśishthha is represented as manifesting a noble spirit of disinterestedness and generosity.


shiṁ śīgamānāna yaṁ | yāvad enaṁ nihānmy adya" tach chhruṭvā vyathitā nadi | 2375. Prāṇajīluṁ tu tataḥ kriṭvā pūndarika-nibheksayaḥ | there was no reason for his displeasure, as the custom was one which had prevailed from time immemorial (verse 4726. Svetaketuḥ kila purú samaksham mātaram pūtuh | jagrāha brāhmaṇāḥ pūnu "gachhāva" iti chābravīt | rishis-puttras tataḥ kopaṁ chakrurūmarsha-chodtāḥ | mātaraṁ tām tātāḥ drīṣṭvā niyamānām balād eva | krudhān tām tu pūtā drīṣṭvā Svetakstum uvācha ha | "mā tāta kopaṁ kārāḥ sv echa dharmaṁ sanātanaḥ | "). But Svetaketu could not tolerate the practice, and introduced the existing rule (verse 4730. Rishi-putro 'tha tuṁ dharmaṁ Svetakstum na chaksham | chakrurū chaiva maryādām inām stri-pūnsayor bhūvī | ). A wife and a husband indulging in promiscuous intercourse were therefore thenceforward guilty of sin. But a wife, when appointed by her husband to raise up seed to him (by having intercourse with another man), is in like manner guilty if she refuse (4734. Patyā niyuktā yū chaiva patnī puttrvītham eva cha | na karishyati tasyāṁ cha bhavishyati tad eva hi | iti tama purū bhūru maryādaṁ sthāpitaṁ balāt | ). Pāṇḍu, the speaker, then proceeds to give an instance of the latter procedure in the case of Madayantī, the wife of Saudāsa, who, by her husband's command, visited Vaśishthā for the purpose in question (4736. Saudāsa ca rambhoru niyuktā puttra-janmani | Madayantī jagāmarṣhiṁ Vaśishtham iti naḥ śrutam | ). Compare what is said above, p. 224, of Angiras, and in pp. 232 and 233 of Dirgatamas or Dirghatapas; and see p. 423, below.
prākampata bhīṣam bhitā vāyunevāhātā lata | ... 2377. Sā tasya vachanaṁ śrūtvā jñātvā pāpa-chikrśhitam | Vasishthasya prabhāvacān cha jānante apratimam bhūvi | sā’dhigamya Vasishthānaṁ cha imam artham achohayat | yad uktā saritām śresṭhā Viśvāmitreṇa dhimatā | ubhayoh śāpayor bhitā vepamānā punah punah | ... 2380. Tāṁ kriśām cha vivarṇām cha drīṣṭvā chintā-samanvitām | uvāca rājan dharmātmā Vasishtho devapadāṃ varah | Vasishtho uvāca | “pāhy ātmānaṁ sarich-ehresthe vaha māṁ śigha-gāmini | Viśvāmitraḥ śaped hi tvam mā krīthās team vichāraṇam” | tasya tad vachanaṁ śrūtvā kripā-śilasyā sa sarit | chintayāmām Kauravya kiṁ kriśvā sukṛitam bhavet | tasyaś chintā samutpānṇā “Vasishtho māmy ativa hi | kriśavān hi dayāṁ nityam tasya kāryyaṁ hitam mayā” | atha kule svake rājan japantam rishi-sattamam | juhēnaṁ Kauṣikam prekṣaya sarvāvay vyahachintayat | 2385. “Idam antaram” ity eva tataḥ sa saritām varā | kūlāpahāram akarot evena vegenā sa sarit | tena kūlāpahārena Maitrāvarunir ahūyata | uvāmānaḥ sa tushtavā tadā rājan Sarasvatim | Pitāmahasya sarasah pravīrttā ‘si Sarasveti | vyāpatāṁ chedaṁ jagat sarvaṁ tavaivambhohir uttamaṁ | team eva cūkāsa-gā devi megheshṭerijāsa payah | sarvāś chāpas team eveti tvatto vayam adhitahi | pushṭir dyutis tathā kṛśṭiḥ siddhir buddhir umā tathā | team eva vāṁ svāṁ tvāṁ vāyavattam idāṁ jagat | 2390. Team eva sarva-bhūteshu vasasaḥa chaturvidhā | ... ... 2392. Tam āṇitaṁ Sarasvatyaṁ drīṣṭvā kopa-samanvitāḥ | athānveshat praharanaṁ Vasishthānta-kaṇaṁ tādā | taṁ tu kuṛuddham abhiprakāhya brahma-badhyā-bhayād nāti | apevāha Vasishthānaṁ tu prāchāṁ diśam atandritā | ubhayoh karevā lakṣyāṁ vanchayitvā cha Gādhiyam tato ‘pavāhitaṁ drīṣṭvā Vasishtham rishi-sattamam | 2395. Abravid duṣkha-sankruddho Viśvāmitro hy amaraṁnaḥ | “yasmaṁ māṁ tvam sarich-ehreshthe vanchayitvā punargataḥ | suṇitaṁ vahā kalyāṇi rakṣho-gra-maṇi-sammatam” | tataḥ Sarasvari śaptā Viśvāmitreṇa dhimatā | avahach erhoṇitenmiśrāṁ toyaṁ saṁcait-sāraṁ tadā. | ... ... 2401. Athājagmuṁ tato rājan rākṣasas tattra Bhārata | tattra te suṇitaṁ sarve pivantaṁ sukham āsate | ... ... 2402. Nrītyantaḥ cha hasantaḥ cha yathā svarga-jītas tathā | ... ... 2407. tāṁ drīṣṭvā rākṣasan rājan munayāṁ saṁśīta-vratāḥ | paritrāṇe Sarasvatyaṁ paraṁ yatnam prachakrire | “2360. There existed a great enmity, arising from rivalry in their austerities, between Viśvāmitra and the Brāhmaṇa rishi Vasishtha. Viś-śīthā had an extensive hermitage in Sthāṇutirtha, to the east of
which was Viśvāmitra's. 2366. These two great ascetics were every day exhibiting intense emulation in regard to their respective austerities. But Viśvāmitra, beholding the might of Vaśishṭha, was the most chagrined; and fell into deep thought. The idea of this sage, constant in duty (!), was the following: 'This river Sarasvatī will speedily bring to me on her current the austere Vaśishṭha, the most eminent of all mutterers of prayers. When that most excellent Brāhmaṇ has come, I shall most assuredly kill him.' 2370. Having thus determined, the divine sage Viśvāmitra, his eyes reddened by anger, called to mind the chief of rivers. She being thus the subject of his thoughts, became very anxious, as she knew him to be very powerful and very irascible. Then trembling, pallid, and with joined hands, the Sarasvatī stood before the chief of munis. Like a woman whose husband has been slain, she was greatly distressed; and said to him, 'What shall I do?' The incensed muni replied, 'Bring Vaśishṭha hither speedily, that I may slay him.' 2375. The lotus-eyed goddess, joining her hands, trembled in great fear, like a creeping plant agitated by the wind.'... Viśvāmitra, however, although he saw her condition, repeated his command. 2377. "The Sarasvatī, who knew how sinful was his design, and that the might of Vaśishṭha was unequalled, went trembling, and in great dread of being cursed by both the sages, to Vaśishṭha, and told him what his rival had said. 2380. Vaśishṭha seeing her emaciated, pale, and anxious, spoke thus: 'Deliver thyself, o chief of rivers; carry me unhesitatingly to Viśvāmitra, lest he curse thee.' Hearing these words of the merciful sage, the Sarasvatī considered how she could act most wisely. She reflected, 'Vaśishṭha has always shown me great kindness; I must seek his welfare.' Then observing the Kauśika sage [so in the text, but does not the sense require Vaśishṭha?] praying and sacrificing on her brink, she regarded (2385) that as a good opportunity, and swept away the bank by the force of her current. In this way the son of Mitra and Varuṇa (Vaśishṭha)²¹² was carried down; and while he was being borne along, he thus celebrated the river: 'Thou, o Sarasvatī, issuést from the lake of Brahmā, and pervadest the whole world with thy excellent streams. Residing in the sky, thou dischargest water into the clouds. Thou alone art all waters. By thee we study.' [Here the river Sarasvatī is identified with Saras-²¹² See above, pp. 316 and 320 f.
vati the goddess of speech.] 214 'Thou art nourishment, radiance, fame, perfection, intellect, light. Thou art speech; thou art Svāhā; this world is subject to thee. 2390. Thou, in fourfold form, dwellest in all creatures.' . . . . 2392. Beholding Vaśishṭha brought near by the Sarasvatī, Viśvāmitra searched for a weapon with which to make an end of him. Perceiving his anger, and dreading lest Brahmanicicide should ensue, the river promptly carried away Vaśishṭha in an easterly direction; thus fulfilling the commands of both sages, but eluding Viśvāmitra. Seeing Vaśishṭha so carried away, (2395) Viśvāmitra, impatient, and enraged by vexation, said to her: 'Since thou, o chief of rivers, hast eluded me, and hast receded, roll in waves of blood acceptable to the chief of demons,' [which are fabled to gloat on blood]. "The Sarasvatī, being thus cursed, flowed for a year in a stream mingled with blood. . . . 2401. Rākshasas came to the place of pilgrimage, where Vaśishṭha had been swept away, and revelled in drinking to satiety the bloody stream in security, dancing and laughing, as if they had conquered heaven." Some rishis who arrived at the spot some time after were horrified to see the blood-stained water, and the Rākshasas quaffing it, and (2407) "made the most strenuous efforts to rescue the Sarasvatī." After learning from her the cause of the pollution of her waters, they propitiated Mahādeva by the most various austerities, and thus obtained the restoration of the river to her pristine purity (2413 ff.).

We have another reference to the connection of the families of Sudās and Vaśishṭha in the legend of Parāśurāma, 215 the destroyer of the Kshattryias, in the 49th section of the Śāntiparvan of the Mahābhārata. Sarvakarman, a descendant of Sudās, is there mentioned as one of those

214 See the remarks on Sarasvatī in my "Contributions to a knowledge of the Vedic Theogony and Mythology No. II.," in the Journ. R. A. S., for 1866, pp. 18 ff.

215 Parāśurāma was the son of Jamadagnī, regarding whose birth, as well as that of Viśvāmitra and the incarnation of Indra in the person of his father Gādhi, the same legend as has been already given above, p. 349 ff, is repeated at the commencement of the story referred to in the text. In discoursing with his wife Satyavatī about the exchange of her own and her mother's meses, Richika tells her, verse 1741: Brahmahūtān hi sakalam pitus tava kulum bhavet | "All the family of thy father (Gādhi) shall be Brahmanical;" and Vāsudeva, the narrator of the the legend, says, verse 1745: Viśvāmitrān cha dāyudān Gādhiḥ Kuśikamandanaḥ | yam prāpa brahma-samvitam viśvair brahmayuṣair yutam | "And Gādhi begot a son, Viśvāmitra, whom he obtained equal to a Brāhman, and possessed of all Brahmanical qualities."
Kshattriyas who had been preserved from the general massacre by Parāśara, grandson of Vaśishṭha: verse 1792. Tathā ’nukampamāṇena yaṣeṣu ’mita-tejasā | Parāśarenā dāyudāḥ Saudāsasyābhītrakshitaḥ | sarva-karmāṇi kurute śudra-vat tasya vai deivaḥ | Sarvakarmety abhi-khyātaḥ sa māṁ rakshatu pārthivah | “Sarvakarman, the son of Saudāsa, was preserved by the tender-hearted priest Parāśara, who performed, though a Brāhmaṇ, all menial offices for him, like a Śūdra; whence the prince’s name;—may this king protect me (the earth).” The same book of the Mahābhārata, when recording a number of good deeds done to Brāhmanas, has also the following allusion to Mitrasaha and Vaśishṭha: verse 8604. Rājā Mitrasahās chaṇḍi Vaśishṭhāya mahātmane | Damayantim priyāṁ datteva tayā saha divaṁ gataḥ | “King Mitrasaha, having bestowed his dear Damayantī on Vaśishṭha, ascended to heaven along with her.”

The same passage has two further allusions to Vaśishṭha, which, though unconnected with our present subject, may be introduced here. In verse 8591 it is said: Rantidevaś cha Sānkriyo Vaśishṭhāya mahātmane | aparḥ pradāya śītoṣṇāḥ nāka-prishtē mahiyate | “Rantideva, son of Sankriti, who gave Vaśishṭha tepid water, is exalted to the heavenly regions.” (See the Bhāg. Pur. ix. 21, 2–18, where the various acts of self-sacrifice practised by this prince are celebrated.) It is said of Vaśishṭha in verse 8601: Avarshati cha Parjanye sarva-bhūtāni bhūta-krit | Vaśishṭho jīvayāmāna praśāpatir iśaparaḥ | “When Parjanya failed to send rain, the creative Vaśishṭha, like Brahṇā, gave life to all beings.”

Vaśishṭha, in short, is continually reappearing in the Mahābhārata. I will here adduce but one other passage. In the Sāntiparvan, verses 10,118 ff., it is said: Tasya Vītrātra-ditasyāthā mohāḥ āśich chhatakra-toḥ | rathantarēṇa tam ṭattṛa Vaśishṭhāḥ samabodhayat | Vaśishṭhāḥ uvācha | deva-bṛṣeṣṭho ’śi devendra dāityāsura-nibarhāṇa | trailokya-balā-

216 This appears to refer to the story told above, p. 418 ff., of Kalmāshapāda (who was the same as Mitrasaha), allowing Vaśishṭha to be the agent in propagating the royal race; for both there (v. 6910) and in the Vishṇu Pur. (Wilson, vol. iii., pp. 308 and 310), the name of the queen is said to have been Madayantī, which is probably the right reading here also, the first two letters only having been transposed. If so, however, it is to be observed that a quite different turn is given to the story here, where it is represented as a meritorious act on the king’s part, and as a favour to Vaśishṭha, that the queen was given up to him; whilst, according to the other account, the king’s sole object in what he did was to get progeny.
sāmyuktaḥ kasmāčh chhakra nishidasi | esha Brahmā cha Vishnūcha Sivaṇ chaiva jagat-patiḥ | Somaḥ cha bhagavān devaḥ sarve cha paramar-shayaḥ | mā kārṣṭhā kasmalaṁ Sākra kāśchid eveto ra yathā | āryyam yuddhe matim kriṣya jahi satrān surādhipa | “By reciting the Rathantāra, Vasishṭha encouraged Indra, when he had become bewildered and distressed in his conflict with Vrittra, saying to him, ‘Thou art the chief of the gods, o slayer of the Daityas and Asuras, possessing all the strength of the three worlds: wherefore, Indra, dost thou despond? There are here present Brahmā, Vishnū, Siva, the divine Soma, and all the chief rishis. Faint not, o Indra, like an ordinary being. Assume a heroic spirit for the fight, and slay thine enemies, etc.’” Strength was thus infused into Indra.

In a later work, the Rāja Tarangini, Book IV. verses 619–655 (pp. 188 ff. and note, pp. 521 and 522, of Troyer’s edition, vol. i. and vol. ii. 189, 469, note), a curious echo of these old legends is found still reverberating. A story is there told of a king Jayāpīḍa who oppressed his people, and persecuted the Brāhmans, and was eventually destroyed by them in a miraculous manner. He is compared to Saudāsa in verse 625: Sa Saudāsaḥ ivāneka-loka-prañāpahārakrit | astutya - kṛitya - sauhlityaṁ svapne 'pi na samāyayau | “Like Saudāsa, depriving many persons of their lives, he was not sated with wicked deeds even in his dreams.” One of the Brāhmans stood up on behalf of the rest to remonstrate: Āha śrīma “Visvāmitro vā Vasishṭho vā taponidhiḥ | tvam Agastyo’t tavā kiṁ stha” iti dārṣena tāṁ nṛpiḥ | . . . bhavān yatra Hariṣchandras Triśankur Nahusha 'pi vā | Visvāmitra-mukhebhya 'haṁ tatraikō bhavituṁ kṣhamah | vihāsya-vēcha tāṁ rājā “Visvāmitrādi-kopataḥ | Hariṣchandrāyo nashtās tvayī krūddhe tu kim bhavet” | pācinā tāḍayann ārveṁ tataḥ krūddho bhyadhaṁ devajah | “mayi krūddhe kṣanad eva brahma-dandaḥ pated na kim” | tach chhrutvā vihāsan rājā kopād brahmaṇam abravit | “patatu brahma-dano ’sau kim adyāpi vilambate” | nanv ayam patito jālmety atha vipreṇa bhāshite | raujam kanaka-danda ’nge vītāna-skalito ’patat | “The king haughtily asked him: ‘Art thou Viśvāmitra, or Vasishṭha, so rich in devotion? or Agastya? or what art thou?’ . . . The Brāhmaṇ answered, swelling with indignation: ‘Just as thou art a Hariṣchandra, a Triśanku, or a Nahusha, so too have I power to be a Viśvāmitra, or one of those other rishis.’ The king answered with a smile of contempt: ‘Hariṣchandra
and the rest perished by the wrath of Viśvāmitra and the other sages: but what will come of thy wrath?" The Brāhman angrily replied, smiting the ground with his hand, "When I am incensed, shall not the Brahmanical bolt instantly descend?" The king retorted with an angry laugh: "Let it descend; why does it not come down at once?" "Has it not fallen, tyrant?" said the Brāhman; and he had no sooner spoken, than a golden beam fell from the canopy and smote the king," so that he became tortured by worms, and shortly after died; and went, as the story concludes, to hell.

Professor Lassen, who quotes the stories regarding Vaśishtha and Viśvāmitra (Ind. Alt. 2nd ed. i. 718 f.), makes the following remarks on their import:

"The legend of the struggle between Vaśishtha and Viśvāmitra embraces two distinct points: one is the contest between the priests and warriors for the highest rank; the other is the temporary alienation of the Ikshvākus from their family priests. Vaśishtha is represented as the exemplar of such a priest; and the story of Kalmāşhapāda is related for the express purpose of showing by an example that the Ikshvākus, after they had retained him, were victorious, and fulfilled perfectly the duties of sacrifice (see above, p. 390): in his capacity of priest he continues to live on, and is the representative of his whole race. We may conclude from the legend that his descendants had acquired the position of family priests to the Ikshvākus, though neither he himself nor his son Sakti belonged to their number. Triśanku is the first prince who forsook them, and had recourse to Viśvāmitra. His successor Ambūrīsha received support from that personage, as well as from Richika, one of the Bṛigus; — a family whose connection with the Kuśikas appears also in the story of Paraśurāma. The hostility between the Ikshvākus and the family of Vaśishtha continued down to Kalmāşhapāda. Viśvāmitra is represented as having intentionally fostered the alienation; while Vaśishtha is described as forbearing (though he had the power) to annihilate his rival.

"The conflict between the two rivals with its motives and machinery is described in the forms peculiar to the fully developed epos. To this style of poetry is to be referred the wonder-working cow, which supplies all objects of desire. There is no ground for believing in any actual war with weapons between the contending parties, or in
any participation of degraded Kshattriyas, or aboriginal tribes, in the
contest; for all these things are mere poetical creations. Besides, the
proper victory of Vasishṭha was not gained by arms, but by his rod.
The legend represents the superiority of the Brāhmans as complete,
since Viśvāmitra is forced to acknowledge the insufficiency of a warrior's
power; and acquires his position as a Brāhman by purely Brahmānical
methods.

"From Viśvāmitra are derived many of the sacerdotal families,
which bear the common name of Kauśika, and to which many rishis
famous in tradition belong. As there were also kings in this family,
we have here an example of the fact that one of the old Vedic races
became divided, and in later times belonged to both of the two higher
castes. It appears impossible that any of the aboriginal tribes should
have been among the descendants of Viśvāmitra's sons, as the legend
represents; and the meaning of this account may therefore be that
some of his sons and their descendants accepted the position of priests
among these tribes, and are in consequence described as accursed."

Sect. XIV.—Story from the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa about king
Janaka becoming a Brāhman.

The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa has the following account of a discussion
between Janaka, king of Videha, and some Brāhmans:

xi. 6, 2, 1. Janako ha vai Vaidho brāhmaṇair dācayadbhir samā-
jugamā Svetaketunā Āruneyena Somasushménā Sātyayajnínā Yājnavalk-
yena | tān ha uvācha "kathaṁ katham agnihotram juhutha" iti | 2. Sa
ha uvācha Svetaketur Āruneyo "gharmāv eva samrāḍ aham ajasrau
yaśasā visyandamanāv anyo 'yasmin juhomi" iti | "kathaṁ tad" iti |
ādityo vai gharmas taṁ sāyam agnau juhomi agnir vai gharmas tam
pratar āditye juhomi" iti | "kiṁ sa bhavati yah evaṁ juhoti" | "ajas-
raḥ eva kriyā yaśasā bhavaty etayo cha devatayoḥ sāyujyaṁ salokatāṁ
jayati" iti | 3. Ataḥ ha uvācha Somasushmah Sātyayajnīḥ "tejaḥ eva
samrāḍ aham tejasi juhomi" iti | "kathaṁ tad" iti | "Ādityo vai tejas
taṁ sāyam agnau juhomi | agnir vai tejas tam pratar āditye juhomi"

217 See also Prof. Müller's Anc. Sansk. Lit., pp. 80 ff., 383 ff., 408, 413 ff., 485 ff.
218 This passage is referred to and translated by Prof. Müller, Anc. Sansk. Lit. pp.
421 ff.
THE BRAHMANS AND KSHATTRYIAS.

"kiṃ sa bhavati yaḥ evaṁ juhoti" iti | "tejasvā yaśasvya annādo bhavaty etayoḥ chaiva devatayoḥ sānyayaṁ salokatāṁ jayati" iti | 4. Atha ha uvācha Yājnavalkyaḥ "yaḥ aham agnim uddhārāmy agnihotram eva tad udyachhami | aḍityāṇaṁ eva astaṁ yantam sarve devāḥ anuyanti | te me etam agnim uddhīrtam dṛṣṭvā upāvarttante atha aham pātraṁ niṁjya upavāpya āgnihotriṁ dohayitvā paśyan paśyataṁ tarpaṇyāmi" iti | teṇṁ nedishthāṁ yājnavalkya āgnihotrasya animāṁsishthāḥ | dhenuśataṁ dadāmi" iti ha uvācha "na te eva enam tvam utkṛantiṁ na gatiṁ na pratishthāṁ na tripiṁ na punarāvrittiṁ na lokāṁ pratyyathāyinam" ity utkṛtaḥ ratham āṭhāya pradhācayān chakāra | 5. Te ha āchur "ati vai no'yaṁ rājanyabandhur avāśid hanta enam brahmodyam ākevāyamāha" iti | sa ha uvācha Yājnavalkyo "brahmaṇāṁ vai vayaṁ smo rājanyabandhur asau yady amun vayaṁ jayema kam ajaishma iti brāyāma atha yady asāv asmān jayed brāhmaṇaṁ rājanyabandhaṁ ajaishād iti no brāyah | mā idam āḍṛidhevaṁ" iti | tad ha asya jajnūḥ | atha ha Yājnavalkyo ratham āṭhāya pradhācayān chakārē teṣāṁ ha anvajāgama | sa ha uvācha "āgnihoṭrāṁ Yājna-valkyo veditum" iti | "āgnihoṭrāṁ samṛād" iti | 6. "Te vai ete āhuti hute utkṛmatas te antarikṣam āśisatas te antarikṣam eva āḥavanīyaṁ kuruṭe vāyuṁ samidham maricāṁ eva śukrām āhutiṁ te antarikṣam tarpayatas te tataḥ utkṛmatāḥ | 7. Te divam āśisatas te divam eva āḥavanīyaṁ kuruṭe āḍityāṁ samidham chandramasam eva śukrām āhutiṁ te divam tarpayatas te tataḥ āḥutiṁ | 8. Te imām āśisatas te imām eva āḥavanīyaṁ kuruṭe agniṁ samidham oṣhadhir eva śukrām āhutiṁ te imām tarpayatas te tataḥ utkṛmatāḥ | 9. Te purusham āśisatas tasya mukham eva āḥavanīyaṁ kuruṭe jihvāṁ samidham annam eva śukrāṁ āhutiṁ te purushāṁ tarpayatas eva yasy evan vidvān aśnāty-agnihoṭram eva asya ṛtam bhavati \( \overset{\downarrow}{\text{le tataḥ utkṛmatāḥ}} \) | 10. Te striyaṁ āśisatas tasyaṁ upastham eva āḥavanīyaṁ kuruṭe dhārakāṁ samidham (dhārakā ha vai nāma eẖa | etayā ha vai Prajāpatiḥ prajāḥ dhārayāṇchakāra) retaḥ eva śukrām āhutiṁ te striyaṁ tarpayataḥ eva yasy evan vidvān mithunam upaity agnihoṭram eva asya ṛtam bhavati yas tataḥ putro jāyate sa lokāḥ pratyyuthāyī | etad agnihoṭraṁ Yājnavalkya na ataḥ param asti" iti ha uvācha | tasmāi Yājnavalkyo varaṁ dadāu | sa ha uvācha "kāmaprāśnaṁ eva me teṣyī Yājnavalkya asad" iti | tato brahmaṁ Janakaḥ āsa |

"Janaka of Videha met with some travelling Brāhmans, Svetaketu
Auruṇeya, Somaśushma Sātyayajni, and Yājanavalkya, and said to them, 'How do ye respectively offer the agnihotra oblation?' 2. Svetaketu replied, 'I, o monarch, in sacrificing, throw the one of the two eternal heats which pervade the world with their splendour into the other.' 'How is that done,' asked the king. (S. replied), 'Āditya (the sun) is one heat; in the evening I throw him into Agni (Fire). Agni is the other heat; in the morning I throw him into Āditya.' 'What' (enquired the king) 'does he become who thus sacrifices? 'He acquires' (replied S.) 'perpetual prosperity and renown; conquers for himself an union with these two deities, and dwells in the same region as they.' 3. Then Somaśushma answered, 'I, o monarch, in sacrificing, throw light into light.' 'How is that done,' asked the king. 'The Sun' (answered S.) 'is light; in the evening I throw him into Fire: and Fire is light; in the morning I throw him into the Sun.' 'What' (enquired the king) 'does he become who thus sacrifices? 'He becomes' (rejoined S.) 'luminous, and renowned, an eater of food, and conquers for himself an union with these two deities, and dwells in the same region as they.' 4. Then Yājanavalkya said, 'When I take up the fire I lift the agnihotra. All the gods follow the Sun when he sets; and when they see me take up the Fire, they come back to me. Then, after washing and putting down the vessels, and having the Agnihotra Cow milked, beholding them as they behold me, I satisfy them (with sacrificial food).' The king answered, 'Thou hast approached very close to a solution of the Agnihotra, o Yājanavalkya; I give thee a hundred milch-cows: but thou hast not discovered the ascent of these two (oblations), nor the course, nor the resting-place, nor the satisfaction, nor the return, nor the world where they reappear(?). Having so spoken, Janaka mounted his car and drove away. 5. The Brāhmans then said amongst themselves, 'This Rājanya has surpassed us in speaking; come, let us invite him to a theological discussion.' Yājanavalkya, however, interposed, 'We are Brāhmans, and he a Rājanya; if we overcome him, we shall ask ourselves, whom have we overcome? but if he overcome us, men will say to us, a Rājanya has overcome Brāhmans. Do not follow this course.' They assented to his advice. Then Yājanavalkya mounted his car, and drove after the king; and came up to him. Janaka asked, 'is it to learn the agnihotra (that thou hast come), Yājanavalkya?' 'The agnihotra, o
monarch,' said Y. 6. The king rejoined, 'These two oblations, when offered, ascend; they enter the air, they make the air their āhavaniya fire, the wind their fuel, the rays their bright oblation, they satisfy the air, and thence ascend. 7. They enter the sky, they make the sky their āhavaniya fire, the sun their fuel, the moon their bright oblation; they satisfy the sky, they return thence. 8. They enter this earth, they make this earth their āhavaniya fire, Agni their fuel, the plants their bright oblation; they satisfy the earth, they ascend thence. They enter man, they make his mouth their āhavaniya fire, his tongue their fuel, food their bright oblation; they satisfy man. (He who, thus knowing, eats, truly offers the agnihotra). 9. They ascend from him, they enter into woman [the details which follow are better left untranslated], they satisfy her. The man who, thus knowing, approaches his wife, truly offers the agnihotra. The son who is then born is the world of re-appearance. This is the agnihotra, o Yājñavalkya; there is nothing beyond this.' Y. offered the king the choice of a boon. He replied, 'Let me enquire of thee whatever I desire, o Yājñavalkya.' Henceforward Janaka was a Brāhmān.”

By Brāhmān in the last sentence we have, I presume, to understand a Brāhman. Even if it were taken to dignify a priest of the kind called Brāhmān, the conclusion would be the same; as at the time when the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa was written, none but Brāhmins could officiate as priests.

Janaka’s name occurs frequently in the Mahābhārata. In the Vanapravam of that poem (8089) he is called a rājarṣi. In the Śāntipravam, verse 66:40, it is said: Atrāpy udāharantam itihāsam purātanam | gitaṁ Videha-rājena Janakena praśāmyatā | “ānantam vata me vittam yasya me nāsti kinchana | Mithilāyām pradiptayām na me dāhyati kinchana” | “They here relate an ancient story,—the words recited by Janaka the tranquil-minded king of Videha:

‘Though worldly self I own no more, Of wealth I have a boundless store: While Mithilā the flames devour, My goods can all defy their power.’”

219 The Commentator explains brahmā by brahmashṭhāḥ, “Most full of divine knowledge.”

220 Prof. Müller remarks in his article on Caste (Chips from a German Workshop, ii. 338): “That king Janaka of Videha possessed superior knowledge is acknowledged by one of the most learned among the Brahmins, by Yājñavalkya himself; and in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, which is believed to have been the work of Yājñavalkya, it is said that king Janaka became a Brahman.”
The same sentiment is ascribed to the same royal rishi in verse 7891: 
*Api eha bhaevi Maithilena gitam nagaram upahitam agnina bhievikhyag |
"na khalu mama hi dahyate 'ttaa kincit" seayam idam aha sma bhumi-
palaḥ | "And these words were repeated by the king of Mithilā when he beheld the city enveloped in fire, 'nothing of mine is burnt here;'
—so said the king himself."

Another "ancient story" of Janaka is related in verses 7882–7983 of the same book. It is there stated that this king was constantly engaged in thinking on matters connected with a future life; and that he had a hundred religious teachers to instruct him on different points of duty (verse 7884). He was, however, visited by the rishi Pancha-
śikha (verses 7886, 7888), a pupil of Āsuri (verse 7890), who so confounded the king's hundred instructors by his reasoning, that they were abandoned by their pupil, who followed this new teacher (7898. *Upētya śatam ačāryan mohayāmāsa hetubhiḥ | 7899. Jana
kas te abhisāmraktaḥ Kāpineyāndurasānāt | utsṛjiya śatam ačāryyaṁ prishṭato 'nuja gaṁa
tam). Panchaśikha appears also, at verse 11839, as his instructor. At verse 10699 Janaka is again brought forward as receiving religious information from Parāśara; in verses 11545–11836 as being taught by the rishi Yājnavalkya the principles of the Yoga and Sānkhyā philosophies; and in verses 11854–12043 as holding a conversation with a travelling female mendicant (*bhikshuki*), named Sulabhā, who sought to prove him, and to whom he declares himself to be a pupil of Pancha-
śikha (here said to belong to the family of Parāśara, verse 11875), and an adept in the systems just mentioned; and from whom, in answer to some reproaches he had addressed to her regarding her procedure, he learns that she belongs to the Rājanya class, like himself, of the family of the rājarshi Pradhāna, that she had obtained no suitable husband, and wandered about, following an ascetic life, and seeking final eman-
cipation (verses 12033 ff.).

A further story in illustration of Janaka's indifference to worldly objects is told in the Āsvamedhikaparvan, verses 887 ff.

---

221 See Prof. Wilson's Sānkhyā-kārikā, p. 190; and Dr. Hall's Preface to his edition of the Sānkhyā-pravachana-bhāshya, pp. 9 ff.
Sect. XV.—Other instances in which Brāhmans are said to have been instructed in divine knowledge by Kshattriyas.

Two other cases in which Brāhmans are recorded to have received instruction from Kshattriyas are thus stated by Professor Müller:

“For a Kshattriya to teach the law was a crime (sva-dharmatikrama), and it is only by a most artificial line of argument that the dogmatic philosophers of the Mīmaṁsā school tried to explain this away. The Brāhmans seem to have forgotten that, according to their own Upanishads, Ajātaśatru, the king of Kāsi, possessed more knowledge than Gārgya, the son of Balāka, who was renowned as a reader of the Veda, and that Gārgya desired to become his pupil, though it was not right, as the king himself remarked, that a Kshatriya should initiate a Brāhman. They must have forgotten that Pravāhana Jaivali, king of the Panchālas, silenced Svetaketu Āruṇeya and his father, and then communicated to them doctrines which Kshatriyas only, but no Brāhmans, had ever known before.” I subjoin two separate versions of each of these stories. The first is that of Ajātaśatru:

Kaushitaki Brāhmaṇa Upanishad, iv. 1. Atha ha vai Gārgya Bālākīr anāchānāh samospasṭhaḥ āṣa | so ‘vasad Uśinareshu savasan Matsyeshu Kuru-panchāleshu Kāsi-vidheshaḥ iti | sa ha Ajātaśatryaḥ Kāsyam āvrajaḥ uvāca “brahma te bravāṇi” iti | tām ha uvācha Ajātaśatryaḥ sahasram dadmaḥ iti | “etasyāṁ vācchi | ‘Janako Janakaḥ iti vai u janāḥ dhāvanti” iti | . . . 19. Tataḥ u ha Bālakis tāśnāṁ āṣa | tām ha uvācha Ajātaśatryaḥ “etavad nu Bālāke” iti | “etavad” iti ha uvācha Bālākiḥ | tam ha uvācha Ajātaśatryaḥ “mrishā vai khalu mā saṁvādayishthāḥ “brahma te bravāṇi” iti | yo vai Bālāke eteshāṁ puruśānāṁ kartā yasya vai tat karma sa vai veditavyaḥ” iti | tataḥ u ha Bālākiḥ samit-pāniḥ pratiçakrama “upāyāṇi” iti | tam ha uvācha Ajātaśatryaḥ “pratiloma-rūpam eva tad manye yat kshatriyo brāhmaṇam upanayeta chi vy eva tvā jñapaiṣṭhyāmi” iti | tam ha pāṇāv abhipadya pravāraya

“Now Gārgya Bālāki was renowned as a man well read in the Veda. He dwelt among the Uśinares, Matsyas, Kuru, Panchālas, Kāsīs, and Videhas, travelling from place to place. He came to

Ajātaśatru, the Kāśya, and said, ‘Let me declare to thee divine knowledge.’ Ajātaśatru said, ‘We bestow on thee a thousand (cows) for this word.’ Men run to us crying, ‘Janaka, Janaka.’” The learned man accordingly addresses Ajātaśatru in a series of statements regarding the object of his own worship, but is silenced by the king’s display of superior knowledge on every topic. The story ends thus: 19. “Then the son of Balāka remained silent. Ajātaśatru said to him, ‘Dost (thou know only) so much, o Bālāki,’ ‘Only so much,’ he answered. The king rejoined, ‘Thou hast vainly proposed to me, let me teach thee divine knowledge.’ He, son of Balāka, who is the maker of these souls, whose work that is,—he is the object of knowledge.’ Then the son of Balāka approached the king with fuel in his hand, and said, ‘Let me attend thee (as thy pupil).’ The king replied, ‘I regard it as an inversion of the proper rule that a Kshatriya should initiate a Brāhman. (But) come, I will instruct thee. Then, having taken him by the hand, he departed.”

Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, xiv. 5, 1, 1 (= Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad, ii. 1, 1, p. 334 of Cal. edit.). Driptabālākhi ha anuḥāno Gārgyaḥ āsa | sa ha uvāca Ajātaśatrum Kāsyam “brahma te bravān” iti | sa uvāca Ajātaśatruḥ “sahasram etasyāṁ vāchi dadmaḥ ‘Janako Janakoḥ’ iti vai janāḥ dhāvanti” iti | . . . . 12. Sa ha tūshνṃ āsa Gārgyaḥ | 13. Sa ha uvāca Ajātaśatrur “etavad nu” iti | “etaved hi” iti | “na etavatā vidiitaṁ bhavati” iti | sa ha uvāca Gārgyaḥ “upa tāv ayāmi” iti | 14. Sa ha uvāca Ajātaśatrur “pratilomaṁ vai tād yad brāhmaṇaḥ kshatriyam upeyād ‘brahma me vakṣhayati’ iti | vy eva tā jñāpayiṣyāmi” iti | tam pānāv ādāya uttasthau |

“Driptabālāki Gārgya was well read in the Veda. He said to Ajātaśatru, the Kāśya, ‘Let me declare to thee divine knowledge.’ Ajātaśatru replied, ‘We give thee a thousand (cows) for this word. Men run to me calling out, “Janaka, Janaka.”’ At the end of their conversation we are told: 12. “Gārgya remained silent. 13. Then Ajātaśatru asked him, ‘(Dost thou know) so much only?’ ‘Only so much,’ he replied. ‘But this,’ rejoined Ajātaśatru, ‘does not comprehend the whole of knowledge.’ Then said Gārgya, ‘Let me come to thee (as thy disciple).’ Ajātasatru answered, ‘This is an inversion of the proper rule, that a Brāhman should attend a Kshatriya with the view

223 See Prof. Cowell’s Translation of the Upanishad, pp. 167 ff.
of being instructed in divine knowledge. (But) I will teach thee. He took him by the hand, and rose."

The second story is that of Pravāhaṇa Jaivali:

Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, xiv. 9, 1, 1 (= Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad, vi. 2, 1, p. 1030 of Cal. edit.). Svetaketur ha vai Āruṇeṣyā Panchalānām parishadam ājagāma | sa ājagāma Pravāhaṇaṁ Jaivalim parichārayamānam | tam udikshya abhyeva "kumāra" iti | sa "bhoh" iti pratiśūrva | "anuśishta na asi pitrā" | "om" iti ha uvāca | 2. "Vetthā yathā imāḥ praṇāḥ prayatyo vipratipadyante" iti | "na" iti ha uvāca | "vetthā yathā imāḥ lokam punar āpadyante" iti | "na" iti ha eva uvāca | "vetthā yathā 'sa' lokam evam bhahūhi punah punah pravaydhir na sampūryyate" iti | "na" iti ha eva uvāca | 3. "Vetthā yatithyām āhutyaṁ kutāyām āpah purusha-vācho bhūtvā samutthāya vadanti" iti | "na" iti ha eva uvāca | "vetthā u devayānasya vā pathah praṇipadam pitriyānasya vā yat kritvā devayānām vā pathāhām pratipadaya pitriyānasya vā | 4. Api hi naḥ risher vahcha śrutam (R.V. x. 88, 15—Vāj. S. 19, 47) 'devi śrīti aśrīnavaḥ pitriyām aham devanām uta mārttyyānām | tābhāyām idān visvaṃ ejat sameti yad antarā pitaram mātaraḥ cha' iti | "na aham ataḥ ekchana veda" iti ha uvāca | 5. Atha ha evam vasatyā upamantrayānchakre | anāditya vasatiṁ kumāraḥ pradadrāva | sa ajagāma pitaram | tam ha uvāca "iti vāva kila no bhavan purā 'nusishtān avocah" 224 iti | "kathaṁ sumedhāḥ" iti | "pancha ma praśnān ṛajanyabandhir aprakṣit tato na ekanchana veda" iti ha uvāca | "katame te" iti | "ime" iti ha pratikṣyā udājaḥāra | 6. Sa ha uvāca | "tathā nas tvaṁ tāta jānīthāḥ yathā yad aham kincha veda sarvam aham tāt tūbhyaṃ avocah | prēhi tu tattra pratitya brahmacharyayāṁ vatsyāva" iti | bhavan eva gachhate" iti | 7. Sa ajagāma Gautamo yatra Pravāhaṇaṁ Jaivaler āsa | tasmaj āsanaṁ āhāryya udakam āhārayānchakāra | atha ha asmaj arghāṁ chākara | 8. Sa ha uvāca "varam bhavate Gautamayā dadmaḥ" iti | sa ha uvāca "pratijñāto me eva varah | yāṁ tu kumārasya ante vācam abhāshathās tām me brūhi" iti | 9. Sa ha uvāca "daiveshu vai Gautama tad vareshu | mānushānām brūhi" iti | 10. Sa ha uvāca "vijnāyate ha asti hiriṃxyaṁ apattam go-asrāṇānāṁ dāśānām pravarāṇāṁ paridhānamānām | mā no bhavan bahor anantasya

224 The text of the Brihadāraṇyaka Up. reads avocah.
225 The Brih. Ār. reads ahṛtya.
226 The Brih. Ār. reads arghyam.
aparyantaya abhy avadanyo bhud’’ iti | "sa vai Gautama tirthena icchasures’’ iti | "upaimy aham bhavantam” iti “vachha ha sma eva purve upayanti” | 11. Sa ha upayana-kirtta uvacha | “tatha nas tevam Gautama ma’paramahsa tava cha pitamahas yathah | iya m vidya itah puresam na kasmischana brahma ca uvasa | tam tv aham tubhyam vakshyami | ko hi tv a evam brucantam arhati pratyakhyatam” iti |

“Svetaikutu Aruneya came to the assembly of the Panchalas. He came to Pravaha Na Jaivali, who was receiving service from his attendants. Seeing Svetaikutu, the king said, ‘o youth.’ ‘Sire,’ he answered. (King) ‘Hast thou been instructed by thy father?’ (Svetaikutu) ‘I have.’ 2. (K.) ‘Dost thou know how these creatures, when departing, proceed in different directions?’ (S.) ‘No.’ (K.) ‘Dost thou know how they return to this world?’ (S.) ‘No.’ (K.) ‘Dost thou know how it is that the other world is not filled with those numerous beings who are thus constantly departing?’ (S.) ‘No.’ 3. (K.) ‘Dost thou know after the offering of what oblation the waters, acquiring human voices, rise and speak?’ (S.) ‘No.’ (K.) ‘Dost thou know the means of attaining the path which leads to the gods, or that which leads to the Pitris; by what act the one or the other is gained’? 4. And we have heard the words of the rishi: (R.V. x. 88, 15 = Vaj. S. 19, 47) “I have heard of two paths for mortals, one to the pitris, another to the gods. By these proceeds every moving thing that exists between the father and the mother (i.e. between Dyaus and Prithivī, heaven and earth).”’ ‘I know none of all these things,’ answered Svetaikutu. 5. The king then invited him to stay. The youth, however, did not accept this invitation, but hastened away, and came to his father, to whom he said, ‘Thou didst formerly declare me to be instructed.’ ‘How now (my) intelligent (son)?’ asked his father. ‘The Rajanya,’ replied the son, ‘asked me five questions, of which I know not even one.’ ‘What were the questions?’ ‘They were these,’ and he told him the initial words of each of them. 6. The father then said, ‘Be assured, my son, that I told thee all that I myself know. But come, let us proceed thither, and become (his) pupils.’ ‘Do thou thyself go,’ rejoined the son. 7. Gantama accordingly arrived (at the abode) of Pravaha Na Jaivali, who caused a seat to be brought, and water and the madhuparka mess to be

presented: 8. and said, 'We offer thee a boon, Gautama.' Gautama replied, 'Thou hast promised me this boon: explain to me the questions which thou hast proposed to the youth.' 9. The king replied, 'That is one of the divine boons; ask one of those that are human.' 10. Gautama rejoined, 'Thou knowest that I have received gold, cows, horses, female slaves, attendants, raiment; be not illiberal towards us in respect to that which is immense, infinite, boundless.' 'This, o Gautama,' said the king, 'thou rightly desirest.' 'I approach thee (as thy) disciple,' answered Gautama. The men of old used to approach (their teachers) with words (merely). He (accordingly) attended him by merely intimating his intention to do so.228 'Do not,' then said the king, 'attach any blame to me, as your ancestors (did not). This knowledge has never heretofore dwelt in any Brāhma; but I shall declare it to thee. For who should refuse thee when thou so speakest?'

Chhāndogya Upanishad, v. 3, 1. Śvetaketur ha Āruneyah Panchālānāṁ samitim eyāya | taṁ ha Pravāhaṇo Jāvalir uvācha "kumāra anu tvā 'sishat pitā" iti | "anu hi bhagavāḥ" iti | 2. "Vettha yad ito 'dhi prajāḥ prayanti" iti | "na bhagavāḥ" iti | "vettha yathā punar āvartante" iti | "na bhagavāḥ" iti | "vettha pathor deva-yānasya pitri-yānasya cha eyāvarttane" iti | "na bhagavāḥ" iti | 3. "Vettha yathā 'sau loko na sampūryyate" | "na bhagavāḥ" iti | "vettha yathā panchanyaṁ āhutav āpah purusha-vachaso bhavanti" iti | "naica bhagavāḥ" iti | 4. "Ataṁ nu kim annāṣiṣṭo 'vochathāḥ | yo hi imāni na vidyāt kathāṁ so 'nuṣiṣṭo bracita" iti | sa ha āyastah pitur ardham eyāya | taṁ ha uvācha "anamāṣiṣṭya vāva kila mā bhagavān abravid 'anu tvā 'śisham'" iti | 5. "Pancha mā rājanyakhandhūḥ praśnāṁ aprakṣhit teshāṁ na ekanchana asakaṁ vivaktum" iti | sa ha uvācha 'yathā mā tevaṁ tadā etān acudo yathā 'ham esāṁ na ekanchana veda yady aham imāṁ acēdāṣyaṁ kathaṁ te na avābhīṣat" iti | 6. Sa ha Gautamo rājno 'rddham eyāya | tasmaī ha praptāya arhāṁ chakāra | sa ha pṛthaka boḥgāḥ udeyāya | taṁ ha uvācha "mānushasya bhagavān Gautama vi-tasya varam erināthāḥ" iti | sa ha uvācha "tava eva rājan mānushaṁ vittam | yāṁ eva kumārasya ante vāchām abhāshathās tameva me brāhī" iti | 7. Sa ha krīchhrī babhūva | taṁ ha "chiraṁ vasa" ity ājnāpayān-

228 Or, "by merely intimating, not performing, the respectful mode of approach by touching his feet," according to the Commentator.
chakāra | taṁ ha uvācha "yathā mā tvam Gautama avado yathā iyam
na prāk tvatāḥ purā brāhmaṇān gachhati tasmād u sareeshu lokesu
kahattrusya eva praśāsanam abhūd" iti | tasmai ha uvācha |

"1. Svetaṅketu Āruṇeya came to the assembly of the Panchalas.
Pravāhaṇa Jaivali asked him, 'Young man, has thy father instructed
thee?' 'He has, sire,' replied Svetaṅketu. 2. 'Dost thou know,' asked
the king, 'whether living creatures proceed when they go hence?'
(S.) 'No, sire.' (King) 'Dost thou know how they return?' (S.) 'No,
sire.' (K.) 'Dost thou know the divergences of the two paths whereof
one leads to the gods, and the other to the pītris?' (S.) 'No, sire.'
3. (K.) 'Dost thou know how it is that the other world is not filled?'
(S.) 'No, sire.' (K.) 'Dost thou know how at the fifth oblation the
waters acquire human voices?' (S.) 'I do not, sire.' 4. (K.) 'And hast
thou then said "I have been instructed?" for how can he who does
not know these things allege that he has been so?' The young man,
mortified, went to his father, and said, 'Thou didst tell me, I have in-
structed thee, when thou hadst not done so. 5. That Rājanya proposed
to me five questions, of which I could not solve even one.' The father
replied, 'As thou didst then say to me regarding these five questions,
I know not one of them,—(so I ask thee whether) if I had known
them, I would not have told them to thee? 6. Gautama went to the
king, who received him with honour. In the morning, having received
his share (of attention), he presented himself before the king, who said
to him, 'Ask, o reverend Gautama, a present of human riches.' He
replied, 'To thee, o king, belongs wealth of that description. Declare
to me the questions which thou proposedst to the youth.' 7. The king
was perplexed and desired him to make a long stay: and said to him,
'As thou hast declared to me, o Gautama, that this knowledge has not
formerly reached the Brāhmans (who lived) before thee, it has there-
fore been among all peoples a discipline inculcated by the Kshattriya
class alone.' He then declared it to him."

Sect. XVI.—Story of King Viśvantara and the Syāpārṇa Brāhmans.

Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, vii. 27. Viśvantara ha Saushadamanāḥ Syāpārnān
parichakāhāno viśyāpārṇāṁ yajnam ājāhre | tad ha anubudhā Syāpārṇās
tam yajnam ājagmuḥ | te ha tad-antarvedy āsāṃchakri | tāṁ ha ērishīvā
uvācha “पापस्या वै इमो कर्माण्य कर्त्तरार्थ असाते अपृतायाः वाचो 

vaditāro यथं chhyāparṇāḥ imān utthāpayata imo me ’nitarvedim āsishata” iti | “tathā” iti tān utthāpayānchakruḥ | te ha utthāpyamanāḥ 

ruruviśe “ye tebhayo Bhūtavirbhyāḥ Āstamrigāḥ Kaśyopānāṁ somapitham abhijigvyah Pārīkahitasya Janaśeṣajayas āvīṣaṣaye yajne tais te 

tattāra viravantaḥ āsūḥ | kaḥ svit so’smāka asti viro yah imāṃ somapitham 

abhijeshyatī” iti | “ayam aham asmi yo virah” iti ha uvācha Rāmo Mārgaveyāḥ | Rāmo ha āsa Mārgaveyō ’nūchānāḥ Sīyāparṇāyaḥ | teshāṁ ha 

uttēśhṭatām uvācha “api nu rājann utthaṇvidaṃ veda utthāpayanti” iti | “yas tvem katham vettha brahmanabandho” iti | 28. “Yatrā Indraśī ēdevatāḥ paryavṛṣinjan Viśvarupāṃ Tvāśtram abhyamanāsta Vṛtttram aṣrito yatin salavirjebhyāḥ pradvād Arumagāhan avadvāt Bhīhaspateḥ 

pratvadvāt” iti | “tattāra Indraḥ somapithena vyārdhyata” | Indrasya 

anu vyṛiddhiṃ kṣhattram somapithena vyārdhyata | api Indraḥ somapithē 

’bhavat Teashtur āmushya somam | tad vyṛiddham eva adyāpi kṣhattraiṃ somapithena | sa yas tam bhakṣham vidyād yah kṣhattrasya somapithena vyṛiddhasya yena kṣhattraiṃ samṛiddhyate kathāṃ tām veda utthāpayanti” iti | “vettha brahmanā tvam tam bhakṣham” | “veda hi” iti | “taṃ vai 

no brahmanā brūhi” iti | “tasmai vai te rājann” iti ha uvācha | 29. 

Trayātām bhakṣhānām ekam āhārītyantī somāṁ vā dadhi vā apo vā | 

sa yadi somam brāhmaṇānāṁ sa bhakṣhāḥ | brāhmaṇāṁs tena bhakṣhaṇa 

jīvanīyasi | brāhmaṇa-kalpas te praṭayaṁ ājanīyate ādāyi āpāyā āvaśaya yathā-kāma-prayaoyaḥ | yadā vai kṣhattrīyāya pāpam bhavati 

brāhmaṇa-kalpośya praṭayaṁ ājayate īsvaro ha asmāda deśitya vā tritiya vā brāhmaṇatām abhyyapaitoh sa brahmaṇabandhaṇa jīyūsthataḥ | atha 

yadi dadhi vaisyānāṁ sa bhakṣhāḥ | vaisyāṁs tena bhakṣhaṇa jīvanīyasi | 

vaisya-kalpas te praṭayaṁ ājanīyate nyasya balī-kriḍ anyasya adyaya yathā-kāma-jyeyayaḥ | yadā vai kṣhattrīyāya pāpam bhavati vaisya-kalpośya 

praṭayaṁ ājayate īsvaro ha asmāda deśitya vā tritiya vā vaisyatām 

abhyyapaitoh sa vaisyatāya jīyūshitaḥ | atha yadi apah śūdraṇāṁ sa 

bhakṣhāḥ | śūdraṇāṁ tena bhakṣhaṇa jīvanīyasi | śūdra-kalpas te praṭayaṁ ājanīyate nyasya prēṣhyaḥ kāmottāpyaḥ yathākāma-vadhyaḥ | 

yadā vai kṣhattrīyāya pāpam bhavati śūdra-kalpośya praṭayaṁ ājayate īsvaro ha asmāda deśitya vā tritiya vā śūdratām abhyyapaitoh | sa śūdra- 

tāya jīyūshitaḥ | 30. Ete vai te trayo bhakṣhāḥ rājann” iti ha uvācha 

“yeshāṃ āsāṁ na iyāt kṣhattrīyo yajamānāḥ atha asya esha svay bha 

kṣhāḥ” ityādi |
"Viśvantara, the son of Sushadman, setting aside the Syāparṇas, was performing a sacrifice without their aid. Hearing of this the Syāparṇas came to the ceremony, and sat down within the sacrificial enclosure. Observing them, the king said, 'Remove these Syāparṇas, doers of evil deeds, and speakers of impure language, who have sat down within my sacrificial enclosure.' Saying, 'So be it,' they removed them. When they were being removed, they exclaimed, 'The Kaśyapas found champions in the Asitamrigas who conquered for them from the Bhūtavīras the soma-draught at the sacrifice which Janamejaya, the son of Parikshit, was performing without their (the Kaśyapas') aid. Who is the champion who will conquer for us this soma-draught?' 'I am your champion,' cried Rāma Mārgaveya. This Rāma was a learned man, belonging to the Syāparṇa race. When the Syāparṇas were moving away, he said, 'Do they, o king, remove from the sacrificial enclosure a man who possesses such knowledge [as I]?' 'How dost thou possess it, Brāhmaṇ?' asked the king. 28. (Rāma answered) "When the deities rejected Indra, who had killed Tvāṣṭra, prostrated Vṛittra, given over the Yatis to the wolves, slain the Arurmaghas, and contradicted Brähaspati, then he (Indra) forfeited the soma-draught. In consequence of his forfeiture, the Kṣhātra (Kshattriya) class lost it

229 Prof. Weber (Ind. St. i., 215) thinks the words "doers of evil deeds" appear to refer to some variety of ceremonial peculiar to the Syāparṇas, and the words "speakers of impure language" to a difference in their dialect; and he is inclined to derive the patronymic of Rāma, Mārgaveya, from the impure caste of Mārgavas mentioned in Manu, x. 34; by which supposition, he thinks, a ground would be discovered for the reproaches which Viśvantara addresses to the Syāparṇa family. In reference to the story of Janamejaya, alluded to in this passage, Weber remarks (Ind. Stud. i. 204): "The same work (the Aitareya Brahmaṇa, viii., 27) makes mention of a dispute which this king had with the sacerdotal family of the Bhūtavīras, a branch of the Kaśyapas; and which was adjusted by the intervention of the Asitamrigas, who belonged to the same race." A Syāparṇa is alluded to in S. P. Br. x., 4, 1, 10 (quoted by Prof. Weber, Ind. St. i., 215): Estd ha sma vai tad viśvam Syāparṇaḥ Sāyakṣaṇaḥ aha "yad vai me idam karmāṃ satyam manu eva prajā Sāvānām rājāno bhavān karmāṃ mama brāhmaṇāḥ mama vaisyāḥ yat tu me etat karmāṇaṃ samāpi tena me ubhayaṃ Sāvān prajām ētūkṣhaye ēti | "Knowing this Sāyakṣaṇa, the Syāparṇa, said, 'If this my rite had been completed, my offspring would have become the kings of the Salvas, mine their Brāhmins, mine their Vaiśyas. But as (only) so much of the rite has been completed, my offspring shall, in both respects, excel the Salvas.'" See also Ind. St. x. 18.

230 See Dr. Haug's note, p. 487, where he states why he cannot follow Sāyana in rendering abhyamāṇeṣta by "killed." Prof. Weber (Ind. St. ix. 326) defends Sāyana's interpretation.
also. (But Indra recovered a share in the soma-draught, having stolen Tvashtrī's soma.) Hence at present also the Kshattriyas are excluded from the soma-draught. Why do they remove from the sacrificial enclosure a man who knows that (other) draught which (properly belongs) to the Kshattriyas who are excluded from the soma-draught, and by which they are rendered prosperous? 'Dost thou, o Brāhmaṇa, know that draught?' asked the king. 'I know it,' answered Rāma. 'Declare it then to us,' rejoined the prince. 'I declare it to thee, o king, said the other. 29. 'Of the three draughts they shall bring one, either soma, or curds, or water. If he (the priest, bring) the soma, that is the draught of the Brāhmaṇs, and with it thou shalt satisfy the Brāhmaṇs. One like a Brāhmaṇ shall be born in thy line, a receiver of gifts, a drinker (of soma), a seeker of food, a rover at will.' Whenever the offence (of drinking the Brāhmaṇ's draught) is chargeable to a Kshattriya, one like a Brāhmaṇ is born in his line, who in the second or third generation from him has the power of becoming a Brāhmaṇ, and likes to live as a Brāhmaṇ. Next, if (the priest bring) curds, that is the Vaiśya's draught; with it thou shalt satisfy the Vaiśyas. One like a Vaiśya shall be born in thy line, one who is tributary to another, who is to be used (lit. eaten) by another, and who may be oppressed at will. Whenever the offence (of consuming the Vaiśya's portion) is chargeable to a Kshattriya, one like a Vaiśya is born in his line, who in the second or third generation from him has the power of becoming a Vaiśya, and is desirous of living as a Vaiśya. Next, if (the priest bring) water, that is the Sūdra's draught; with it thou shalt satisfy the Sūdras. One like a Sūdra shall be born in thy line, the servant of another, who may be expelled and slain at pleasure. When the offence (of drinking the Sūdra's draught) is chargeable against a Kshattriya, one like a Sūdra is born in his line, who in the second or third generation from him has the power of becoming a Sūdra, and desires to live like a Sūdra. 30. 'These, o king, are the three draughts, which the Kshattriya when sacrificing should not desire. His own proper draught is as follows: Let him squeeze the descending branches

231 Prof. Weber (Ind. Stud. ix. 326) would prefer to translate āvasayī (überall-)wohnend, "dwelling everywhere."

232 Dr. Haug translates "when there is any fault on the Kshattriya (who, when sacrificing, eats the Brāhmaṇa portion)," etc. See the beginning of par. 30 below.
of the nyagrodha (Indian fig) tree, with the fruits of the udumbara, the aśvattha, and the plaksha trees, and drink these juices. This is his own proper draught."

The continuation may be read in Dr. Haug’s translation, pp. 486 ff.

After the priest has given the king a deal of further information the result is told in par. 34, as follows:

_Tam evam etam bhaksham provācha Rāmo Mārgaveyo Viśvantarāya Saushadmanāya | tasmin ha uvācha prokte “sahasram u ha brāhmaṇa
_tubhyām dadmah | saśyāparṇaḥ u me yajnaḥ” iti |

“This draught did Rāma Mārgaveya declare to Viśvantara the son of Sushadman. When it had been declared the king said, ‘Brāhmaṇa, we give thee a thousand (cows): and my sacrifice (shall be performed) with (the aid of the) Śyāparṇa’s.‘”

Sect. XVII.—Story of Matanga who tried in vain to raise himself to the position of a Brāhmaṇa.

The legend of Matanga, which is narrated in the Anuśāsana-parvan of the Mahābhārata, verses 1872 ff., is introduced by a question which Yudhishṭhira addresses to Bhīshma, verse 1867: _Kshatriyo yadi vā vaiśyaḥ śudro vā rājasattama | brāhmaṇyam prāpnyād yena tad me vyākhyātum arhasi _ tapasā vā sumahātā karmanā vā śrutiṇa vā v brāhmaṇyaṁ atha ched ichhet tad me brūhi samāsataḥ | Bhīshmaṁ uvācha _ 1870. _Brāhmaṇyaṁ tāta dusśprāpyaṁ varṇaiḥ kṣatrādibhis tribhīṣ | paraṁ hi sarca-bhūtanāṁ sthānam etad Yudhishṭhira | bahviṣ tu sam- saran yonīr jāyamānāḥ punaḥ punaḥ | paryāye tāta kṣatiṁśchid brāhmaṇo nāma jāyate _ “Explain to me the means—whether it be intense austere-fervour, or ceremonies, or Vedic learning—whereby a Kṣatrāya, a Vaiśya, or a Śudra, if he desire it, can attain to the state of a Brāhmaṇa. Bhīshma replies (1870), The state of a Brāhmaṇa is hard to be acquired by men of the other three classes, the Kṣatrāyas, etc.; for this Brāhmaṇhood is the highest rank among all living creatures. It is only after passing through numerous wombs, and being born again and again, that such a man, in some revolution of being, becomes a Brāhmaṇa.” Bhīshma proceeds to illustrate this principle by the case of Matanga, who was apparently the son of a Brāhmaṇa, was distinguished for his good qualities, and was esteemed to be himself of the same class as his
father (verse 1873: deviśatēḥ kasyachit tāta tulya-varṇah sutas tv abhūt | Matango nāma nāmā vai sarvaḥ samudito guṇaḥ |) He was, however, discovered to be of spurious birth in the following manner: He happened to be sent somewhere by his father to perform sacrifice, and was travelling in a car drawn by asses. On his way he repeatedly pierced on its nose with the goad the colt which was conveying him along with its mother. Feeling for the wound thus inflicted on her offspring, the she-ass said: “Be not distressed, my son, it is a Chaṇḍāla who is on the car. There is nothing dreadful in a Brāhmaṇ; he is declared to be kindly, a teacher who instructs all creatures: how then can he suit any one? This man of wicked disposition shows no pity to a tender colt, and thereby indicates his origin; for it is birth which determines the character” (verse 1876. Ucācha mā sucaḥ putra chaṇḍālas tv adhitish-ṭhati | brāhmaṇa dārunāṁ nāsti maitro brāhmaṇa uchyate | āchāryaḥ sarva-bhūtānāṁ sāstā kim praharishyaṭi | ayaṁ tu pāpa-prakritir bālo na kurute dayāṁ | svayonim mānayaty eṣa bhavo bhāvaṁ niyachhati |). Overhearing this colloquy, Matanga instantly got down from the car and besought the she-ass, whom he honoured with the epithet of “most intelligent,” to tell him how she knew him to be a Chaṇḍāla and how his mother had been corrupted. The she-ass informs him that his mother when intoxicated had received the embrases of a low-born barber, and that he was the offspring of this connection and consequently no Brāhmaṇ (verse 1882. Brāhmaṇyaṁ vrishalena tvam mat-tāyāṁ nāpitena ha | jātas tvam asi chaṇḍālo brāhmaṇyaṁ tena te ṅastra |). On receiving this unwelcome revelation, Matanga returned home, and being questioned by his reputed father about the cause of his speedy reappearance, he told him what he had heard; and expressed his determination to enter on a course of austerities. He does so accordingly with such effect that he alarms the gods, and receives the offer of a boon from Indra. He asks for Brāhmaṇhood; but Indra tells him that he must perish if he continues to make that request, as the high position he seeks cannot be obtained by one born as a Chaṇḍāla (verse 1895). Matanga, however, continues his exercises for a hundred years, when Indra repeats his former determination, and supports it by reasons, explaining (1901 ff.) that a Chaṇḍāla can only become a Śūdra in a thousand births, a Śūdra a Vaiśya after a period thirty times as long, a Vaiśya a Rājanya after a period sixty times the length, a Rā-
janya a Brāhman after a period of sixty times the duration, and so on, a Brāhman only becoming a Kāṇḍapriṣṭha, a Kāṇḍapriṣṭha a Japa, a Japa a Srotriya, after immense intervals. Indra therefore advises Matanga to choose some other boon. But the devotee is still dissatisfied with the god’s decision, and renews his austerities for a thousand years. At the end of that period he receives still the same answer, and the same advice. But though distressed he did not yet despair; but proceeded to balance himself on his great toe; which, although reduced to skin and bone, he succeeded in doing for a hundred years without falling. At length, when he was on the point of tumbling, Indra ran up and supported him; but continued inexorably to refuse his request; and though further importuned, would only consent to give him the power of moving about like a bird, and changing his shape at will, and of being honoured and renowned (verses 1934 ff.).

The assertion here made of the impossibility of a Kshattriya becoming a Brāhman until he has passed through a long series of births is of course in flagrant contradiction with the stories of Viśvāmitra, Viśhāvyā, and others.

Matanga (or a Matanga) is mentioned in a passage already quoted in p. 411 as a rājaṇarshi who supported Viśvāmitra’s family and for whom that sage sacrificed. He is also named in the Sabhā-parvan, verse 340, as sitting in Yama’s assembly along with Agastya, Kāla, and Mrītyu, etc., etc.; in the Vana-parvan, 8079, as a great rishi (maharshi); and in the Sānti-parvan, 10875, as one of certain sages who had acquired their position by austerities (see above, p. 132). His disciples, he himself, and his forest are mentioned in the Rāmāyaṇa, iii. 73, 23, 29, 30.

Sect. XVIII.—Legend of the Brāhman Paraśūrāma, the exterminator of the Kshattriyas.

As Paraṇurāma belonged to the race of the Bhṛgus, it may be advisable to premise some particulars regarding that family.

In his Lexicon, s.v., Professor Roth tells us that the Bhṛgus were a class of mythical beings, who, according to the Nirukta, xi. 19, belonged to the middle or aereal class of gods (“mādhyamiko deva-gāṇaḥ” iti Nairuktāḥ). They were the discoverers of fire and brought it to men
(R.V. x. 46, 2, etc.) He adds, however, that this race has also a connection with history, as one of the chief Brahmanical families bears this name, and allusions are made to this fact even in the hymns of the Rig-veda (vii. 18, 6; viii. 3, 9, 16; viii. 6, 18; viii. 91, 4). Bhṛigu is also, as Prof. Roth observes, the name of a rishi representing a family, who is mentioned in Atharva-veda, v. 19, 1, as suffering injury at the hands of the Śrīṇjayas (see above, p. 286). As regards his birth, it is said in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, iii. 34, that first the Sun, and then Bhṛigu arose out of the seed which had issued from Prajāpāti, that Bhṛigu was adopted by Varuṇa, and was consequently called Vāruṇi, etc. (Tasya yad retasah prathamam udadipyata tad asāv ādityo 'bhavevat | yad devītyam āsīt tad Bhṛigar abhavet | tasmā Varuṇo nyagrīhṇīta | tasmāt sa Bhṛigur Vāruṇīḥ). He is accordingly called by this name in the S. P. Br. xi. 6, 1, 1, where he is said to have conceived himself to be superior in knowledge to his father Varuṇa (Bhṛigar ha vai Vāruṇir Varuṇam pitaram vidyayā 'timene); and also in the Taittirīya Upaniṣad (Bibl. Ind. p. 123: Bhṛigar vai Vāruṇir Varuṇaṁ pitaram upa-sasāra). The preceding story of Bhṛigu’s birth is developed and modified in the Anuśāsana-parvan of the Mahābhārata, verse 4104 ff.: Vasishṭha uvācha | api chedam purā Rāma śrutam me Brahma-darśanam | Pitāmahasya yad vṛttam Brahmaṇah paramātmanah | devasya mahatas tāta Vāruṇim bibhratas tanum | aśvaryaśe vāruṇe Rāma Rudrasyeśasya vai prabhoh | “Vasishṭha said, 4104: I have also heard, o Rāma (i.e. Paraśurāma), of this vision of Brahmā, of that which occurred regarding Pitāmaḥ, Brahma, the supreme spirit, the great god (i.e. Mahādeva), Rudra,Īśa, the lord, assuming the body of Varuṇa, and invested with the dominion of Varuṇa.” After this singular description of Mahādeva as identified with Brahmā, Brahma the supreme spirit, and Varuṇa, the speaker goes on to tell us that the munis, the gods headed by Agni, the embodied portions of the sacrifice, and the Vedas, etc., assembled on the occasion referred to, and then proceeds, verse 4112: Esā Brahmā S'ivo Rudro Varuṇo 'gmiḥ Prajā-patīḥ | kirttaye bhagavān decaḥ sarva-bhūta-patīḥ śivah | tasya yajno

233 See my article on “Manu, the progenitor of the Āryan Indians” in Journ. R. A. S. for 1863, p. 415 f.; and above, pp. 168 and 170.
234 The commencement of the story, of which this is part of the sequel, is given above, p. 107 f.
235 See Ind. Stud. ii. 231, and Journ. of the German Or. Soc. ix. 240.
Early contests between

Paśupates tapaḥ kratava eva cha | dikṣāḥ dipta-urtā devi disāḥ cha samagītasvarāḥ | deva-patnaḥ cha kanyāḥ cha devānāṁ chaiva mātaraḥ | ājagnuḥ sahitās tattra tadā Bhṛigu-kulodevha | 4115. Yajnam Paśu-pateḥ prītāḥ Varuṇasya mahātmanah | Sva-yamabhavaś tu tāḥ dhṛṣṭvā retaḥ samapadat bhūvi | tasya sukrasya visyanatām pāṁśūṃ sangrihya bhūmitaḥ | prāsyat Pūshā karābhyaṁ vai tasmin eva hūtāsane | tatas tasmin samaprajñataḥ sattrē jñalitā-pravaka | Brahmaṇo juhavās tattra prādurbhavā babhūve ha | skanna-mātraṁ cha tach chhukram śruveṇa parāgrīhya saḥ | ājya-vad mantraṁ chāpi so 'juhod Bhṛigu-nandana | tatas tu janayāmāsa bhūta-grāmaṁ cha viryavān | . . . . . . 4121. Sukre hute 'gnau tasmiṁs tu prādūrāsamś trayāḥ prabhō | purushō vavuṣāḥ yuktāḥ saivāḥ saivāḥ prasava-jair-guṇaiḥ | "bhṛigī" ity eva Bhṛigūḥ pūrvam angārebhyo 'ngirā 'bhavat | angāra-saṃśrayāḥ chaive Kavīr ity aparō 'bhavat | saha jñalābhīr utpanno Bhṛigus tasmād Bhṛigūḥ smṛitaḥ | . . . . . . 4140. "Varuṇaś chesvaro deva labhatāṁ kāmam ispitam" | nisargād Brahmaṇaḥ chāpi Varuṇaḥ yādasāmputiḥ | jagrāhā vai Bhṛigūḥ pūrvam apatyaṁ sūrya-varchasam | Īśvaro 'ngirasaṁ chāgnier apatyārtham akalpayat | Pīṭhamahas tv apatyaṁ vai Kavīr jagrāhā tattva-vit | tadā sa Vārunaḥ khyāto Bhṛigūḥ prasava-karma-kriti | Āneyas tv Angrīrāḥ śrīmān Kavīr Brāhma mahāyaśāḥ | Bhārgavāngirasau lokṣa loka-santāna-lakśhaṇau | ete hi prasavāḥ sarve prajānām patayām trayāḥ | sarvaṃ santānaṃ eteshām idam ity upadhāraya | Bhṛigos tv puttraḥ saṃvaśān sarve tulyāḥ Bhṛigor gunaiḥ | Chyavano Vajraśirshaḥ cha Sūchir Aurgas tathaiva cha | Sukro Vaṃényas cha Vībhūḥ Savanaḥ cheti sapta te | Bhārgavāḥ Vārunaḥ sarve yeshāṃ vaṁśo bhavān api | "4112. This adorable and gracious god, lord of all creatures, is known as Brahmā, Siva, Rudra, Varuṇa, Agni, Prajāpati. This Paśupati (had) a sacrifice.225 Austere-fervour, Oblations, Consecration, (Dikṣā) that goddess with brilliant rites, the Points of the compass, their regents, the wives, daughters and mothers of the gods came all together with joy (4115) to this sacrifice of Paśupati the great Varuṇa. When Sva- yambhū (Brahmā) saw these goddesses his seed fell to the ground. Pūshan in consequence collected the particles of dust which were thus moistened, and threw them into the fire. When the sacrifice with its blazing fires had begun, there was seen an apparition of Brahmā offering an Oblation. Collecting with the sacrificial ladle that which had fallen,

225 Such seems to be the construction of this line.
he cast it, like butter, with sacred texts, into the fire. And thence the powerful god generated all beings. . . . 4121. When the seed had been cast into the fire, there arose three men endowed with bodies, and with their own respective qualities derived from their generation. Bṛigu sprang first from bhrīk (the blazing of the fire), Angiras from the cinders, and Kavi²²⁷ from a heap of cinders. Bṛigu was so named because he was produced together with flames.” The god, called Mahādeva, Varuṇa, and Pavaṇa, claimed these three men as his own, and the fruit of his sacrifice (verse 4133 f.). Agni and Brahmā also claimed them (4135 f.). The other gods, however, entreated Brahmā to accede to the wishes of Agni and Varuṇa: “4140. ‘And let Varuṇa, the lord, the god, also receive the object of his desire.’ By the gift of Brahmā, Varuṇa, lord of sea-monsters, first received for his offspring Bṛigu brilliant as the sun. And Īśvara (Mahādeva) appointed Angiras to be Agni’s son. And Pitāmaha, who knows the reality of things took Kavi as his offspring. Then Bṛigu, the progenitor of creatures, was named the son of Varuṇa, Angiras the son of Agni, and the glorious Kavi the son of Brahmā. The Bṛāgava and the Āngirasa are distinguished in the world as the propagators of mankind. For all these three lords of creatures were propagators. Know the whole of this world to be their offspring. Bṛigu had seven sons, all equal to their father in good qualities, Chayavana, Vajraśirsha, Suchi, Auruva, Sukra, Vareṇya, Vibhu, and Savana. These were all Bṛāgavas, and Vāruṇas, to whose race you (Paraśurāma) yourself also belong.”

In another passage of the M. Bh. Ādip. 869, it is similarly said: Bṛigur maharṣir bhagavāṇ Brahmanā vai Sevayambhūvā | Varuṇasya kṛṇau jātaḥ pāvakād iti naḥ śrutam | “We have heard that the great and venerable rishi Bṛigu was produced by Brahmā from fire at the sacrifice of Varuṇa.”

The Nirukta, iii. 17, has the following etymology of Bṛigu: Archi-shi Bṛiguḥ sambabhūva | Bṛiguḥ bhṛjjyamāno na dehe | “Bṛigu was produced in the flame; though roasted, he was not consumed.”

The Taitt. Br. i. 8, 2, 5, has a different account: Indrasya suṣhva-ṇasya tṛdha indryām viṛyyam parāpatat | Bṛiguḥ tritīyam abhavat |

²²⁷ In the M. Bh. Ādip. v. 2606, Kavi is said to be Bṛigu’s son (Bṛigoh puttraḥ Kavir āveśaṁ S’ukraḥ). On the other hand he, or another person of the same name, is said in the Anuśāsana-p. 4150, to be, along with Kavi, a son of Kavi.
"While Indra was continuing to pour out Soma, his manly vigour fell in three portions. The third became Bhṛgu."

Bhṛgu is declared in the Viṣṇu P. (see above, p. 65) to have been one of the nine Brahmās, mental sons of Brahmā. The Bhāg. P. iii. 12, 23, says he sprang from the skin of the creator (Bhṛgus tu techā). The M. Bh. Ādip. 2605, on the contrary declares: Brahmano hridayam bhītvā niserito bhagavān Bhṛgūḥ | "The venerable Bhṛgu, having split Brahmā's heart, issued forth" (Weber, Ind. St. ii. 231). So, too, the Vāyu P. i. 9, 100: Bhṛgus tu hridayajyajne rishiḥ Salilajanmanah | "Bhṛgu was produced from the heart of the Water-born (Brahmā);" and adds, verse 103: Ity ete mānasāḥ putrāḥ vijnayāḥ Brahmanah sutaḥ | Bhṛgus-ādyas tu ye srishtāḥ naveite brahma-rādinaḥ | 104. Grihamedhīnāḥ puruṇas dharmas tait prāk pravarttitaḥ | "These were the mind-born sons of Brahmā. Bhṛgu, and the others, nine in all, who were created, were declaimers of sacred knowledge and ancient householders; by them was duty of old established." Manu mentions Bhṛgu (i. 35, see above, p. 36) as one of his own ten sons. He also speaks of him (i. 59, 60, above, p. 38) as commissioned by himself (Manu) to promulgate his code. In Manu, v. 1. however, the sage is said to have sprung from fire (idam uchur mahātmānam anala-prabhavam Bhṛgum). As, however, he had been previously declared to be one of Manu's ten sons, and is so called also in the third verse of book v. and the second of book vii., where he is styled Mānava Bhṛgūḥ, Kullūka thinks it necessary to explain this other alleged descent from fire by saying that that had been the sage's origin in a previous mundane era (Kalpa): Yadyapi prathamādyaya daśa-prajāpati-madhya "Bhṛgūḥ Nāradam eva cha" iti Bhṛgus-srishtir api Manutaḥ eva uktā tathāpi kalpa-bhedena agni-prabhavatvam uchyate | tathā cha śrutiḥ "tasya yad retasaḥ prathamaṁ dedipyate tad asāv adityo 'bhavat | yad devitiyam ādhi Bhṛgur" iti | ataḥ eva bhrashtād retasaḥ utpannatvād Bhṛgūḥ | "Though the creation of Bhṛgu, as one of the ten Prājāpātis, is declared, in the 35th verse of the first book, to have proceeded from Manu, still he is here said to have been produced from fire, from the difference in the manner of his birth in the different Kalpas. And so the Veda says (in the passage quoted above from the Ait. Br.). Hence he is called Bhṛgu, because he sprang from the seed which fell (bhrashtāt)."228

228 See Prof. Wilson's note, Viṣṇu Purāṇa, vol. i. p. 100 ff., in the course of
THE BRAHMANS AND KSHATRIYAS.

Professor Roth (Lit. and History of the Veda, p. 135) says: "The Bhrigus are one of the most important Vedic families, to which Jamadagni, Chyavana, Aurva, Apnavana, and other rishis are assigned. Many conjectures might be formed in connection with the part which these several Bhrigus play in the later legends; but it seems to me unsafe to draw any conclusions till we are in possession of the intermediate links, and especially till we have learnt more precisely from the Vedic hymns themselves the relations of these families to each other. Nevertheless I will remark that Sunahsepha, the adopted son of Visvamitra, is, according to the Puranas, a Bhrigu; and consequently the Bhrigus appear in intimate connection with the enemy of Vasishtha; and further, that Sagara, who was reared by the Bhrigu Aurva, is restrained by Vasishtha in his war of extermination against the Sakas and other barbarous tribes. His enemies, when hard pressed, had resorted to Vasishtha as an intercessor." (See above, p. 337, and Wilson’s Vishnu Purana, vol. iii. p. 291.)

The story of Parasurama and the Kshattriyas is briefly mentioned in the second section of the Adiparvan of the Mahabharata (verses 272–280), where the events referred to are said to have occurred in the interval between the Treta and Dwapara ages (Tretā-dvāparayoh sandhau Rāmaḥ śastra-bhiritāṁ varah | asakrit pārthivaṁ kshattram jāgānāmar- sha-choditaḥ | sa sarvaṁ kshatrāṇaṁ utsādyā sva-vyāpyenañala-dyutih). The history is more fully told in other parts of the Mahabharata. In the 178th–180th sections of the Adiparvan there is a legend in which no mention is made of Parasurama, or the slaughter of the Kshattriyas; but in which we have the following particulars: Parāśara was son of Saktri, and grandson of Vasishtha, as we have seen above, p. 417. When he heard of the way in which his father had met his death, he determined to execute a general slaughter of all creatures (v. 6800); but his grandfather restrained him by narrating the history of the

which he says, "The Vāyu has also another account of their (the Prajāpatis) origin, and states them to have sprung from the fires of a sacrifice offered by Brahmā; an allegorical mode of expressing their probable original—considering them to be in some degree real persons—from the Brahmanical ritual, of which they were the first institutions and observers."

Reference is made in the commencement of the Vishnu Purana to the same circumstance (Wilson’s Vishnu Purāṇa, vol. i. pp. 7 ff.) Parāśara is the narrator of the Vishnu Purana (ibid. p. 11).
Bṛgus and Kshattriyas, as follows: There was a king named Kṛita-viryya, by whose liberality the Bṛgus, learned in the Vedas, who officiated as his priests, had been greatly enriched with corn and money (verse 6802. Yañyo veda-vidām loke Bṛgūnam pārthivara-śbhaḥ | sa tān agra-bhujas tāta dāhṇyena cha dhanena cha | somānte tar-payāmśa vipulena viśāmpate |). After he had gone to heaven, his descendants were in want of money, and came to beg for a supply from the Bṛgus, of whose wealth they were aware. Some of the latter hid their money under ground, others bestowed it on Brāhmans, being afraid of the Kshattriyas, while others again gave these last what they wanted. It happened, however, that a Kshattriya, while digging the ground, discovered some money buried in the house of a Bṛgus. The Kshattriyas then assembled and saw this treasure, and, being incensed, slew in consequence all the Bṛgus, whom they regarded with contempt, down to the children in the womb (verse 6809. Atramanya tatāh krodhad Bṛgūnas tān saranāgataṁ | nijaghnuḥ paramesvarāh sarvāṁś tān niṣitaiḥ saraiḥ | ā-garbhad avakṛntantaṁ cheruḥ sarvāṁ casundhara-ṛām |). The widows, however, fled to the Himālāya mountains. One of them concealed her unborn child in her thigh. The Kshattriyas, hearing of its existence from a Brāhmaṇī informant, sought to kill it; but it issued forth from its mother’s thigh with lustre, and blinded the persecutors. After wandering about bewildered among the mountains for a time, they humbly supplicated the mother of the child for the restoration of their sight; but she referred them to her wonderful infant Aurva into whom the whole Veda, with its six Vedāngas, had entered (verse 6823. Shad-angaḥ chākhiło vedaḥ imaṁ garbhasṭham eva ha | viveśa Bṛgū-vaṁśasya bhūyaḥ priya-chikīrṣhayaḥ |), as the person who (in retaliation of the slaughter of his relatives) had robbed them of their eyesight, and who alone could restore it. They accordingly had recourse to him, and their eyesight was restored. Aurva, however, meditated the destruction of all living creatures, in revenge for the slaughter of the Bṛgus, and entered on a course of austerities which alarmed both gods, asuras, and men; but his progenitors (Pitrīs) themselves appeared, and sought to turn him from his purpose by saying that they had no desire to be revenged on the Kshattriyas: 6834. Nā-niśair hi tadda tata Bṛgūkhīr bāvītāmabhīḥ | badho hy upekṣhitāḥ sarvaiḥ kṣhattriyānāṁ viḥīṃsatām | āyushā vipraṇirṣṭena yadā nāḥ
kheda āvīśāt | tadā 'smābhīr badhas tāta kṣhattrīyair īpsitaḥ svayam | nikhātaṁ yach cha vai vittaṁ kenachid Bhṛigu-veśmanī | vairāyaiva tadā nyastaṁ kṣhattrīyān kopayishubhīḥ | kiṁ hi vittaṇa naḥ kāryaṁ svarg-geppunāṁ deviottama | . . . . 6841. Mā badhīḥ kṣhattrīyāṁs tāta na lokān sapta patraka | dūshayantāṁ tapas-tejaḥ krodam utpatitaṁ jahi | "6834. It was not from weakness that the devout Bhṛigus overlooked the massacre perpetrated by the murderous Kṣhattrīyas. When we became distressed by old age, we ourselves desired to be slaughtered by them. The money which was buried by some one in a Bhṛigu's house was placed there for the purpose of exciting hatred, by those who wished to provoke the Kṣhattrīyas. For what had we, who were desiring heaven, to do with money?" They add that they hit upon this device because they did not wish to be guilty of suicide, and concluded by calling upon Āruva to restrain his wrath; and abstain from the sin he was meditating, verse 6841: "Destroy not the Kṣhattrīyas, o son, nor the seven worlds. Suppress thy kindled anger which nullifies the power of austere-fervour." Āruva, however, replies that he cannot allow his threat to remain unexecuted. His anger, unless wreaked upon some other object, will, he says, consume himself. And he argues on grounds of justice, expediency, and duty, against the clemency which his progenitors recommend. He is, however, persuaded by the Pitṛis to throw the fire of his anger into the sea, where they say it will find exercise in assailing the watery element, and in this way his threat will be fulfilled. "It accordingly became the great Hayaśiras, known to those who are acquainted with the Veda, which vomits forth that fire and drinks up the waters" (Mahād Hayaśiro bhūteva yat tad vedas tivo viduḥ | tam agnim udgirād vaktrāt pibaty āpo mahodadhau). It is worthy of remark that in a legend, one object of which, at least, would seem to be to hold up to abhorrence the impiety of the Kṣhattrīyas in oppressing the Brāhmans, we should thus find a palliation of the conduct of the oppressors, coming from the other world. But here the principle of the nothingness of mundane existence asserts itself; and the final superiority of the Brāhmans is vindicated, while their magnanimity is exemplified.

The next version of this legend, which I shall quote, is that given in the 115th–117th sections of the Vanaparvan. Arjuna, son of Kṛīta-vīrya, and king of the Haihāyas, had, we are told, a thousand arms.
He obtained from Dattātreya an aërial car of gold, the march of which was irresistible. He thus trod down gods, Yākshas, rishis, and oppressed all creatures (10137. Aeyāhata-gatiḥ caiça rathas tasya mahatmanah | rathena tena tu tadā vara-dānena viryyavān | mamardda devān yakshānūs cha rishīnūs caiça samantataḥ | bhūtānūs caiça sa sarvānūs tu piḍayāmāsā sarvataḥ ). The gods and rishis applied to Vishnu, and he along with Indra, who had been insulted by Arjuna, devised the means of destroying the latter. At this time, the story goes on, there lived a king of Kanyakubja, called Gādhi, who had a daughter named Satyavatī. The marriage of this princess to the rishi Rīchika, and the birth of Jamadagni, are then told in nearly the same way as above narrated in page 350. Jamadagni and Satyavatī had five sons, the youngest of whom was the redoubtable Paraśurāma. By his father’s command he kills his mother (who, by the indulgence of impure desire, had fallen from her previous sanctity), after the four elder sons had refused this matricidal office, and had in consequence been deprived of reason by their father’s curse. At Paraśurama’s desire, however, his mother is restored by his father to life, and his brothers to reason; and he himself is absolved from all the guilt of murder; and obtains the boon of invincibility and long life from his father. His history now begins to be connected with that of king Arjuna (or Kārtavīrya). The latter had come to Jamadagni’s hermitage, and had been respectfully received by his wife; but he had requisite this honour by carrying away by force the calf of the sage’s sacrificial cow, and breaking down his lofty trees. On being informed of this violence, Paraśurāma was filled with indignation, attacked Arjuna, cut off his thousand arms, and slew him. Arjuna’s sons, in return, slew the peaceful sage Jamadagni, in the absence of Paraśurāma. The narrative thus proceeds:

10201. Dadāha pitaraṁ chānau Rāmaḥ para-puranjayah | pratijāneya badham chāpi sava-kaḥtrassya Bhārata | sa krudhoh tibalah sankhyo sastraṁ ādāya viryavān | jaghniyaṁ Kārtavīryaṣya sutāṁ eko nakti-OPAMAH | Teshāṁ chānugataṁ ye cha kṣattriyaṁ kṣattriyarshabha | tāṁ cha savaṁ avāniridhnād Rāmaḥ praharatam varaṁ | trissaptakriteva prithiyen kritesa niḥkṣattriyam prabhuḥ | samantapanchake pancha chakāra raudhirān hrddan | 10205. Sa teshu tarpayamāsa Bhṛgūn Bhṛgūn-kulaivekāhaṁ | sākṣhād dadarśa charchikaiṁ sa cha Rāmaṁ
nyaveďayat | tato yajñena mahātā Jāmadagnyah pratāpavān | tarpayā-
māsa devendram rītvighyāh pradadau mahīm | vediṁ chāpy addadāi hai-
mīm Kaśyapaśa mahātmāne | daśa-vyāmāyatāṁ kṛitvā navotsedhāṁ
viśāmpate | tāṁ Kaśyapasyānumater brāhmanāḥ khaṇḍāsas tadā | vya-
bhajāṁs te tadā rājan prakhyātāḥ Khaṇḍāvāyanaḥ | sa pradāya mahīm
tasmāi Kaśyapāya mahātmāne | asmin mahendre sāilendre vasyati amit-
vikramāḥ | evaṁ vairam abhūt tasya kṣhattriyair loka-vāsibhiḥ | prthivi
chāpi vijitā Rāmenāmita-tejasā |

"Rāma, after performing, on his return, his father’s funeral
obsequies, vowed to destroy the whole Kṣhattriya race; and executed
his threat by killing first Arjuna’s sons and their followers. Twenty-
one times did he sweep away all the Kṣhattriyas from the earth, and
formed five lakes of blood in Samantapanchaka; (10,205) in which he
satiated the manes of the Bṛgīgus, and beheld face to face (his grand-
father) Rīchīka, who addressed himself to Rāma. The latter gratified
Indra by offering to him a grand sacrifice, and gave the earth to the
officiating priests. He bestowed also a golden altar, ten fathoms long
and nine high, on the mighty Kaśyapa. This, by his permission, the
Brāhmans divided among themselves, deriving hence the name of
Khaṇḍāvāyana. Having given away the earth to Kaśyapa, Paraśu-
rāma himself dwells on the mountain Mahendra. Thus did enmity
arise between him and the Kṣhattriyas, and thus was the earth con-
quered by Rāma of boundless might."

The means by which the Kṣhattriya race was restored are described
in the following passage from the Ādiparvan, verses 2459 ff. :

Trissapta-kṛiteva prithiviṁ kṛiteva niṅkṣhattriyāṁ purā | Jāmadag-
yas tapas tope Mahendre parvatottama | 2460. Tadā niṅkṣhattriyā
de loke Bhārgaveṇa kṛite satī | brāhmaṇāṅ kṣhattriyāḥ rājan sutarśhinyo
'bhisakramuḥ | tābhīṁ saha samāpetur brāhmaṇāṅ samsīta-vratāḥ | pitāv
pitau nara-vyāghra na kāmād nāṁrītau tathā | tebyaḥ ca lebhīre garb-
haṁ kṣhattriyāṁ tathā sahasraśaḥ | tataḥ sushuvire rājan kṣhattriyāṁ
vīryavattarāṁ | kumāraṁ ca kumāriṁ ca punaḥ kṣhattrābhīvṛd-
dhyaye | evaṁ tad brāhmaṇaṁ khaṭtrām kṣhattriyāṁu tapasvībhiḥ |
jataṁ vṛiddhaṁ ca dharmena sudirghanāyushā nvitām | chatvāro ’pi tato
caryāḥ babhūcav brāhmaṇottarāḥ |

"2459. Having one and twenty times swept away all the Kṣhattri-
yas from the earth, the son of Jāmadagni engaged in austerities on
Mahendra the most excellent of mountains. 2460. After he had cleared the world of Kshattriyas, their widows came to the Brāhmans, praying for offspring. The religious Brāhmans, free from any impulse of lust, cohabited at the proper seasons with these women, who in consequence became pregnant, and brought forth valiant Kshattriya boys and girls, to continue the Kshattriya stock. Thus was the Kshattriya race virtuously begotten by Brāhmans on Kshattriya women, and became multiplied and long-lived. Thence there arose four castes inferior to the Brāhmans."

This restoration of the Kshattriyas and their rule is said to have been followed by a state of great virtue, happiness, and prosperity. As one exemplification of the religious perfection which prevailed, it is said that "the Brāhmans did not sell their sacred lore, nor recite the Vedas in the vicinity of Śudras" (verse 2474. Na cha vikrīṇate brahma brāhuṇāś cha tadā nrīpa | na cha śādra-samābhyaśe vedaṁ uchchāraṇy uta |).

Another version of this legend is given in the Sāntiparvan, section 49. The birth of Jamadagni as the son of Rīchika and Satyavatī is related very much as in the Vīṣṇu Purāṇa (see above, p. 349 f.); but Rīchika tells his wife that the whole of her father’s race shall become Brāhmaṇical (verse 1741. Brahma-bhūtaṁ hi sakalam pitus tava kulam bhavet); and of Vīśvāmitra, the son of Gādhi, we are told that he “had the character of a Brāhman, and was possessed of all Brahmanical qualities” (1745. Vīśvāmitraṁ cha dāyādaṁ Gādhiṁ Kuśika-nandanaḥ | yam prāpa brahma-samitaṁ viśvair brahma-guṇair yutam |). Jamadagni was father of the dreadful Paraśurāma, "who became perfect in science, thoroughly versed in archery, and the slayer of the Kshattriyas, himself violent as flaming fire. By propitiating Mahādeva he obtained, among other weapons, the irresistible axe (parāśu)” (1747. Sarva-vidyānta-gaṁ brāhuṇāḥ dhanur-vedasya pāragam | Rāmaṁ kshattriya-hantaram pra-diṭtam ievā pāvekam | toshayiteva Mahādevam parvate Gandhamādane | astraṁ varayāmāsa paraśuṁ cātitejasam |), from which his name is derived. Arjuna, son of Kṛitavirya, king of the Haihayas, is here also represented as having a thousand arms, but in opposition to the previous account he is described as a "dutiful and religious monarch, who at an āśvamedha (horse-sacrifice) bestowed on the Brāhmans the earth with its seven continents and mountains, which he had conquered by his
arms and weapons." (verse 1751. Chakravarttī mahātejā viprāṇām āśva-
medhike | dadāu sa prithivīm sāravān saptadīvām sa-parvātām | vaa-
bāhe-astra-balenājau jītvā parama-dharma-vit |). He had, however, at
the solicitation of Agni permitted that voracious deity to consume his
towns, villages, forests, etc.; and as the hermitage of Āpava (Vaśisṛtha)
had been destroyed in the conflagration, Arjuna was doomed by the
sage’s curse to have his arms cut off by Paṛāṣurāma. The story proceeds:
Verse 1769. Arjunas tu mahātejā balī nityaṁ samātmekah | brah-
manyas ca šaranyas dātā śrāvaś ca Bhārata | 1760. Nāchintayat tada
śāpoṁ tena dattam mahātmanā | tasya putrās tu balināḥ sāpēnasur
pitur bāhe | nimittād avaliptaḥ vai nṛśamsāḥ chaiva sarvadā | Jami-
dagni-dhenvēs te vatsam ānūny Bharatarśabha | ajñataṁ Kārtta-
vīryena Haihayendreṇa dhīmatā | tannimittam abhūd yuddhaṁ Jaimadagner
mahātmanāḥ | tato 'ṛjunasya bāhuṁś tāṁ chhittēva Rāma rūhā 'nvitaḥ |

1766. Tataḥ pitṛ-badhmārshaḥ Rāmaḥ parama-manyumān | niṁkshattriyaṁ pratiśrutaḥ mahīṁ śastram agriṁata | tataḥ sa Bhṛgupa-
śārdūlaḥ Kārttavīryasya viragyān | vikramya vijaghaṇāsū puṭrān paut-
trūmāḥ ca sarvasāḥ | sa Haihayya-sahasrāṇī hatvā parama-manyumān | cha-
kāra Bhāṛgavo rājan mahīṁ śoṁita-kardanān | sa tathā 'su mahātejāh
kṛteva niṁkshattriyaṁ mahīṁ | 1770. Kṛṣṇayā parayā" vishto vanam eva
jagāma ha | tato varsha-sahasresu samatttesu keshuchit | kshepaṁ sam-
prāptavāṁs tattva prakṛityā kopanāḥ prabhūḥ | Viśvāmitrasya pauttras
tu Raibhya-puttro mahātapāḥ | Parāvasur mahārāja kshiptāh (kshiptvā
"ha ?) jana-saṁsādī | "ye te Yayaṁ-patane yajne santāḥ samagataḥ | Prat-
tardana-prabhṛtayo Rāma kiṁ kshattriyaṁ na te | mithyā-pratijno Rāma
tvaṁ katthase jana-saṁsādī | bhayāt kshattriya-vīraṁ parvataṁ samu-
pāśritaḥ | sa punaḥ kshattriya-śataḥ prithivī sarvataṁ śṛitā" | 1775.
Parāvasor vachāḥ śrutvaḥ sastraṁ jagrāha Bhāṛgavaḥ | tato ye Kshat-
triyāḥ rājan sataśas tena varjjitāḥ | te vi śriddhāḥ mahāvīryāḥ prithvī-
patayo 'bhavan | sa punas tāṁ jaghānaśu bālān api narādhipa | garbha-
sthais tu mahī vyāptā punar evābhavat tadā | jātaṁ jātaṁ sa garbhāṁ tu
punar eva jaghāna ha | arakshaṁ tu sūtaṁ kāṁśhit tadā kshattriya-
yosithaḥ | triṣaṅkta-kṛtevaḥ prithicīm kṛteva niṁkshattriyaṁ prabhūḥ |
dakṣināṁ avamadhānte Kāsyapāyaadāt tadā | sa kshattriyaṁ āṁ śeṣhārthaṁ karṇodāsiya Kāsyapāḥ | 1780. Sruṣ-praghrahaṇaṁ rājāṁ
tato vākyam athābravita | "gacchha tiraṁ samudrasya dakṣināsyā
mahāmune | na te mad-viśhaye Rāma vaśtavāya iha karhīchit" | tataḥ
Sūrpārakaṁ desaṁ sūgaras tasya nirmane | sahasā Jāmadagnyasya so
parānta-mahātalam | Kasyapas tām mahārāja pratigrihya vasundhārām |
krītā brāhmaṇa-saṁsthāṁ vai pravīśhāḥ samahāvanam | tataḥ śūḍrāṁ
echa vaisyaḥ cha yathā-swaira-pracārīṇaḥ | avarttanta dvijāyānaṁ
dāresha Bharatarshabhā | arūjake jīva-loke durvalaḥ balavattraivaḥ |
1785. Pidyante na hi vitteṣhū prabhutvaṁ kasyachit tādā | tataḥ kālena
prithivi pitṛyamāṇā durātmabhiḥ | viparyayena tenāsu pravīṣeṣa rasāta-
lam | arakshyamāṇā vidhivat kshattriyaṁ dharmā-rakṣhibhiḥ | tāṁ
drishtā ca dravatīṁ tattaṁ saṃtrāṣaṁ sa mahāmanāḥ | uruṇā dhārayāmāna
Kasyapaḥ prithiviṁ tataḥ | dhṛtā tenorūṇa yena tenorviti mahī smṛtiṁ |
arakṣanārtheṁ samuddhiyā yayoche prithiviṁ tādā | prasādaṁ Kasyaṁ
devi varayāmānā bhumipam | prithiviye vācha | 1790. “Santi brahmaṁ
mayā guptā strīshu kshattra-pungavāḥ | Haihayānāṁ kule jātāṁ te
saṁrakshantu māṁ mune | asti Paurava-dāyādā Vidāratha-stuṁh prabhō |
rikṣhāṁ saṁvardhīto vipra rikṣhavaty atha pareto | tathā 'nukampā-
māṇena yajcanā 'py amitaujasā | Parāsareṇa dāyādāḥ Saudaśasya-
bhirakshitaḥ | sarva-karmāṇi kurute śudra-vastra tasya sa devaḥ | Sarva-
karmety abhikhyātaḥ sa māṁ rakshatu pārthivāḥ | ... 1799. Ete
kshattra-dāyādās tattāt tattā pariśritāḥ | dyokāra-ême-kāraṇī-jātiṁ
nityaṁ samāśritāḥ | 1800. Yadī māṁ abhirakshanti tada sthāyāmi
niśchalā | eteshāṁ pitaraś chaiva tathaiva cha pitāmaḥḥ | mad-arthaṁ
niḥsataḥ yuddhe Rāmaṅkalisha-karmāṇaḥ | teshāṁ apachitaṁ chaiva mayā
kāryāḥ mahāmune | na hy ahaṁ kāmaye nityāṁ atikrāntena rakṣhaṁ |
varttāmaneṇa vartteyaṁ tat kshipraṁ saṁvidhiyatāṁ” | tataḥ prithīyeṁ
nirāśṣhāṁ tāṁ samāṇya Kasyapaḥ | abhyashinchad mahipālān kshat-
trīyāṁ virya-sammatāṁ |

“Being of a meek, pious, kind, and charitable turn of mind, the
aviant Arjuna thought nothing of the curse; but his sons, who were
of an arrogant and barbarous disposition, became the cause of its
resulting in his death. Without their father’s knowledge they took
away Jāmadagni’s calf; and in consequence Paraśurāma attacked
Arjuna and cut off his arms.” His sons retaliated by killing Jāma-
dagni. 1766. Paraśurāma incensed at the slaughter of his father,
vowing in consequence to sweep away all Kshattraivas from
the earth, seized his weapons; and slaying all the sons and grandsons
of Arjuna, with thousands of the Haihayas, he turned the earth into a
mass of ensanguined mud. 1770. Having thus cleared the earth of
Kshattriyas, he became penetrated by deep compassion and retired to the forest. After some thousands of years had elapsed, the hero, naturally irascible, was taunted by Parāvasu, the son of Raibhya and grandson of Viśvāmitra, in a public assembly in these words:

'Are not these virtuous men, Pratardana and the others, who are assembled at the sacrifice in the city of Yayāti,—are they not Kshattriyas? Thou hast failed to execute thy threat, and vainly boastest in the assembly. Thou hast withdrawn to the mountain from fear of those valiant Kshattriyas, while the earth has again become overrun by hundreds of their race.' Hearing these words, Rāma seized his weapons. The hundreds of Kshattriyas who had before been spared had now grown powerful kings. These, however, Paraśurāma now slew with their children, and all the numerous infants then unborn as they came into the world. Some, however, were preserved by their mothers. Having twenty-one times cleared the earth of Kshattriyas, Rāma gave her as a sacrificial fee to Kaśyapa at the conclusion of an aśvamedha. 1780. Making a signal with his hand, in which he held the sacrificial ladle, Kaśyapa, in order that the remaining Kshattriyas should be spared, said to Paraśurāma, 'Go, great muni, to the shore of the southern ocean. Thou must not dwell in my territory.' Sāgara (the ocean) created for him a country called Sūrpāraka on the remotest verge of the earth. Having received dominion over the earth, Kaśyapa made it an abode of Brāhmans, and himself withdrew to the forest. Śūdras and Vaiśyas then began to act lawlessly towards the wives of the Brāhmans; and, in consequence of there being no government, the weak (1785) were oppressed by the strong, and no one was master of any property. The Earth, being distressed by the wicked, in consequence of that disorder, and unprotected according to rule by the Kshattriyas, the guardians of justice, descended to the lower regions. Perceiving her moving from place to place in terror, Kaśyapa upheld her with his thigh (āru). From this circumstance she derives her name of ureī. The goddess Earth then propitiated Kaśyapa, and supplicated him for protection, and for a king. 'I have,' she said, 'preserved among females many Kshattriyas who have been born in the race of the Haihayas; let them be my protectors. There is the heir of the Pauravas, the son of Vidūratha, who has been brought up by bears

240 Ureī really means "the broad," signifying the same as prithieī.
on the mountain Rikshavat: let him protect me. So, too, the heir of Saudāsa has been preserved by the tender-hearted and glorious priest, Parāśara, who has performed, though a Brāhmaṇ, all menial offices (sarvakarmāṇi) for him, like a Śūdra;—whence the prince’s name Sarvakarman.” After enumerating other kings who had been rescued, the Earth proceeds: “All these Kshattriyas’ descendants have been preserved in different places, abiding continually among the classes of dyokāras and goldsmiths. If they protect me, I shall continue unshaken. Their fathers and grandfathers were slain on my account by Rāma, energetic in action. It is incumbent on me to avenge their cause. For I do not desire to be always protected by an extraordinary person [such as Kaśyapa]; but I will be content with an ordinary ruler. Let this be speedily fulfilled.” Kaśyapa then sent for these Kshattriyas who had been pointed out by the Earth, and installed them in the kingly office.”

This reference to the bestowal of the Earth upon Kaśyapa is founded on an older story which occurs both in the Aitareya and the Satapatha Brāhmaṇas. The passage in the first-named work is as follows, viii. 21. Etena ha vai Aindrea mahābhishkeṇa Kaśyapo Viśvakarmāṇam Bhauvanam abhishihchecha | tasmād u Viśvākarmā Bhauvaneḥ samantaṁ sarcaṭah prithiviṁ jayaṁ pariyoṣa ṛṣena cha medhyena ṛṣe | bhūmir ha jagāv ity udāharanti “na mā mṛtyuḥ kaśchana dātum arhati Viśva- karman Bhauvanaḥ māṁ didāsitha | nimankṣaye ’haṁ salilasya madhye mohas te esha Kaśyapāyāsas sangarahaḥ” iti | “With this great inauguration that of Indra did Kaśyapa consecrate Viśvakarman Bhauvana, who in consequence went round the Earth in all directions, conquering it; and offered an aśvamedha sacrifice. They relate that the Earth then recited this verse:

"Me may no mortal give away; but thou, oh king, dost so essay;  
Deep will I plunge beneath the main; thy pledge to Kaśyapa is vain."

The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, xiii. 7, 1. 15, says: Taṁ ha Kaśyapo yā- ājanīchakāra | tad epi bhūmiḥ slokaṁ jagau “na mā mṛtyuḥ kaśchana dātum arhati Viśvakarman Bhauvanaḥ mandaḥ āsitha | upamankṣhyati syā salilasya madhye mrishaśka te sangarah Kaśyapāya” iti | “Kaśyapa officiated for him at this sacrifice. Therefore also the Earth recited this verse: ‘No mortal may give me away. Viśvakarman, son of
Bhauvana, thou wast foolish (in offering to do so). She will sink into the midst of the waters. Thy promise to Kaśyapa is vain.'”

The story is also related in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa in a similar way. I note the chief points and variations. When Gāḍhi’s daughter was demanded in marriage by the rishi Rīchika, the king considered that the suitor was not a fit husband for a daughter of his noble race; and said, “Give me a thousand horses white as the moon, each with one black ear, as a marriage gift for the maiden; for we are Kuśikas” (ix. 15, 5. Varaṇ visadriṣam matvā Gādhir Bhārgavam abraveit | 6. Ekataḥ śyāma-karnā-ñāṁ hayānāṁ chandra-varchasām | sahasraṁ diyatāṁ śukāṁ kanyāyāḥ Kuśikāḥ vaye |). The youngest offspring of their union was, we are told, “Paraśurāma, who is declared to have been a portion of Vāsudeva (Vishṇu in the form of Krishṇa),” and who exterminated the Haihaya race. Thrice in seven times he swept away from this earth all the Kshattriyas, that depraved and impious race, full of passion and darkness, with which she was burthened. He destroyed them, though the offence which they had committed was but insignificant (v. 14. Yam āhur Vā- sudevāṁśaṁ Haihayānāṁ kūntakam | trissaptakriteva yah imāṁ chakre niṃkshattriyāṁ mahām | duṣṭaṁ kshattram bhuce bhāram abrahmayam aninaṣat | rajas-tamo-vītam aham phalguny api krite ’ūhasti |). King Arjuna, who had been endowed with miraculous powers, took Rāvana prisoner, then released him, and afterwards carried away by force Jamadagni’s cow and calf. Paraśurāma, in revenge, after a terrible battle, and the defeat of the king’s army, cut off Arjuna’s arms and head, and recovered the cow and calf. When his father was informed of the king’s death, he said to Paraśurāma: “Rāma, Rāma, thou hast committed sin, in that thou hast causelessly slain the lord of men, who is composed of all the deities.” It is by longsuffering that we, the Brāhmans, have acquired respect; the same means whereby the deity, the instructor of all worlds, attained the highest rank of godhead. By

---

241 It will be observed that there are some varieties of reading in the verse, as given in the two Brāhmaṇas. Manda āsītha in the S. P. Br. looks like a corruption of the māṁ diḍāsītha of the Aitareya. The story of Arjuna, Paraśurāma, and the Kshatriyas is briefly told again in the Āśvamedhika-parvan, but without any new circumstances of particular interest.

242 See above, p. 350, and note 146. None of the passages I have quoted from the Mahābhārata allude to Paraśurāma being an incarnation of Vishṇu.

243 Compare the passages quoted above in p. 300 from the Vishṇu Purāṇa, and from Manu.
patience the fortune of Brahmā shines like the splendour of the Sun. Hari, the lord, is speedily pleased with those who are patient. The murder of a king who has been formally inaugurated is worse than that of a Brahmā. Go and expiate thy sin by visiting holy places, with thy mind intent upon Achyuta (Vishiṇu)." (ix. 15, 38. Rāma Rāma mahābhāga bhavan pāpam akārashitāḥ | abadād nara-devaṁ yat sarva-

devamayaṁ vṛthā | vayaṁ hi brahmaṁś tatha kshamayaṁ 'rhaṇatāṁ gataḥ |

yayaṁ loka-guruṁ devaṁ pārāmeshtyam ayaṁ padam | kshamayaṁ rochate

lakshmīr Brahmī saurī yathā prabhā | kshaṁiṁ āśu bhagavāṁś tush-
yate Harīr īśvaraḥ | rājno mūrdhābhishiktasya badho brahma-badhād
guruḥ | tīrtha-saṁsevayā chāṇāko jahi angačhyuta-chetanaḥ Ṛḥ). On his
return from this pilgrimage Rāma was desired by his father to kill his
mother (on grounds similar to those stated in the account quoted above,
p. 450, from the Mahābhārata), as well as his brothers, and executed
the order; but at his intercession they were all restored to life. During
his absence in the forest, his father Jamadagni was slain, and his head
cut off, notwithstanding the entreaties of his wife, by the sons of
Arjuna, in revenge for the loss of their own father. Parāśurāma,
hearing his mother's outcries, hastened back to the hermitage, and
laying hold of his axe, proceeded to avenge this outrage: ix. 16, 17.
Gatā Mahāishmatim Rāmō brahma-ghanva-vihata-sriyam | teshāṁ sa śir-

shabhīḥ rājan madhye chakre mahāgirin | 18. Tad-raktena nadiṁ ghorām
abrahmanya-bhayāvahām | hetum kriye pīṭha-badhaṁ kshattre 'mangala-
kārini | . . . . 20. Pīṭha kāyeṇa sandhāya śirah ādāya barhiṣi | sarva-
devamayaṁ devam ātmānām ayajad makhaiḥ | 21. Dadu prāchīn disāṁ
hotre brahmaṁvad dakshīnāṁ disāṁ | adhvaryave pratichāv vai udgātre
uttarāṁ disāṁ | 22. Anyeḥyeho 'vāntara-disāḥ Kaśyapāya cha madhyataḥ |

āryāvarttam upadrashṭre sadasyebyhas tataḥ param | 23. Tatas
chāvabhrīthā-sāna-vidhātāsēsha-kilevīḥ | Sasvavyam brahma-nadyāṁ
re jeyabhΡrī śivāṁśumān | . . . . 26. Āste 'dyaṁi Mahendra-drau nyasta-
dandaḥ praśāntadhiḥ | upagīyamāna-charitaḥ siddha-gandharva-chāra-
naiḥ | 27. Evam Bhṛiguṣuḥ visvātāṁ bhagavān Harīr īśvaraḥ | avatīrya
param bhāram bhuvah 'han bahuḥo nṛpāṁ | "17. He went to the city of
Mahāishmati, which had been robbed of its glory by those Brāhma-

siayers, and raised in the midst of it a great mountain composed of
their heads. With their blood he formed a dreadful river, which struck

244 So in the Bombay edition. Burnouf's text has the usual form akārashīt.
fear into the impious; justifying his action against the oppressive Kshattriyas by their murder of his father. . . . 20. He then united his father's head to his body, laying it on the sacred grass; and offered a sacrifice to the divine Spirit, who is formed of all the deities. On this occasion he gave the eastern region of the earth to the hotri priest, the south to the brahman, the west to the adhvaryu, and the north to the udgatri. To others he gave the intermediate regions (south-east, south-west, etc.), to Kaśyapa the central; on the upadrashtri he bestowed Āryāvarta, and on the Sādasyas what was beyond. Having then cleansed all his impurity by the avabhṛthth a ablution in the Sarasvati, the river of Brahmā, he shone like the sun unobscured by clouds. . . .

26. Having laid aside his weapons, he sits to this day in tranquillity of mind on the mountain Mahendra, whilst his exploits are celebrated by the Siddhas, Gandharvas, and Chāranas. Thus did the universal Spirit, the divine lord, Hari, become incarnate in the Bhṛigus, and destroy numerous kings who were a burden to the earth.” It is singular that sin requiring expiation should be, as it is in this narrative, imputed to Paraśurāma, while he is at the same time declared to have been a portion of Viṣṇu, the supreme Spirit.

The story of Paraśurāma is also told in the Droṇaparvan of the Mahābhārata, verses 2427 ff., after those of many other kings and warriors, to illustrate the truth that death must sooner or later overtake even the most pious and distinguished personages. The earlier incidents are briefly narrated; but some of the details, as the slaughter of the Kshattriyas, are dwelt on at greater length than in the other accounts. Some of the victims of the hero's vengeance are described as “haters of Brāhmans” (brahma-devānam, verse 2431). The Kshattriyas who were slain are described as of various provinces, viz. Kāśmīras, Daradas, Kuntis, Kshudrakas, Mālavas, Angas, Vangas, Kalingas, Videhas, Tāmraliptakas, Rakshovāhas, Viṭihotras, Trigarttas, Mārtikāvatas, Sīvis, and other Rājanyas (Śivin anyāṁ cha rājanyān, verse 2437). At verse 2443 the narrative proceeds: Nirdasvam prithiviṁ kritvā śishtesha-jana-sankulām | Kaśyapāya dadau Rāmō haya-medhe mahāmākke | triśopta-vārān prithi-vim kritvā niḥkshattṛiyām prabhuh | iṣṭvā kratu-śatāir viro brāhmaṇe-bhīyo hy ananyata | saṃpta-devāpān vasumatīṁ Mārīcheḥ 'grīṇaṁ dviṣāh | Rāmam provācha “nirgachha vasudhāto mamājnayaḥ | sa Kaśyapasya
vachanāt protsārya sarītānupatim | ishupātair yudhāṁ śreṣṭhāṁ kurvan
brāhmaṇa-sāsanam | adhyāvasad giri- śreṣṭhāṁ Mahendram parevottamam | "2443. Having freed the earth from Dasyus (or robbers), and
filled her with respectable and desirable inhabitants, he gave her to
Kaśyapa at an āsvamedha. Having twenty-one times cleared the earth
of Kshattriyas, and offered hundreds of sacrifices, he destined the earth
for the Brāhmans. The Brāhmaṇ, the son of Marichi (i.e. Kaśyapa),
received the earth, and then said to Rāma, 'Depart out of her by my
command.' Having repelled the ocean by his arrows, and established
the rule of the Brāhmans, Rāma dwelt on the mountain Mahendra.'

The Anuśāsanaparvan of the same poem has another "ancient story"
about Paraśurāma, which, like the preceding passage from the Bhāga-
vata Purāṇa, adverts to the pollution incurred by that warrior from his
numerous deeds of blood. It begins as follows: verse 3960. Jāmadag-
nyena Rāmaṇa tīrva-roshānvitena vai | trissaptā-kriyāṁ pruḥhiṁ kriyā
niḥkshattriyā purā | tato jīve mahīṁ kriṣṇaṁ Rāmo rājīva-lochanaṁ |
ājāhāra kratuṁ viro brahma-kṣhattreṇa pūjitam | saṁjī-medham mahārāja
sava-kāma-samanvitam | pāvanaṁ sava-bhātāṇaṁ tejo-dyuti-vicārḍha-
nam | vipāparam sa cha tejāvī tena kratu-phalena cha | naivātmano 'tha
laghutāṁ Jāmadagnyā dhyagacchhata | sa tu kratu-varṇeshtvā mahātma
dakshinācaṭa | 3965. Paprachāgama - sampannāṁ rishin devāṁś cha
Bhāorghini | "pāvanaṁ yat param niṁgam ugra karmani vatattām |
tad uchyatāṁ mahābhāgāḥ" iti jāta-ghrigov 'bravīt | ity uktaṁ vedā-
sāstra-jnāṁ tam āchus te mahārājyaḥ | "Rāma vipraḥ satkriyantāṁ
veda-prāṁśya-darśanāt | bhūyasca viprarṣhi-gañāḥ prasātavyāḥ pāva-
nam prati | te yad brūyur mahāpraṁjāṁ tach chaiva samudācharaṁ" |
"3960. Rāma, son of Jamadagni, having thrice seven times cleared
the world of Kshattriyas, and conquered the whole earth, performed
the horse-sacrifice, venerated by Brāhmans and Kshattriyas, which
confers all objects of desire, which cleanses all creatures, and augments
power and lustre; and became thereby sinless and glorious. He did
not, however, feel relieved in his mind, but after offering the most
excellent of sacrifices, at which presents were bestowed, he (3965) en-
quired of the rishis skilled in the scriptures, and of the gods, what was
that which most perfectly cleansed those men who had committed
deeds of violence; for he felt compunction for what he had done. The
rishis skilled in the Vedas and Śastras replied, 'Let the Brāhmans be
the objects of your liberality, as the authority of the Vedas requires; let the Brāhman-rishis be further consulted in regard to the means of lustration; and do whatever these wise men may enjoin." PARAŚURĀMA accordingly consulted Vasīsthā, Agastya, and Kaśyapa. They replied that a sinner was cleansed by bestowing cows, land, and other property, and especially gold, the purifying power of which was very great. "Those who bestow it, bestow the gods," a proposition which is thus compendiously proved: "for Agni comprehends all the gods; and gold is of the essence of Agni" (verse 3987. DeVatās te prayachhanti ye suvṛṇām dadaṛ atha | Agnir hi devatāḥ sarvāḥ suvṛṇām cha tattāmakam). In regard to the origin of this precious metal, Vasīsthā tells a very long story, which he had heard Prajāpāti relate, how it was born by the goddess Gangā to Agni, by whom she had been impregnated, and was thus the son of that god. "Thus was gold born the offspring of Jātavedas (Agni). That which is produced in Jambūnada is the best, and a fit ornament even for the gods. It is called the chief of gems and of ornaments, the most pure of all pure things, the most auspicious of all auspicious objects; and one with the divine Agni, the lord Prajāpāti" (verse 4099. Evaṁ suvṛṇām utpannam apatyaṁ Jātavedasaḥ | tatra Jāmbūnadaṁ śreshṭhaṁ devānam api bhuṣhaṇam | 4001. Ratnaṁ uttamaṁ ratnam bhuṣhaṇānāṁ tathottamaṁ | pavitraṁ cha pavitraṁ mangalānāṁ cha mangalam | yat suvṛṇāṁ sa bhagavān Agnir iṣaḥ praṇaṁ |). It must be highly consolatory for those who are disposed to be liberal to the Brāhman, to be assured that the gold which they bestow has such a high mystical, as well as current, exchangeable value. "Paraśurāma," the story concludes, "after being thus addressed by Vasīsthā, gave gold to the Brāhmans, and was freed from sin" (verse 4183. Ity uktāḥ sa Vasīsthena Jāmaṅgynaḥ pratāpavān | dadau suvṛṇāṁ viprebhyo vyamucchaṭa cha kilicāt). It is interesting to remark how the different distinctive principles of Indian religion and sentiment severally assert themselves in turn, and thus, occasionally, come into conflict with each other, as in the story of Paraśurāma. The primary object of this legend is no doubt to illustrate the vengeance which inevitably overtakes all those who violate the sacredness of the Brāhmanical prerogative, and the meritorious character of those who act as its defenders. No sooner, however, is this end ac-
accomplished, and the impious foes of the priesthood swept away again and again from the face of the earth, than a revulsion of feeling takes place, and the higher principles of the sacredness of life, and of the blessedness of mercy, come forward to claim recognition; and a deep sense of the pollution of bloodshed calls aloud for atonement. In the Bhāgavata, as we have seen, Jamadagni imputes it as a crime to the avenger of the Brāhmans that he had slain a king; and even goes the length of declaring that in doing so he had incurred greater guilt than if he had murdered a Brāhman.

In the same book of the Mahābhārata, verses 7163 ff., an extravagant description is given of the prerogatives and powers of the Brāhmans; and Arjuna is again brought forward, in verses 7187 ff., as at first scouting their pretensions, but as ultimately conceding their unapproachable superiority: “The magnificent and mighty Kārttavirya (Arjuna), possessing a thousand arms, was lord of this whole world, living in Māhishmati. This Haihaya of unquestioned valour ruled over the whole sea-girt earth, with its oceans and continents” (verse 7187. Sahasra-bhuja-bhṛit śṛimān Kārttaviryo ’bhavat prabhuḥ | asya lokasya sarvasya Māhishmatyām mahābalaḥ | sa tu ratnā- kartavṛtān sadvipāṁ sāgarāmbarāṁ | saśasa prithivīṁ sarvāṁ Haihayaḥ satya-vikramaḥ). He obtained boons from the muni Dattātreyā, a thousand arms whenever he should go into battle, power to make the conquest of the whole world, a disposition to rule it with justice, and the promise of instruction from the virtuous in the event of his going astray. 7196. Tataḥ sa ratam āsthāya jvalanārka-sama- dyutim | abraevd viryayassammodhāt “ko ne asti sadṛśo mama | dhaiyve virye yaśaḥ-sauryye vikrameṇaṇjasā ‘pi vā” | tad-vākyānte 'ntari- kehe vai vāg uvāchāsaśarirī | “na team mūḍha vijānīshe brāhma- naḥ kshattriyād varam | sahito brāhmaṇeṇa kshattriyāḥ śāsti vai prajāḥ” | Arjuna uvācha | kuryāṃ bhūtāni tushṭo ’ham kruddho nāśam tathā naye | karmāṇaḥ manasaḥ vācāḥ na matto ’sti varo devjaḥ | 7200: Purvo brahmottaro vādo devīyah kshattriyottaraḥ | teyoktāu hetu- yuktau tau viśehas tattra dhṛṣyate | brāhmaṇāḥ suṁśrītāḥ kshattrin na kshattram brāhmaṇāśritam | śrītāḥ brahmopadāḥ viprāḥ khadanti kshattriyān bhūvi | kshattriyeshv āśrito dharmah prajānām paripālanam | kshattrād vṛttir brāhmaṇānāṁ taiḥ katham brāhmaṇo varah | sāreva-bhā- pradhānāṁṁ tāṁ bhaikṣa-vṛttit āhamدادā | ātmā-sambhāvītan viprān
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štāpayāmy ātmane vāse | kathitaṁ hy anayā satyam gayatryā kanyaya divi | vijeshyāmy avasāṁ sarvān brāhmaṇāṁś charma-vāsasaḥ | 7205. Na cha māṁ chāvaved rāṣṭrāt triśu lokeshu kaśchana | devo vā mānusho vā 'pi tasmāj yeshito devād ahām | atha brāhmottaraṁ lokāṁ karihye kshattriyottaram | na hi me saṁyuge kaṁchit soḍhun utsahate balam | Arjunasya evaṁ śrutāṁ 'bhūd niśāchari | athainam antariksaññhas tato Vāyur abhāshata | "tyajinaṁ kaluram bhāvam brāhmaṇe-bhyo namaskuru | eteshāṁ kurvataḥ pāpaṁ rāṣṭra-kshobho bhavishyati | atha vā teśāṁ mahāpāla śamayishyantī vai devijāḥ | nirasishyantī te rāṣṭrād hatotsaham mahābalāḥ" | 7210. Taṁ rājā "kas team" ity āha tatas tam prāha Mārutah | "Vāyur vāi deva-dūto 'smī hitaṁ teṁ pravramy ahām" | Arjunah uvācha | "aho teṣyā 'dyam vipreṣku bhaktir-rajāḥ pradarśitah | yādriśam prithivi-bhaṭaṁ tādriśam brūhi vai devijam | vāyau vā sadriśam kinchid brūhi team brāhmaṇottamam | apāṁ vai sadriśo vahniḥ sūryasya nabhaso 'pi vā | "Then ascending his chariot glorious as the resplendent sun, he exclaimed in the intoxication of his prowess, 'Who is like me in fortitude, courage, fame, heroism, energy, and vigour?' At the end of this speech a bodiless voice in the sky addressed him: 'Thou knowest not, o fool, that a Brāhman is better than a Kshattriya. It is with the help of the Brāhman that the Kshattriya rules his subjects.' Arjuna answers: 'If I am pleased, I can create, or, if displeased, annihilate, living beings; and no Brāhman is superior to me in act, thought, or word. The first proposition is that the Brāhmans are superior; the second that the Kshattriyas are superior; both of these thou hast stated with their grounds, but there is a difference between them (in point of force). The Brāhmans are dependant on the Kshattriyas, and not the Kshattriyas on the Brāhmans; and the Kshattriyas are eaten up by the Brāhmans, who wait upon them, and only make the Vedas a pretence. Justice, the protection of the people, has its seat in the Kshattriyas. From them the Brāhmans derive their livelihood: how then can the latter be superior? I always keep in subjection to myself those Brāhmans, the chief of all beings, who subsist on alms, and who have a high opinion of themselves. For truth was spoken by that female the Gāyatrī in the sky. I shall subdue all those unruly Brāhmans clad in hides. 7200. No one in the three worlds, god or man, can hurl me from my royal authority; wherefore I am
superior to any Brâhman. 'Now shall I turn the world in which Brâhmans have the upper hand into a place where Kshattriyas shall have the upper hand: for no one dares to encounter my force in battle.' Hearing this speech of Arjuna, the female roving in the night became alarmed. Then Vâyu, hovering in the air, said to Arjuna: 'Abandon this sinful disposition, and do obeisance to the Brâhmans. If thou shalt do them wrong, thy kingdom shall be convulsed. They will subdue thee: those powerful men will humble thee, and expel thee from thy country.' The king asks him, 'Who art thou?' Vâyu replies, 'I am Vâyu, the messenger of the gods, and tell thee what is for thy benefit.' Arjuna rejoins, 'Oh, thou displayest to-day a great warmth of devotion to the Brâhmans. But say that a Brâhman is like (any other) earth-born creature. Or say that this most excellent Brâhman is something like the wind. But fire is like the waters, or the sun, or the sky.'

Vâyu, however, goes on to answer this spirited banter by adducing various instances in which the superiority or terrible power of the Brâhmans had been manifested: 7124. Tyakteva mahitvam bhûmis tu sparshdhaya'nga-nripasya ha | násâm jagâma tâm vipro vyashtambhayata Kâsyapah | "The earth, being offended with king Anga, had abandoned her form and become destroyed: but the Brâhman Kâsyapa supported her." This is afterwards told more at length, verse 7232: Imâm bhûmiṁ devijâthibhyo ditsur vai dakshiṇâm purâ | Ango nâma nripo râjâms tataḥ chintâm mahi yayaū | "dhâraṇâṁ sarva-bhûtânâṁ ayaṁ prâpya varo nripâh | katham ichhati mâyâ dâtuṁ devijebhyo Brahmaṇâh sutâm | sa 'haṁ tyakteva gamisyâmi bhûmiteva Brahmaṇâh padam | ayaṁ sa-râshthro nripatîr mâ bhûd" iti tato 'gamat | 7235. Tatas tâm Kâsyapo drishãtvâ vrajantim prîthiveśu tâdâ | praviceṣa mahiṁ sadyo mukteva 'tmânaṁ samâhitâḥ | riddhâ sat sarvato jajne trinaushadhi-samanvâtâ | ... 7238. Athâganyâ mahârâja nîmskrita cha Kâsyapam | prîthive Kâsyapo jajne sutâ tasya mahâtmanâḥ | esa râjann idriśo vai brâhmaṇâh Kâsyapo 'bhavat | anyam prâbrâhi vâ tvam cha Kâsyapât kshattriyam varam | "King Anga wished to bestow this earth on the Brâhmans as a sacrificial fee. The earth then reflected, 'How does this excellent king, after having obtained me, the daughter of Brahmâ, and the supporter of all creatures, desire to give

245 The drift of the last line is not very clear, unless it be a reply by anticipation to line 225, which will be found a little further on.
me to the Brāhmans? I shall abandon my earthly form, and depart to
the world of Brahmā. Let this king be without any realm.’ Accord-
ingly she departed. 7235. Beholding her going away, Kaśyapa, sunk
in contemplation, entered into her, leaving his own body. She then
became replenished, and covered with grass and plants, etc., etc.
7238. She afterwards came and did obeisance to Kaśyapa, and
became his daughter. Such was the Brāhman Kaśyapa: Declare, on
your part, any Kshattriya who has been superior to him.”

Further illustrations of the tremendous power of the Brāhmans are
the following:

7215. Āpi bat tejasā hy āpaḥ svayam evāṅgirāḥ purāḥ | sa taḥ piṇaṃ
kshiram iva nātreyata mahāmanāḥ | apūrayad mahaughena mahīṃ sar-
vāṃ cha pārthiva | tasminn āhāṃ cha kruddhe vai jagat tyaktvā tato
gataḥ | eyatishthām agnihotre cha chiram Angiras bhayāt | atha śaptās
cha bhagavān Gautamena Purandaraḥ | Ahalyāṃ kāmayāno vai dharm-
mārthāṃ cha na hiṁsitaḥ | yathā samudrō nirpate pūrṇo mrīṣhtās cha
vārīṇā | brāhmaṇaḥ abhistaptaḥ san babhūva lavanodakaḥ |

7223. Dandakānām mahād rājyaṃ brāhmaṇaṇa vināśitam | Tālajangham mahā-
kshattrram Aurveṇaikena nāsitam | . . . 7225. Agniṁ teṇuṃ yajāse nid-
yāuṃ kasmād brāhmaṇam Arjuna | sa hi sarvasya lokasya havya-vāt kiṃ
nā vetai tam | . . . 7241. Bhadrā Somasya duhitā rāpena paramā
matā | yasyāḥ tulyam patīṃ Somaḥ Utathyaṃ samapāsyata | sa cha
tiveraḥ tapas tepo mahābhāgā yaśasvinī | Utathyārthe tu chārvāngi
param niyamam āśhitā | tataḥ ahūya sotathyāṃ tadāt Atrīr yaśas-
vinīm | bhāryārthe sa tu jagrāha vidhiḥca bhūri-dakshināḥ | tām te
akāmayata śrīmāṇ Varuṇaḥ purvaṃ eva ha | sa cādāmya vanaprasthāṃ
Yamunāyāṃ jahāra tām | 7245. Jaleśvaras tu hṛiteva tām anayat sva-
puram prati | paramādhhuta-sankāṣam shat-sahasra-śataṃ hradam | na
hi rasyataraṃ kincit tasmād anayat puroṭtamam | prāśādaik aparābhīṣ
dhiva bhāma kāmaḥ cha sōbhitaṃ | tatras devas tanā sārdhām reme rājā
jaleśvarāḥ | athākhyātam Utathyāya tataḥ patny-avamarddanaṃ | tath
chhrutē Nāradaṃ sarvam Utathyo Nāradaṇā tadā | provāca “gachha
brūhi teṇuṃ Varuṇam paruṣaṁ vachi | madvākyaṃ munaḥ ma bhāryā-
ṃ kasmāt tām hritavān asi | lokapālo ’si lokānām na lokasya vilamp-
akaḥ | Somena dattā me bhāryā yaśāḥ chāpahritā ’dya vai” | . . .
7251. Iti śrutvā vachas tasya tatas taṁ Varuṇo ’bravit | “mamaśhā
supriyā bhūrir nainām utsrashtum utsaha” | ity ukto Varuṇenātha Nā-
radaḥ prāpya vai munim | Utathyam abravīt vākyāṁ nātiḥrishta-manāḥ
iva | "gale grihiteśa kshipa 'smi Varunena mahāmune | na prayachhati
te bhārayāṁ yat te kārayāṁ kurushva tat" | Nāradasya vachāḥ śrutvā
kruddhaḥ prājvalad Angirāḥ | 7255. Api māt tejasā vāri visatbhya sa
mahātapāḥ | piyamāne tu sarvasmiṁs toye vai salilēvārah | suhridbhīṁ
kshobhyānāṁ vai naivāmunchata tāṁ tadā | tataḥ kruddho 'bravīt bhāv-
mim Utathyo brāhmaṇottamāḥ | darśayasa chhalaṁ bhadre schaḥ-sahasra-
sataṁ hradam | tatas tad śrīnāṁ jātaṁ samudraś chāvasārpaṁ | tasmād
desān nadāṁ chaiva provāchāsau devijottamāḥ | "adṛśyā gaccha bhūru
tvaṁ Sarasvati marūn prati | apunyāḥ esha bhavatu desās tyaktas tvayā
śūbhe" | tasmān saṁsōshite desa Bhadrām ādāya vāripaḥ | 7260. Aadbāt
śravaṇāṁ gatvā bhārayāṁ Āngirasaśa vai | pratigrihyā tva tām bhārayāṁ
Utathyāḥ sumanā 'bhavat | mumocha cha jagad duḥkhad Varuṇaṁ chaiva
Haṁsāya | ... . 7262. Mānāśāṁ tapasa prāpta kroṣatas te jalaḥdhipa | 7263. ... esha rājann īdṛīṣo vai Utathyo brāhmaṇottamāḥ | bravīmy
aham brūhi vai tvam Utathyāt kshattriyam varam |

"Angiras, too, himself formerly drank up the waters by his own
might. Drinking them up like milk he was not satisfied: and filled
the whole earth with a great flood. When he was thus wroth, I
abandoned the world and departed, and dwelt for a long time in the
agnihotra. The divine Purandara (Indra), who had a passion for Ahalīyā,
was cursed by (her husband) Gautama; but, from motives of religion,
he was not injured. The sea, which is filled and purified by water,
being cursed by the Brāhmans, became salt." 7223. The great king-

246 See above pp. 121 and 310; and also pp. 107–113. In this same Anuśāsana
Parva, verses 2262 ff., there is found another story (told to illustrate the frailty
of the female sex) of Indra being enamoured of Ruchi, the wife of the rishi Dvāsар-
man, and of the method which that sage’s disciple, Vipula, (to whose care his pre-
ceptor’s wife had been entrusted during her husband’s absence,) devised to preserve
his charge from being corrupted by the licentious immortal who was in the habit of
assuming manifold Protean disguises in order to carry out his unworthy designs, and
to save the female from being “lied up by the king of the gods, as a mischievous
dog licks up the butter deposited at the sacrifice” (Yatha Ruchiṁ nāvālikhed deven-
dra Bhṛgu-sattama | kṛate upahīte nyastam ābhe bhīva duṛītavāṅ), a respectful
comparison, truly, to be applied to the chief of the Indian pantheon! The plan
which Vipula adopted to save the virtue of his master’s wife against her will was to
take possession of her body with his own spirit, and to restrain her movements by
the force of Yoga, and compel her to say the contrary of what she desired. The
story ends by his re-entering his own body, reproaching Indra with his disgraceful
behaviour, and compelling him to retire abashed.
 domination of the Danḍakas was overthrown by a Brāhmaṇ; and the great Kṣatrapa family of the Tālajanghas was destroyed by Aurva alone. 7225. And why dosta thou, o Arjuna, worship Agni (who is) a Brāhmaṇ? for knowest thou not that he bears the oblivions of the whole world?" The story of Utathya, of the race of Angiras, is afterwards told: "7241. Bhadrā was the daughter of Soma, and considered to be a person of great beauty. Soma regarded Utathya as a fitting husband for her. She practised severe austerities in order to gain him. Atri (the father of Soma, according to the Vishnu Purāṇa, Wilson, 1st ed. p. 392) then sent for Utathya, and gave her to him, and he married her in due form, presenting large gifts. 7245. The god Varuṇa, however, who had formerly been enamoured of her, came and carried her off from the abode of the hermit, who was living on the banks of the Yamunā, and took her to his own city, to a very wonderful lake of six hundred thousand (yojanas). No city was more delightful than that, adorned as it was by palaces and apsarasas, and rich in celestial objects of enjoyment. There the god enjoyed her society. His wife's dishonour being made known to Utathya by Nārada, he requested the latter to go and deliver a severe message to Varuṇa: 'I command thee to let my wife go, who was given to me by Soma; wherfore hast thou carried her away? Thou art a guardian of the world, not a robber.' . . . 7251. Varuṇa answered, 'She is my beloved; I cannot bear to give her up.' Nārada, in no very gratified humour, reported this answer to Utathya, and said, 'Varuṇa took me by the throat, and cast me out. He will not give up thy wife. Take whatever measures thou esteemest proper.' Utathya was greatly incensed (7255), and stopped up and drank all the sea. Still Varuṇa, though urged by his friends, would not give up the female. Utathya then desired the earth to try some other stratagem; and the lake above described was turned into a salt wilderness, and the ocean swept away. The saint then addressed himself to the countries and to the river: 'Sarasvati, disappear into the deserts; and let this land, deserted by thee, become impure.' After the country had become dried up, Varuṇa submitted himself to Utathya, and brought back Bhadrā. The sage was pleased to get his wife, and released both the world and Varuṇa from their sufferings. . . . He said to the latter (7262) 'This, my wife, was gained by my austerities in spite of thy remonstrances.' 7263. . . . 'Such, o king, I say, was
the Brāhman Utathya; tell me of any Kshatriya superior to him."

A story is next told (verses 7265 ff.) of the gods being conquered by the Asuras or Dānavaś, deprived of all oblations, and stripped of their dignity, and of their coming to earth, where they saw the sage Agastya, and applied to him for protection. The succour they implored was granted to them by the sage, who scorched the Dānavaś, expelled them from heaven and earth, and made them fly to the south. Thus were the gods reinstated in their dominion.

We have then, verses 7280–7290, the following legend of Vasishṭha: The Ādityas were performing a sacrifice, bearing Vasishṭha in their remembrance, when they were attacked by the Dānavaś, called Khalins, who came in tens of thousands to slay them:

Verse 7284. Tatas tair ardditaḥ devaḥ saraṇaṁ Vasaṁvaṁ yuyuḥ | sa cha tair vyathitaḥ Šakro Vasishṭhaṁ saraṇaṁ yayaū | tato 'bhayaṁ dadau te bhavo Vasishṭho bhagavān rishiḥ | tadā tān duhkhitān jñāte ānriṣaṁy ayaḥ muniḥ | ayatnenaḥhatat sarvaṁ Khaḷināḥ ekena tejasā |

Verse 7289. Evaṁ sendrah Vasishṭhaṁ rakshitā trīdvaukasah | Brahma-datta-varaḥ chaiva hataḥ daityaḥ bhratmanā | etat karma Vasisthāya kathitar hi mayā 'nagha | brahmy ahau dhrui vā āyaṁ Vasishṭhāt kshatriyaṁ varam |

"The gods being distressed by them, restored to Indra; and he too, being harassed by them, went to Vasishṭha for help. This reverend and benevolent sage gave them all his protection; and being aware of their distress, without any exertion, burnt up all the Dānavaś . . . . 7289. Thus were the gods, including Indra, preserved by Vasishṭha, and the Daityas, even although they had obtained a boon from Brahmā, were slain. Such was the exploit of Vasishṭha: can you tell me of any Kshatriya who was superior to him?"

A further tale is told of the prowess of the sage Atri, who interposed to deliver the gods and restore light to the celestial luminaries:

Verse 7292. Ghore tamaṁ ayudhyanta sahitāḥ deva-dānavaḥ | avidhyata śaṁais tattra Svarbhānuḥ Soma-bhāskarau | atha te tamasā grastāḥ vihaṇyante sma dānavaṁḥ | devaḥ niripati śārdūla sahaiva Bālīhīs tadā |

Verse 7297. Te'brucāṁ "chandramāḥ bhava | timira-ghnaḥ cha savita dasya-hanta cha no bhava" | evam uktas tadā 'trir vai tamo-nud abhavaḥ śaśi | apasyat saumya-bhāvāḥ cha soma-
vat-priya-darśanaḥ | drīṣṭvā nātiprabhām somaṁ tathā sūryaṁ cha pār-
thīva | prakāśam akarod Atris tapasā svena saṁyuge | 7300. Jagad
vītimitvāḥ chāpi prakāśam akarot tadā | evaṁyata śatru-saṁghāṁs cha
decānāṁ svena tejasā | . . . 7303. Devīnāgīni-deviśyenā japatā charma-
vāsāṛ | phala-bhakṣhenā rājarshe paśya karmātrīṇā kriṭam | . . .
7304. . . brūhi vā tvam Aṛitaḥ kṣatriṛīyaṁ evam |

"The gods and Dānavas fought together in dreadful darkness; when
Svarbhānu pierced with his arrows the sun and moon. Enveloped in
gloom the gods were slaughtered by the Dānavas, together with the
Balis. Being thus slain and exhausted, the celestials beheld the Brāh-
man Atri employed in austerities;" and invoked his aid in their ex-
tremity. He asked what he should do. They reply, verse 2297:
"'Become the moon, and the gloom-dispelling sun, the slayer of the
Dasyns.' Atri then became the gloom-dispelling moon, and in his
character as such looked beautiful as Soma. Perceiving the sun and
moon to be shorn of their brightness, Atri threw light upon the conflict,
(7300) freed the world from darkness, by the power of his auster-
fervour, and vanquished the enemies of the gods. . . . 7303. Behold
the deed done by Atri, the Brāhman, attended by Agni, the mutterer
of prayers, clad in a skin, and living upon fruits. . . . 7304. 'Tell
me of any Kshatriya superior to Atri.'"

This story is founded on some verses of the Rig-veda, v. 40, 5 :

Yat tvā sūryya Svarbhānu tamasā vidhyad āsurah | aksheṭra-vid yathā
mudgho bhavanāṁ adidhayuḥ | 6. Svarbhānor aśa yad Indra māyāḥ aśo
divo varttamāṇiḥ acāhan | gūlhaṁ sūryaṁ tamasā pavatena turiyena
brahmaṇā vindad Atriḥ | 8. Grāvṛṇo brāhmaṇā yujujāṇah saparyyan kīrīṇa
devān namasopākikan | Atriḥ sūryasya divi chakshur udhāt Svarbhānor
apa māyāḥ aghukshat | 9. Yaṁ vai sūryaṁ Svarbhānus tamasā vidhyad
āsurah | Atrayās tam anv avindan nahi anye asaknuvān |

"When Svarbhānu of the Asura race pierced thee, o Sun, with
darkness, all worlds appeared like a man who is bewildered in a region
which he does not know. 6. When, Indra, thou didst sweep away
the magical arts of Svarbhānu, which were operating beneath the sky, Atri
discovered by the fourth text the Sun, which had been hidden by the
hostile darkness. 8. Applying the (soma-crushing) stones, performing
worship, serving the gods with reverence and praise, the priest Atri
placed the eye of the Sun in the sky, and dispelled the illusions of
Svarbhānu. 9. The Atris discovered the Sun which Svarbhānu had pierced with darkness. No others could."

We have next a curious legend about the sage Chyavana, of the race of Bṛigu:


"Having given a promise to that effect, Chyavana applied, along with the other gods, to Indra, to allow the Aśvins to partake in the soma juice. Indra answered, 'How can they become drinkers of the soma, seeing they are reviled by us, and are not on an equality with the gods? We do not wish to drink soma in their company; but we shall accede to your wishes in any other respect.' Chyavana repeats his request, and urges that the Aśvins also are gods, and the offsprings of the Sun. 7310. He adds that it will be well for the gods if they accede to this
demand, and ill if they do not. Indra rejoins that the other gods may drink with the Aśvins if they please, but he cannot bring himself to do it. Chyavana retorts that if he does not, he shall be chastised by the sage, and made to drink soma (with them) at the sacrifice. A ceremony was then instantly begun by Chyavana for the benefit of the Aśvins; and the gods were vanquished by sacred texts. Indra, seeing this rite commenced, became incensed, uplifted a vast mountain (7315), and rushed with his thunderbolt, and with angry eyes, on Chyavana. The sage, however, sprinkling him with water, arrested him with his mountain and thunderbolt. Chyavana then created a fearful open-mouthed monster, called Mada, formed of the substance of the oblation,” who is further described as having teeth and grinders of portentous length, and jaws, one of which enclosed the earth and the other the sky: and the gods, including Indra, are said (7319), “to have been at the root of his tongue [ready to be devoured] like fishes in the mouth of a sea monster. Finding themselves in his predicament, the gods took counsel and said to Indra, ‘Make salutation to Chyavana, and let us drink soma along with the Aśvins, and so escape from our sufferings.’ Indra then, making obeisance, granted the demand of Chyavana, who was thus the cause of the Aśvins becoming drinkers of the soma. He then performed the ceremony, and clove Mada to pieces.”

Does this legend mean that this rishi of the Brāhgu family was the first to introduce the Aśvins within the circle of the Arian worship?

Compare the passages from the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa iv. 1, 5, 1 ff., and from the Vanapravān of the M. Bh. verses 10316 ff. quoted in my “Contributions to a knowledge of the Vedic theogony and mythology,” No. II., in the Journ. R. A. S., for 1866, pp 11 ff.; Ind. St. i. 188, and the Āśvamedhikā-parvan of the M. Bh., verses 249 ff., there referred to. The Aśvins are, in different passages of the Rig-veda, as iii. 58, 7, 9; viii. 8, 5; viii. 35, 7–10, invited to drink the soma-juice.

Vāyu relates to Arjuna yet one more instance of the irresistible power of the Brāhmans:

7327. Madasyāsyaṁ anuprāptāḥ yadā sendrāḥ divaukasāḥ | tadaiva Chyavanenaḥ hritā teshāṁ vasundhārá | ubhau lokau hritau matvā te devāḥ dukkhitāḥ bhriśam | śokārttāḥ cha mahātmāno Brahmāṇaṁ sarāṇāṁ yauḥ | devāḥ uchuh | Madasya-evatisiktañām asmākāṁ lokā-pūjita | Chyavanena hritā bhūmiṁ Kapaiś chaiva divam prabhō | Brahmā ucācha |
7330. Gachhadhevaṃ saranaṃ viprān āsu sendraḥ divavakasah | prasādyat
   tān ubhau lokāv arāpyathath yathā purā | tē yauyūḥ saranaṃ viprān uchus
tē “kān jayāmahe” | ity uktas te devījān prāhur “jayateha Kapān” iti |
   “bhūgatān hi vijētaṃ vayām” ity abruvant “devījaḥ” | tataḥ karma sa-
   māraḍdhāṃm brāhmaṇaṃ Kapānaṃ Kapa-ṇāśanam | tat śrutvā prēshito ādu brāh-
   maneḥbhya Dhanī Kapāīṃ | bhū-gatān brāhmaṇaṃ aha Dhanī Kapa-vaḥo
yathā | “bhavadbhiḥ sadṝṣāḥ sarve Kapāḥ kimīha varttate | sarve vedav-
   vidoḥ prājnāḥ sarve cha kratu-yaṇinaḥ | 7335. Sarve s图案vratāsa chaiva sarve tuṁyaḥ maharṣhibhiḥ | śṛṣṭi chaita ramataiteshā dhārayanti śṛyaṃ
tē cha te | . . . . . . 7339. Etaś chānyaiḥ cha bahuhir guṇair yuktān kathām
   Kapān | 7340. Vijesyaḥthatho nivarttadhevaṃ nirīttaṃnāṃ subhaṃ hi vah” | Brāhmaṇāḥ uchuk | Kapān vayaṃ viṣeṣyāmo ye devās te vayaṃ smṛītāḥ |
tasmād badhyāḥ Kapāḥ 'ṃākam Dhanī yāhī yathāgatām | Dhanī gatvā
   Kapān āha “na no viprāḥ priyentalarāḥ | grihyātva 'strāṇy ato viprān
   Kapāḥ sarve saṃādravān | samudagra-dhejāṅ drishtā Kapān sarve dev-
   iḷaṭāyāḥ | vyayājan jéalītān aṅgīn Kapānīm prāṇa-ṇāsanān | brahma-
   srisktāḥ havyabhujāḥ Kapāṇ hatcā saṅātanāḥ | nabhasīva yathā 'bhruṇī
evamājanta naṛadhīpa | Hataḥ vai dānaṃna devāḥ sarve saṃbhāya sām-
   yuga | ‘tenābhyaṇān hi tadā brāhmaṇaṃ nihatān Kapān | athāgamya
   mahātejāḥ Nārādo 'kaṭhayad vīho | yathā hatāḥ mahābhāgais tejaśa
   brāhmaṇaṃ Kapāḥ | Nārādasya vachāḥ śrutvā prītāḥ sarve divavakasah | prāśasāṃsūḥ devījaṃśi chāpi brāhmaṇāṃśe cha yaṣaśvināḥ |

When the gods, including Indra, were enclosed within the mouth
of Mada, the earth was taken from them by Chyavana. The gods then
considering that they had lost both worlds, in their distress resorted to
Brahmā, and said, ‘Since we have been swallowed up in the mouth
of Mada, the earth has been taken from us by Chyavana, and the heaven
by the Kapas.’ Brahmā answered, ‘Go speedily, ye gods, with Indra, to
the Brāhmans for help. After propitiating them ye shall regain both
worlds.’ They did so, and the Brāhmans, after ascertaining that the
gods would themselves deal with those of their enemies who were on
everthearth, began a ceremony for the destruction of the Kapas. The Kapas
upon this sent a messenger to the Brāhmans, to say that they themselves
were all, like them, skilled in the Vedas, learned, and offerers of sacrifice,
all pure in their observances, and all resembling great rishis, etc., etc.,
How then should the Brāhmans be able to conquer them? It would
be more for their interest to desist from the attempt. The Brāhmans,
however, would not be persuaded; and when, in consequence, the Kapas assailed them, they hurled forth fires by which the Kapas were destroyed. The gods themselves conquered the Dānavas, and learning from Nārada what the illustrious Brāhmans had effected, they sang their praises.”

Hearing of all these testimonies to the terrible might of the Brāhmans, Arjuna at length gives in, saying:

7350. ṇivāmy aham brāhmaṇārthaṁ sarvatāṁ prabhō | brāhmaṇo brāhmaṇeṣhīyaṁ ca praṣamāmī cha nityasāḥ || Dattātreya-prasādāccha mayā praptam idam balam | lokes cha paramā kirttir dharmas cha charito mahān | aho brāhmaṇa-karmāṁ mayā Māruta tatvataḥ | teyā proktāni kārtiṣyena śrutāṁ pratyatena cha | Vāyur ucācha | brāhmaṇān kṣattra-dharmena pālayavendriyāṁ ca | Bṛgubhyas te bhayaṁ ghoraṁ tat tu kālāṁ bhavishyatī |

“I live altogether and always for the sake of the Brāhmans. I am devoted to the Brāhmans, and do obeisance to them continually. And it is through the favour of Dattātreya (a Brāhman) that I have obtained all this power and high renown, and that I have practised righteousness. Thou hast declared to me truly all the acts of the Brāhmans, and I have listened intently.” Vāyu then says to him: “Protect the Brāhmans, fulfilling a Kshatriya’s function; and restrain your senses. A dreadful cause of apprehension impends over you from the Bṛgus, but it will only take effect after some time.” This last remark may have been introduced to bring this story into harmony with the other legend about the destruction of Arjuna and the Kshatriyas.

The narrative, which has just been quoted, is, as I have already stated, preceded by a panegyric of some length pronounced by Bhīshma on the Brāhmans (verses 7163–7184), of which the following are specimens:


“The prowess of the Brāhmans can destroy even the gods. 7164.

This translation is a good deal condensed.
Those wise beings uphold all these worlds. 7175. To them it is indifferent whether they are perfumed with sandal wood or deformed with mire, whether they eat or fast, whether they are clad in silk, or in sackcloth or skins. 7177. They can turn what is not divine into what is divine, and the converse; and can in their anger create other worlds with their guardians. 7179. They are the gods of the gods; and the cause of the cause. 7181. An ignorant Brähman is a god, whilst a learned Brähman is yet more a god, like the full ocean.” (Compare the similar eulogies in p. 130, above.)

In the Anuṣāsanaparvan, sections 52 ff., we have the story of Paraśurāma, in connection with that of Viśvāmitra, yet once more handled. Yudhishṭhīra says he is very curious to know something more about these two personages:

2718. Katham eṣa samutpanno Rāmaḥ satya-parākramaḥ | katham brahmaṇa-vaṁśo 'yaṁ kshattrā-dharmā vyajāyata | tad asya sambhavāṃ rājan nikhileṇaṇukirttaya | Kauśikācha kathāṁ vaṁśat kshatrād vai brāhmaṇo 'bhavat | aho prabhāvāḥ sumahān āśā vai sumahātmanāḥ | Rāmasya cha nara-vyāghra Viśvāmitrasya chaiva hi | katham putrān atikramya teshāṁ naptrishv athābhavat | eṣa doshaḥ sutān hitvā tat tvam vyākhyātum arhasi |

“How was this valiant Rāma, descended from the family of a Brähman-rishi, born with the qualities of a Kshatriya? Tell me the whole story: and how did a Brähman spring from the Kshatriya race of Kuśika? Great was the might of Rāma, and of Viśvāmitra. How did it happen that, passing over the sons [of Rīchika and Kuśika], this defect showed itself in their grandsons?”

Then there follows a long dialogue related by Bhīṣma as having taken place between king Kuśika and the sage Chyavana. The latter, it seems, “foreseeing that this disgrace was about to befall his race [from connection with the Kuśikas], and entertaining, in consequence, after he had weighed all the good and evil, and the strength and weakness (on either side), the desire of burning up that whole family” (verse 2723. Etaṁ dosham purā dṛṣṭevā Bhārgavas Chyavanas tadā | āgāminam mahābuddhiḥ sva-vāṁśo muni-sattamaḥ | niśchitya manasa sarvaṁ guṇa-dosham balabalam | dagdhv-kāmaṁ kulaṁ sarvaṁ Kuśikāṁnāṁ tapodhanah |), came to Kuśika. Chyavana is welcomed and treated with great attention, and receives from Kuśika the offer of all his king-
The saint, however, does not requite this honour with corresponding kindness, but makes the king and his wife perform many menial offices, rub his feet, attend while he sleeps, bring him food, and draw him in a chariot, while he lacerates their backs with a goad. All this is submitted to so patiently, that the sage is propitiated, addresses them in kindly tones, and touches their wounded bodies with his godlike hands. After creating a magical golden palace, with all the accompaniments of pleasure (2826 ff.), in order to give them a conception of heaven, (2892 ff.) the sage offers to bestow any boon the king may choose; and to solve any of his doubts. Kuśika asks the reason of the sage’s unaccountable procedure. Chyavana answers that he had heard from Brahmā that there would be “a confusion of families in consequence of the hostility of Brāhmans and Kshattriyas, and that a grandson of great glory and heroism would be born to Kuśika” (verse 2878. Brahma-kshattrra-virodhena bhavītā kula-sankaraḥ | paṭras te bhavītā rājaṁs tejo-vīryya-samanevitaḥ |); that he had intended in consequence to burn up the race of the Kuśikas, but that the king had come so well out of the severe ordeal to which he had been subjected, that the sage had become thoroughly pacified, and would grant the boon which Kuśika desired:

2897. Bhavishyaty esha te kāmas Kuśikā Kuśikā deviḥ | trītyam purushānu tuḥhyam brāhmaṇatvaṁ ganishyati | vaṁśas te pārthiva-śreshṭha Bhṛgūṇām eva tejasā | paṭras te bhavītā vipras tapasvi pāvana- dyutiḥ | yah sa-deva-manushyāṇam bhayam utpādayishyati |

“This thy desire shall be fulfilled; from a Kuśika a Kuśika Brāhmaṇ shall arise: in the third generation thy race shall attain to Brāhmaṇhood by the might of the Bhṛgas. Thy son’s son shall become a Brāhmaṇ, a devotee; splendid as fire, who shall alarm both gods and men.” Kuśika being anxious to know how all this was to be brought to pass, Chyavana informs him:

2995. Bhṛgūṇāṁ kshattriyāḥ yājyāḥ nityam etaj janādhipa | te cha bhedam gamishyanti daiva-yuktena hetunā | kshattriyāḥ cha Bhṛgūṇ sarvān badhishyanti nāraṇdhipa | āgarbḥād anukrintanto daiva-danda nipīditāḥ | tatha utpatsye śmākaṁ kula-gotra-viwardhanāḥ | Ūreṇa nāma mahātejā jvalanārka-sama-dyutiḥ | sa tailokyā-vināśaya kopāgniṁ janayishyati | mahaṁ sa-pavata-vanāṁ yah karishyati bhasmasat | kanchit kālaṁ tu vahniṁ cha sa eva śamayishyati | samudre vaḍavā-vaktro prak-

"The Bhṛigus have always been the priests of the Kṣhatriyas; but these will become hostile to each other for a fated reason. The Kṣhatriyas shall slay all the Bhṛigus, even to children in the womb, being oppressed by a divine nemesis. Then shall arise the glorious Urva, like the sun in splendour, who shall augment the glory of our race. He shall create a fire of wrath for the destruction of the three worlds, which shall reduce the earth with its mountains and forests to ashes. After a time he will extinguish the fire, throwing it into the ocean into the mouth of Vaḍavā (the submarine fire). Into his son Richika shall

248 Urva is here said (verse 2907) to belong to the race of Chyavana, but whether as a near or remote descendant is not stated. In verse 2910 Richika is said to be the son of Urva. In the Adi-parvan, verses 2610 ff., the matter is somewhat differently stated: Aruṣī tu Manuḥ kanyā tasya patnī yaśasvini | Auvras tasyoṁ samabhavad ūrum bhitteva mahājaśaḥ | mahātejaṁ mahāvيعرو yo bālo eva guṇair yutaḥ | Richikas tasya putras tu Jamadagnī tato 'bhavat | " Aruṣī, the daughter of Manu, was the wife of the sage (Chyavana); of her was the illustrious Auvra born, having split his mother's thigh. He was great in glory and might, and from his childhood endowed with eminent qualities. Richika was his son, and Richika's was Jamadagnī." Here Auvra is said to derive his name from having divided his mother's thigh (ūru); and no allusion is made to Auvra, though the same person appears to be meant. In the passage of the Anuśāsana-parvan, however, we have an Urva, the father of Richika, whose patronymic will thus be Auvra; as it is, in fact, in the Vishnu Purāṇa, as quoted above in p. 352.
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enter the entire embodied Dhanur-veda (science of archery), for the destined destruction of the Kshattriyas. This science he shall transmit to his great son Jamadagni, whose mind shall be spiritualized by devotion, and who shall possess that Veda. He (Richika) shall obtain [for his wife] a maiden of thy family, to prolong thy race. This great devotee, wedding thy grand-daughter, the daughter of Gādhi, shall beget a Brāhman (i.e. Paraśurāma), fulfilling the functions of a Kshattriya; (2915) and shall bestow on thy family a Kshattriya who shall perform the functions of a Brāhman, Viśvāmitra, the son of Gādhi, an austere devotee, and glorious as Vṛihaspati. The two wives shall be the cause of this interchange of characters. According to the decree of Brāhma all this shall so happen. Brāhmanhood shall come to thee in the third generation, and thou shalt become connected with the spiritual-minded Brāhigus.” 2923. “Thus (concludes Bhishma) have I told thee at length the cause of the connection between the Brāhigus and the Kuśikas. All this was accordingly fulfilled in the births of Paraśurāma and Viśvāmitra.”

Is this legend intended to account for a real fact? Was Paraśurāma of a sacerdotal tribe, and yet by profession a warrior, just as Viśvāmitra was conversely of royal extraction, and yet a priest by profession?

According to the Vishnus Purāṇa, iv. 11, 3 (Wilson, 4to. ed. pp. 416, 417), Arjuna was of the race of Yadu, and the ninth in descent from Haihaya, the great-grandson of that prince. It is there said of him:

"From Kritavirya sprang Arjuna, who was lord of the seven dvípas [circular and concentric continents of which the earth is composed], and had a thousand arms. Having worshipped a portion of the divine Being, called Dattátreya, sprung from the race of Atri, he sought and obtained these boons, viz. a thousand arms, the power of restraining wrong by justice, the conquest of the earth, and the disposition to rule it righteously, invincibility by enemies, and death at the hands of a man renowned over the whole world. By him this earth, with all its dvípas, was perfectly governed. He offered ten thousand sacrifices. To this day this verse is repeated respecting him: 'No other king shall ever equal Kártavirya in regard to sacrifices, liberality, austerities, courtesy, and self-restraint.' In his reign no property was ever lost.

4. Thus he ruled for eighty-five thousand years with unbroken health, prosperity, strength, and valour. When he was excited by sporting in the Narmadā and by drinking wine, he had no difficulty in binding like a beast Rávana, who had arrived in Māhishmati in his career of conquest, and who was filled with arrogance, arising from the pride of victory over all the gods, daityas, and gandharva chiefs, and imprisoning him in a secret place in his capital. At the end of his reign of eighty-five thousand years Arjuna was destroyed by Paraśuráma, who was a portion of the divine Náráyana."

The Bhágavata Puráṇa, ix. 23, 20–27, assigns to him the same descent, and relates of him nearly the same particulars. Verse 23 says:

Arjunah Kritaviryasya saptā-dvīpesvaro 'bhavat | Dattātreyād Harer anśat prāpta-yoga-mahāguyah | "Arjuna was the son of Kritavirya, and ruler of the seven dvípas. He obtained the great attribute of Yoga (supernatural powers arising from devotion) from Dattátreya, who was a portion of Hari," etc.

The legend of Paraśuráma, as related, is of course fabulous. Not to speak of the miraculous powers which are ascribed to this hero, and the incredible number of the exterminations which he is said to have executed, we cannot even suppose it probable that the Bráhmans should in general have been sufficiently powerful and warlike to overcome the Kshattriyas by force of arms. But the legend may have had some small foundation in fact. Before the provinces of the sacerdotal and military classes were accurately defined, there may have been cases in which ambitious men of the former successfully
aspired to kingly dominion, just as scions of royal races became distin-
guished as priests and sages. But even without this assumption, the
existence of such legends is sufficiently explained by the position which
the Brāhmans eventually occupied. With the view of maintaining
their own ascendancy over the minds of the chiefs on whose good will
they were dependent, and of securing for themselves honour and profit,
they would have an interest in working upon the superstitious feelings
of their contemporaries by fabricating stories of supernatural punish-
ments inflicted by their own forefathers on their royal oppressors, as
well as by painting in lively colours the prosperity of those princes
who were submissive to the spiritual order.
CHAPTER V.

RELATION OF THE BRAHMANICAL INDIANS TO THE NEIGHBOURING TRIBES, ACCORDING TO MANU AND THE PURANAS.

I now propose to enquire what account the Indian writers give of the origin of those tribes which were not comprehended in their own polity, but with which, as dwelling within, or adjacent to, the boundaries of Hindustan, their countrymen were, in ancient times, brought into continual and familiar contact.

It appears to have been the opinion of Manu, the great authority in all matters regarding the Hindu religion and institutions in their full development, that there was no original race of men except the four castes of Brāhmans, Kshattriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras; and that all other nations were derived from these. His own words (x. 4) are these: Brāhmaṇaḥ kṣatrīya vaiśyaṁ traya varṇāḥ devijātayaḥ | chatur-thaḥ ekajātis tu śudro nāsti tu panchamaḥ | “Three castes, the Brāhman, the Kshattriya, and the Vaiśya, are twice-born; the fourth, the Śūdra, is once-born; and there is no fifth.” On the last clause of this verse Kullūka Bhaṭṭa annotates thus: Panchamaḥ punar varṇo nāsti sankirṇa-jātīnāṁ tv āsvatara-vad mātā-piṭī-jiṭi-vyatirikta-jāty-antaratvād na varṇatevam | ayaṁ cha jāty-antaropadeśaḥ śāstre saṁvyavaharagnārthaḥ | “There is no fifth caste; for caste cannot be predicated of the mixed tribes, from the fact that, like mules, they belong to another species, distinct from that of their father and mother. And this reference, which is made in the Śāstras to castes other than the four, is merely for the sake of convenience and conformity to common usage.”

Accordingly, in the following description which Manu gives in the same chapter of the rise of the inferior castes, they are all, even the
very lowest, such as Nishādas and Chaṇḍālas, derived from the mixture the four so-called original castes. Thus, in verse 8: *Bṛahmanād vaiśya-kanyāyām ambāṣṭho nāma jāyate | nishādah śūdra-kanyāyām yah parāśava ucyate* | “From a Brāhman father and a Vaiṣṭya mother springs an Ambāṣṭha: from a Brāhman father and a Śūdra mother is born a Nishāda, called also Parāśava.” 1 Again, in verse 12. *Śūdrād āyogavaḥ kshattā chaṇḍālas chādhamo nṛṇām | vaiśya-rājanya-vipraśu jāyante varṇa-sankarāḥ* | “From a Śūdra, by women of the Vaiṣṭya, Kshattṛiya, and Brāhman castes are born those mixed classes, the Āyogava, the Kshattṛi, and the Chaṇḍāla, lowest of men.” Again, in verse 20: *Deviśtatvah savaryāṃ janayanty avratāṁ tu yān | tān śāvitrī-paribhrashtān vrātyāḥ iti vinirdiṣet* | “Persons whom the twice-born beget on women of their own classes, but who omit the prescribed rites, and have abandoned the gāyatrī, are to be designated as Vrātyas.” 2

In the next three verses the inferior tribes, which spring from the Brāhman Vrātya, the Kshattṛiya Vrātya, and the Vaiṣṭya Vrātya respectively, are enumerated.

In verses 43 and 44 it is stated: *Sanakais tu kriyā-lopaḥ imāḥ 1*

---

1 It does not appear how the account of the origin of the Nishāda race from king Vena, given above in pp. 301 and 303, can be reconciled with this theory of Manu; unless recourse be had to the explanation that that story relates to the Śvāyambhuva Manvantara. But Manu's narrative seems to refer to the same period. See above, p. 39. If the Vedic expressions *panchojanaḥ* and the other corresponding phrases signifying “the five tribes” be rightly interpreted of the “four castes, and the Nishādas,” we might understand this as intimating that the Nishādas had at one time been regarded as a distinct race. But the phrase is variously understood by the old Vedic commentators; as has been shewn above, p. 177.

2 Manu says, ii. 38 f.: *Aḥoḍasād brāhmanasya śāvitrī nātivarttate | a-deviśsūḥ kshattrabhandhor a-chaturviśsāte viśāḥ | ataḥ ārdrāṁ trayaḥ py ete yathā-kulam asamkritāḥ | śāvitrī-patitāḥ vrātyāḥ bhavanty ārya-nigarchāḥ* | “The gāyatrī should not, in the case of a Brāhman, be deferred beyond the sixteenth year; nor in the case of a Kshattṛiya beyond the twenty-second; nor in that of a Vaiṣṭya beyond the twenty-fourth. After these periods youths of the three classes, who have not been invested, become fallen from the gāyatrī, Vrātyas, contended by respectable men (Āryyas).” In the following verse of the Mahābhārata, Anuṣāsanaparvan, line 2621, a different origin is ascribed to the Vrātyas: *Chaṇḍālo vrātya-vaidyau cha brāhmanyaśāṃ kshattriyas ca | vaiśya-yāmin chaiva śūdrasya lakthyante 'pasadāḥ trayaḥ* | “The three outcaste classes are the Chaṇḍāla, the Vrātya, and the Vaidya, begotten by a Sūdra on females of the Brāhman, Kshattṛiya, and Vaiṣṭya castes respectively.” A Vrātya, therefore, according to this account, is the son of a Sūdra man and a Kshattṛiya woman. On the Vrātyas, see Weber's Indische Studien, i. 33, 52, 138, 139, 445, 446, etc.
khattriya-jātayāḥ | viśalatvaṁ gataḥ lokāḥ brāhmaṇaṁadarśanena cha |
pauṇḍrakaḥ choṭa-dravīḍaḥ Kāmbojāḥ Yavaṇāḥ Sakaḥ | Pāradaḥ Pah-
lavāḥ Cīnaḥ Kirātāḥ Daradaḥ Khaṣāḥ | “The following tribes of 
Kshattriyas have gradually sunk into the state of Viśalas (outcasts),
from the extinction of sacred rites, and from having no communication 
with Brāhmans; viz. Pauṇḍrakas, Oḍras, Dravīḍas, Kāmbojas, Yavanas,
Sakas, Pāradas, Pahlavas, Cīnas, Kirātas, Daradas, and Khaṣas.”

The same thing is affirmed in the Mahābhārata, Anuśāsanaparvan,
verses 2103 f.: Sakaḥ Yavana-kāmbojas tāḥ khattriya-jātayāḥ |
viśalatvaṁ parigataḥ brāhmaṇaṁ adarśanāt | Dravīḍas cha Ka-
lindas cha Pulindas chāpy Uśinaraḥ | Kolisarpāḥ Māhishakas tāḥ tāḥ 
khattriya-jātayāḥ ītyādi | “These tribes of Kshattriyas, viz. Sakas,
Yavanas, Kāmbojas, Dravīḍas, Kalindas, Pulindas, Uśinaras, Kolisarpas,
and Māhishakas, have become Viśalas from seeing no Brāhmans.”
This is repeated in verses 2158–9, where the following additional 
tribes are named: Mekalas, Lāṭas, Konvāṣiras, Sauṇḍikas, Darvas,
Chauras, Savaras, Barbaras, and Kirātas, and the cause of degradation 
is, as in verse 2103, restricted to the absence of Brāhmans. (Then 
follow the lines (2160 ff.) in glorification of the Brāhmans, already 
quoted in p. 130.)

The Yavanas are said in the Mahābhārata, Ādīparvan, section 85,
verse 3533, “to be descended from Turvasu, the Vaiśhojas from 
Druhyu, and the Mlecha tribes from Anu” (Yadu tva Yadavah jātās 
Turvasor Yavanāh smṛitāḥ | Druhyoh sutās tu Vaiśhojah Anos tu 
mlechha-jātayāḥ |). Is it meant by this that the Yavanas are not to 
be reckoned among the Mlechas? Their descent from Turvasu is not 
however, necessarily in conflict with the assertion of the authorities 
above quoted, that they are degraded Kshattriyas.

I shall not attempt to determine who the Yavanas, and other tribes 
mentioned in the text, were.

The verse which succeeds that last quoted from Manu is the follow-
ing: 45. Mukha-bāhur-paj-jānām yāḥ lokāḥ jātayo vahiḥ | mlechha-
vācāḥ chāryya-vācāḥ sare te dasyavah smṛitāḥ | “Those tribes which 
are outside of the classes produced from the mouth, arms, thighs, and 
feet, [of Brahmā, i.e. Brāhmans, Kshattriyas, Vaiṣyas, and Śūdras,] 
whether they speak the language of the Mlechhas or of the Āryas,
are called Dasyus.” The interpretation to be given to this verse turns
upon the sense which we assign to "outside" (vāhiḥ). Does it mean that the Dasyus were of a stock originally distinct from that of the four primeval castes, and therefore altogether separate from those tribes which sprang from the intermixture of those four castes, or which, by the neglect of sacred rites, apostatized from their communion? Or does it merely mean that the Dasyus became eventually excluded from the fellowship of the four castes? If the latter sense be adopted, then Dasyu will be little else than a general term embracing all the tribes enumerated in verses 43 and 44. The commentator Kullūka understands the word in the latter sense. His words are: Brāhmaṇa-kṣatriya-vaisya-sūdrāṇāṁ kriyā-lopādīnaḥ yāḥ jātayo vāhyāḥ jātāḥ mlechha-bhāsha-yuktāḥ āryya-bhāshopetāḥ vā te dasyavaḥ sarea smritāḥ | "All the tribes, which by loss of sacred rites, and so forth, have become outcasts from the pale of the four castes, Brāhmans, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras; whether they speak the language of the Mlechhas or of the Āryas, are called Dasyus." His view is confirmed by a short passage in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, quoted above (p. 358), where Viśvāmitra, speaking to his sons, says: "Let your descendants possess the furthest ends (of the country)," and the author of the Brāhmaṇa adds: "These are the numerous border-tribes, the Andhras, Pundras, Sābaras, Pulindas, Mūtibas. Most of the Dasyus are sprung from Viśvāmitra." Here the writer of this ancient Brāhmaṇa connects together certain tribes named either in Manu, or in the Mahābhārata, as degraded Kṣatriyas, with the appellation Dasyu, thus intimating that the latter was a general name embracing all the former. This view is further confirmed by the following lines of the Mahābhārata, book ii. verses 1031-2: Daradān saha Kāmbojair ajayat Pākaśāraniḥ | prāguttarāṁ disaṁ ye cha vasanty āśritya Dasyavaḥ | "The son of Indra conquered the Daradas with the Kāmbojas, and the Dasyus who dwell in the north-east region;" and still more by the annexed verses from the Dronaparvan, of the same epic poem, 4747: Kāmbojānāṁ sahasraśeṣa Sukānāṁ cha viśampate | Sāvarāṇāṁ Kirātānāṁ Varvāraṇāṁ tathaiva cha | agamyā-rupāṁ prithveśa māṃsa-śoṁita-karddamām | kriyāvāṁ tatra Saineyāḥ kṣapayaṁ tāvakam balam | Dasyūnāṁ sa-śirastraṇāṁ śrobbhir lānā-marcdhajāṁ | dirgha-kūrchaṁ mahi kirṇā vivarhair anda- jair iva | "Saineya, destroying thy host, converted the beautiful earth into a mass of mud with the flesh and blood of thousands of Kāmbojas,
Sakas, Sabaras, Kirātas, and Varvaras. The ground was covered with the shorn and hairless but long-bearded heads of the Dasyus, and their helmets, as if with birds bereft of their plumes." Here the word Dasyu is evidently a general term for the tribes named just before. Some of these same tribes had previously been called Mlechhas in verses 4716, 4723, and 4745. See also Sabhāp. 1198 f.

There is a passage in the Sāntiparvan, section 65, lines 2429 ff., which is worth quoting, as it shows that the Brāhmans of that age regarded the Dasyus as owing allegiance to Brahmanical institutions.

King Mādhātri had performed a sacrifice in the hope of obtaining a vision of Vishnu; who accordingly appeared to him in the form of Indra (verse 2399). The following is a part of their conversation. Mādhātri asks:

lindas, Ramaṭhas, Kāmbojas, men sprung from Brāhmans, and from Kshattryiyas, persons of the Vaiśya and Śūdra castes—how shall all these people of different countries practise duty, and what rules shall kings like me prescribe for those who are living as Dasyus? Instruct me on these points; for thou art the friend of our Kshattryiya race.' Indra answers: 'All the Dasyus should obey their parents, their spiritual directors, persons practising the rules of the four orders, and kings. It is also their duty to perform the ceremonies ordained in the Vedas. They should sacrifice to the Pitris, construct wells, buildings for the distribution of water, and resting places for travellers, and should on proper occasions bestow gifts on the Brāhmans. They should practise innocence, veracity, meekness, purity, and inoffensiveness; should maintain their wives and families; and make a just division of their property. Gifts should be distributed at all sacrifices by those who desire to prosper. All the Dasyus should offer costly pāka oblations. Such duties as these, which have been ordained of old, ought to be observed by all people.' Māndhāṭrī observes: 'In this world of men, Dasyus are to be seen in all castes, living, under other garbs, even among men of the four orders (āśramas).’ Indra replies: 'When criminal justice has perished, and the duties of government are disregarded, mankind become bewildered through the wickedness of their kings. When this Kṛita age has come to a close, innumerable mendicants and hypocrites shall arise, and the four orders become disorganized. Disregarding the excellent paths of ancient duty, and impelled by passion and by anger, men shall fall into wickedness,' etc. In these last lines it is implied that the Brahmanical polity of castes and orders was fully developed in the Kṛita [or golden] age. This idea, however, is opposed to the representations which we find in some though not in all other passages. See above, the various texts adduced in the first chapter.

In the Vishnu Purāṇa, Bhāratavarsha (India) is said to "have its eastern border occupied by the Kṛatas; and the western by the Yavana; while the middle is inhabited by Kshattryiyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras, engaged in their several fixed occupations of sacrifice, war, trade, etc." (Vishnu Purāṇa, ii. 3, 7. Pūrve Kṛitāḥ yasyante pāśchime Yavanāḥ sthitāḥ | brāhmaṇāḥ kṣhattriyāḥ vaiśyāḥ madhyo śūdrās cha bhāgaśāḥ | ṣyā-yuddha-vanijyādyair varttayanto vyavasthitāḥ |).
Manu's account of the origin of the Yavanas, Sakas, Kāmbojas, etc., corresponds with the tenor of the following story, which we find in the fourth book of the Vishnu Purāṇa, sect. 3. Bāhu, the seventh king in descent from Harischandra (see above, p. 379) was overcome by the Haihāyas and Tālajanghas, and compelled to fly with his queens to the forests, where he died. After his death one of his wives gave birth to a son, who received the name of Sagara. When he had grown up, the youth learnt from his mother all that had befallen his father.


"Being vexed at the loss of his paternal kingdom, he vowed to exterminate the Haihāyas and other enemies who had conquered it. Accordingly he destroyed nearly all the Haihāyas. When the Sakas, Yavanas, Kāmbojas, Pāradas, and Pahlavas were about to undergo a similar fate, they had recourse to Vasishṭha, the king’s family-priest, who interposed in their behalf in these words addressed to Sagara, representing them as virtually dead: ‘You have done enough, my son, in the way of pursuing these men, who are as good as dead. In order that your vow might be fulfilled, I have compelled them to abandon the duties of their caste, and all association with the twice-born.’ Agreeing to his spiritual guide’s proposal, Sagara compelled these tribes to alter their costume. He made the Yavanas shave their heads, the Sakas shave half their heads, the Pāradas wear long hair, and the Pahlavas beards. These and other Kshatriyas he deprived of the

3 See Wilson’s Vishnu Purāṇa, 4to. edit., p. 416 and 418 note. In the note to p. 418 the Avantyas are mentioned, on the authority of the Vāyu Purāṇa, as being a branch of the Haihāyas. In Manu, x. 21, the Āvantyas are said to be descended from Brāhmaṇa Vṛtyas.
study of the Vedas, and the vashaṭkāra. In consequence of their abandonment of their proper duties, and of thei rdesertion by the Brāhmans, they became Mlechhas.”

This story is also related in the Harivaṃśa, from which I extract the concluding part of the narrative:

773. Aurvaas tu jātakarmādi tasya kṛite vahātmanah | adhyāpya ve-
dān akhilān tata’stram pratyapadaya | āgneyaṁ tu mahābāhur amaran
api dussaham | sa tenāstra-balena balena cha samanvitaḥ | Haihayān
nījagānāsu kruddho Rudraḥ paśuṁ iva | ajahāra cha lokeshu kirttiṁ
kṛttimataṁ varaḥ | tataḥ S’akān sa-yavanān Kāmbojān Pāradāṁs tathā |
Pahlavāṁs chaiva niśeshān karttuvā vyavasītaṁ kila | te badhyamanāṁ
vireṇa Sagareṇa mahātmanā | Vaśiṣṭhaṁ saranāṁ gataṁ prāṇīpatu mani-
shānaṁ | Vaśiṣṭhaṁs tv atha tān drīṣṭvā samayena mahādyutiḥ | Sagaraṁ
vārayāmśa teshāṁ datvā ’bhayaṁ tada | Sagaraḥ svāṁ pratiyām ānaṁ
cha gwor vaṁyaṁ niśāmya cha | dharmam jaghāna teshāṁ vai veśānyatvam
chakāra ha | arddhaṁ S’akānāṁ śirasa mnūdayiteva vyasārayat | Yavan-
ānāṁ śīraḥ saṁvān Kāmbojanāṁ tathāvā ca | Pāradāṁs mukta-keśāścha
Pahlavāṁ śmaśru- dhāriṇaḥ | nissvāduḥyaṁ-vahaṭkāraṁ kṛitaṁ tena
mahātmanā | Sakaṁ Yavana-kāmbojaṁ Pāradāṁ Pahlavāṁ tathā | Koḷi-
sarpāḥ sa-Mahishāḥ Dārvas Cholāḥ sa-Keralāḥ | sarve te kṣattriyāṁ tātā
teshāṁ dharmo nirākriṇaḥ | Vaśiṣṭhaṁ-vachanād rājan Sagareṇa ma-
ḥātmanā |

“Aurva having performed Sagara’s natal and other rites, and taught
him all the Vedas, then provided him with a fiery missile, such as
even the gods could not withstand. By the power of this weapon,
and accompanied by an army, Sagara, incensed, speedily slew the
Haihayas, as Rudra slaughters beasts; and acquired great renown
throughout the world. He then set himself to exterminate the Sakas,
Yavanas, Kāmbojas, Pāradas, and Pahlavas. But they, when on the
point of being slaughtered by Sagara, had recourse to the sage
Vasiṣṭha, and fell down before him. Vasiṣṭha beholding them,
by a sign restrained Sagara, giving them assurance of protection.
Sagara, after considering his own vow, and listening to what his
teacher had to say, destroyed their caste (dharma), and made them
change their costumes. He released the Sakas, after causing the half
of their heads to be shaved;—and the Yavanas and Kāmbojas, after
having had their heads entirely shaved. The Pāradas were made to wear
long hair, and the Pahlavas to wear beards. They were all excluded from the study of the Vedas, and from the vashaṭkāra. The Sakas, Yavanas, Kāmbojas, Pāradas, Pahlavas, Kolisarpas, Mahishas, Dārvas, Cholas, and Keralas had all been Kshattriyas; but were deprived of their social and religious position by the great Sagara, according to the advice of Vaśishṭha.” Other tribes are mentioned in the following line who seem to have undergone the same treatment.

It would appear from this legend, as well as from the quotations which preceded it, that the Epic and Puranic writers believed all the surrounding tribes to belong to the same original stock with themselves; though they, at the same time, erroneously imagined that these tribes had fallen away from the Brahmanical institutions; thus assigning to their own polity an antiquity to which it could in reality lay no claim. Any further explanations on these points, however, must be sought in the second volume of this work.

In the passages quoted above, pp. 391, 393, and 398 from the Mahābhārata and Rāmāyaṇa, it is stated that Sakas, Yavanas, Pahlavas, etc., were created by Vaśishṭha’s wonder-working cow, in order to repel the aggression of Viśvāmitra. It does not, however, appear that it is the object of that legend to represent this miraculous creation as the origin of those tribes. The narrators, if they had any distinct meaning, may not have intended anything more than that the cow called into existence large armies, of the same stock with particular tribes previously existing.

It is not very easy to say whether it is only the inhabitants of Bhāratavarsha (viz. that portion of Jambudvīpa which answers to India) whom the Puranic writers intend to represent as deriving their origin from the four primeval Indian castes. Perhaps the writers themselves had no very clear ideas. At all events the conditions of life are different in the two cases. The accounts which these writers give us of the other divisions of Jambudvīpa, and of the other Dvīpas, or continents, of which they imagined the earth to be composed, and their respective inhabitants, will be considered in the next chapter.
CHAPTER VI.

PURANIC ACCOUNTS OF THE PARTS OF THE EARTH EXTERIOR TO BHĀRATAVARSHA, OR INDIA.

It will clearly appear from the contents of the present chapter that the authors or compilers of the Purāṇas in reality knew nothing of any part of the world except that immediately around them. Whenever they wander away beyond their own neighbourhood, they at once lose themselves in a misty region of fiction, and give the most unbridled scope to their fantastic imaginations.

The following is the account given in the Vishṇu Purāṇa regarding the divisions of the earth, and their inhabitants. Priyavrata, son of Svāyambhuva, or the first Manu (see above, pp. 65 and 72) who is separated from the present time by an enormous interval (see pp. 43 ff. and 298, above), “distributed the seven dvīpas,1 of which the earth is composed, among seven of his sons” (ii. 1, 7. Priyavrato dadau teshāṁ saptanām muni-sattama | vibhajya sapta dvīpāni Maitreya sumahātmanām).

The Bhāgavata Purāṇa gives us the following account, v. 1. 30. Tad anabhinandan sama-javena rathena jyotirmayena rajanīm api dinaṁ kariṣṭhāṁ ātē saṅkṛitvas taraṇīm anuparyyakramad dvitiyaḥ iva patangah | [evaṁ kurvāṇam Priyavrataṃ āgatyā Chaturānanaḥ “tavādhikāro 'yaṁ na bhavati” iti nivārayāmāsa] (The words in brackets are not in the Bombay edition, but are taken from Burnouf’s.) 31. Ye vai u ha tad-ratha-charaṇa-nemi-krita-parikhātās te sapta sindhavaḥ āsan yataḥ eva kritāḥ sapta bhuvo dvīpāḥ |2 “Priyavrata, being dissatisfied that only

1 The original division of the earth into seven continents is assigned to Nārāyaṇa in the form of Brahmā; see above, pp. 51 and 76.
2 In this passage we find the particles vai, u, ā, occurring all together as they do in the Vedic hymns and Brāhmaṇas. This circumstance might seem to suggest the
half the earth was illuminated at one time by the solar rays, "followed
the sun seven times round the earth in his own flaming car of equal
velocity, like another celestial orb, resolved to turn night into day.
[Brahmā, however, came and stopped him, saying this was not his
province.] The ruts which were formed by the motion of his chariot
wheels were the seven oceans. In this way the seven continents of
the earth were made."

The same circumstance is alluded to at the commencement of the
16th section of the same book, where the king says to the rishi:
verse 2. Tatvāpi Priyavrata-ratha-charaṇa-parikhātaṁ saptaśhitaṁ sapta
sindhavaḥ upaśiśiptah yataḥ etasyaḥ sapta-dvīpa-viśesha-vikalpas tvayā
bhagavan khalu sāchitaḥ ""The seven oceans were formed by the seven
ruts of the wheels of Priyavrata's chariot; hence, as you have indicated,
the earth has become divided into seven different continents."

It is clear that this account given by the Bhāgavata Purāṇa of
the manner in which the seven oceans and continents were formed does not
agree with the description in the Vishnū Purāṇa, as quoted above
in p. 51.

These seven continents are called "Jambu dvīpa, Plaksha dvīpa, Sāl-
possibility of the passage, or its substance, being derived from some of the Brahmānas
(to which, as we have seen, p. 155 note, the compiler of this Purāṇa was in the
habit of resorting for his materials); but the style has otherwise nothing of an
archaic caste, and I am not aware that the dvīpas are mentioned in any of the
Brahmanas. It is also remarkable that the words sapta sindhavaḥ are here used for
"seven oceans." This phrase occurs several times in the Vedas. For instance, it is
to be found in the Vājasānyeya Sanhitā (of the Yajur-veda), 38, 26, yavati dvīpa-
prithivi yavab ca sapta sindhavaṇa vītasūrī ""As wide as are the earth and sky,
and as far as the seven oceans extend." The commentator Mahādhara understands
the latter in the Puranic sense, as the oceans of milk, etc. (saptā sindhavaḥ sapta
samudrāḥ kṣhīrādyūḥ). The hemistic I have quoted from the Vāj. Sanhitā occurs
somewhat modified, and in a different connexion, in the Atharva-veda, iv. 6, 2. The
same phrase, sapta sindhavaḥ, is to be found also in several places in the first Book of
the Rig-veda. (See Benfey's Glossary to Sāma-veda, sub voce saptā.) In Rig-veda i. 32,
12, it is said to Indra avāvijñē saṁtāve sapta sindhūn ""Thou hast let loose the
seven rivers to flow." Sāyana understands this of the Ganges and other rivers, seven
in number, mentioned in the Rig Veda, x. 75, 5: imam me Gange Yamunē Sarasvatī
Sūtudrī stomaṁ sachiśa Parusahyot ""Receive this my hymn with favour, o Gāṅgā,
Yamunā, Sarasvatī, Sūtudrī, with the Parushā, etc." but in this distich ten rivers
in all are mentioned. (See Wilson's note to Rig-veda, i. 32, 12, vol. i. p. 88, of his
translation). See also hymns 34, 8; 35, 8; 71, 7; and 102, 2, of the first, and 58,
12, and 85, 1, of the eighth Books of the Rig-veda. The "seven rivers" of the
Veda are, according to Professor Müller (Chips from a German Workshop, vol. i.
p. 63), "the Indus, the five rivers of the Penjāb and the Sarasvatī."
mali dvīpa, Kuśa dvīpa, Krauncha dvīpa, Śāka dvīpa, and Pushkara dvīpa. They are surrounded severally by seven great seas, of salt water, sugar-cane juice, wine, clarified butter, curds, milk, and fresh water” (V.P. ii. 2, 4. Jambu-plakṣāhāveya dvīpau Sālmaliś chāparo dvīja | Kuśaḥ Kraun-
chas tathā Śākaḥ Pushkaraḥ chaia saptamaḥ | 5. Ete dvīpaḥ samudrais
tu saptā saptabhir āvṛitāḥ | lavanekṣuḥ-surā-sarpīr-dadhī-dugdha-jalaiḥ
samam |). Jambu dvīpa is in the centre of all these continents (Wilson,
vol. ii. p. 110). It fell to the lot of Agnīdhra, son of Priyavrata, who
again divided it among his nine sons (Wilson, ii. 101). In the centre
of Jambu dvīpa is the golden mountain Meru, 84,000 yojanas high, and
crowned by the great city of Brahma (ibid. p. 118). There are in this
continent six cross-ranges of boundary-mountains, those of Himavat
(= Himādri, or Himālaya), Hemakūṭa, and Nishadha lying south of
Meru; and those of Nila, Sveta, and Śrīpupin, situated to the north-
ward. Of these, Nishadha and Nila are the nearest to Meru, while
Himavat and Śrīpupin are at the south and north extremities. The
nine Varshas or divisions of Jambu dvīpa, separated by these and other
ranges, are Bhārata (India), south of the Himavat mountains, and the
southernmost of all; then (2) Kimpurusha, (3) Harivarsha, (4) Ilāvīta,
(5) Ramyaka, (6) Hiranyayana, and (7) Uttara Kuru, each to the north
of the last; while (8) Bhdrāsva and (9) Ketumāla lie respectively to the
east and west of Ilāvīta, the central region. Bhārata Varsha, and
Uttara Kuru, as well as Bhdrāsva and Ketumāla, situate on the
exterior of the mountain ranges. (Wilson, ii. pp. 114–116, and 123.)
The eight Varshas to the north of Bhārata Varsha (or India) are thus
described:
V.P. ii. 1, 11. Yāṇī Kimpurushādīṇī varshāṇy ashtau mahāmune |
teshāṁ svābhāvikā siddhiḥ suka-prāyā hy ayatnataḥ | 12. Viparyyayo

The Mahābhārata tells us, Bhishmaparvan, verses 227-8, in regard to the Varsha
of Ketumāla: ayaḥ daśa sahasrasya varshāṇōḥ tattva Bhārata | swarṇa-parvāḥ cha
naraḥ striyasiḥ chāsasara-sambhūtāḥ | anāmāyaḥ viśa-sokāḥ nityam mudita-mūnasāḥ |
jayaṁ mūnaṁ sattva nishtapta-kamaka-prabhāḥ | “The people there live ten
thousand years. The men are of the colour of gold, and the women fair as celestial
nymphs. Men are born there of the colour of burnished gold, live free from sickness
and sorrow, and enjoy perpetual happiness.” The men by the side of the mountain
Gandhamādana, west of Meru, are said (v. 231) “to be black, of great strength and
vigour, while the women are of the colour of blue lotuses, and very beautiful” (tattva
kṛṣṇāḥ naraḥ rojaṁ tejo-yuktāḥ mahābaliḥ | striyāḥ chopala-parvāḥ saṃvāḥ
supriya-darśanāḥ).
na tatträsti jarä-mrätyu-bhayaṁ na eha | dharmādharman na teshv āstāṁ
nottamādhamā-madhyamāḥ | na teshv āsti yugāvasthā kshettresho ashtau
sarvadā |

"In the eight Varshas, called Kimpurusha and the rest (i.e. in all except Bhärata Varsha) the inhabitants enjoy a natural perfection attended with complete happiness obtained without exertion. There is there no vicissitude, nor decrepitude, nor death, nor fear; no distinction of virtue and vice, none of the inequalities denoted by the words best, worst, and intermediate, nor any change resulting from the succession of the four yugas." And again:

ii. 2, 35. Yāni Kimpurushadhyāni varshāny ashtau mahāmune | na
teshu śoko nāyāso nōdeya-kahud-bhayādikam | susthāḥ prajāḥ nirvātanāḥ
sarva-duḥkha-vivarjītāḥ | 36. Daśa-devadāsa-varshānāṁ sahasrānī sthirā-
yushāḥ | na teshu varshate devo bhaumyāṇy ambhāṁsi teshu vai | 37.
Kṛita-tretādikā naiv ca teshu sthāneshu kalpanā |

"In those eight Varshas there is neither grief, nor weariness, nor anxiety, nor hunger, nor fear. The people live, in perfect health, free from every suffering, for ten or twelve thousand years. Indra does not rain on those Varshas, for they have abundance of springs. There is there no division of time into the Kṛita, Tretā, and other ages."

The Uttara Kurus, it should be remarked, may have been a real people, as they are mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, viii. 14: 4

Athā enam udīcyāṁ diśi viśve devaḥ šadbhīśi chaiva panchaviṁśa'ir
ahobhir abhyashinchann etena cha trichena etena cha yajushā etābhīśi cha
vyāhritibhir vairājīyāya | tasmād etsayām udīcyāṁ diśi ye ke cha parena
Himavantaṁ janapecdaḥ "Uttara-Kuravah Uttara-Madrāḥ" iti vairā-
jjāya eva te 'bhishichyante |

"Then in the northern region during six days on which the Panchaviṁśa stoma was recited, the Viśve-devas inaugurated him (Indra) for glorious dominion with these three rik-verses, this yajush-verse, and these mystic monosyllables. Wherefore the several nations who dwell in this northern quarter, beyond the Himavat, the Uttara Kurus and the Uttara Madras, are consecrated to glorious dominion (vairājya), and people term them the glorious (vīrāj)." See Colebrooke's Miso. Essays, i. 38–43; Dr. Haug's translation of the Ait. Brāhmaṇa; and Prof. Weber's review of this translation in Ind. Studien, ix. pp. 341 f.

4 Quoted by Weber in Ind. St. i. 218.
In another passage of the same work, however, the Uttara Kurus are treated as belonging to the domain of mythology:

Ait. Br. viii. 23. Etāṁ ha vai aindrām mahābhishkekaṁ Viśiṣṭhaḥ Śātaḥavyo ’tyarātaye Jānanapaye pravācha | tasmād u Atyarātir Jānanaprīṇir arājā san vidyāyā samantaṁ sarvataṁ prithiviṁ jayan pariyaṁ | sa ha uvācha Viśiṣṭhaḥ Śātyaḥavyo "ajaishīr vai samantaṁ sarvataṁ prithiviṁ mahad mā gamayā" iti | sa ha uvācha Atyarātir Jānanapīṁ "yadā brāhmaṇa ātīrūra-kurūn ājeyam tretām u ha eva prithiyavo rājā svāḥ senāpatir eva te ’haṁ syām" iti | sa ha uvācha Viśiṣṭhaḥ Śātyaḥavyo “deva-khettraṁ vai tād na vai tād maṁtya jēto arhaty adraksho me ā ’tāh idāṁ dade” iti | tato ha Atyarātirīm Jānanapīṁ ātūtā-viryyam niśāsakram amitra-tapanaḥ Sushmīnas Śāviyo rājā jaghāna | tasmād evāṁ vidushe brāhmaṇāya evāṁ-chakrushe khaṭahiryo na druhyed na id rāṣṭrād avapadyeyad (?) na id vāma-prāṇo jahad iti |

“Śātyaḥavya of the family of Viśiṣṭha declared this great inauguration similar to Indra’s to Atyarāti, son of Jānanapa; and in consequence Atyarāti, though not a king, by his knowledge, went round the earth on every side to its ends, reducing it to subjection. Śātyaḥavya then said to him, ‘Thou hast subdued the earth in all directions to its limits; exalt me now to greatness.’ Atyarāti replied, ‘When, o Brāhmaṇ, I conquer the Uttara Kurus, thou shalt be king of the earth, and I will be only thy general.’ Śātyaḥavya rejoined, ‘That is the realm of the gods; no mortal may make the conquest of it: Thou hast wronged me; therefore I take all this away from thee.’ In consequence Sushmina, king of the Sivas, vexer of his foes, slew Atyarāti son of Jānanapa who had been bereft of his valour and energy. Wherefore let no Kshattriya wrong a Brāhmaṇ who possesses such knowledge and has so acted, lest he should be expelled from his kingdom, be short-lived, and perish.”

The Uttara Kurus are also mentioned in the description of the northern region in the Kishkindhā Kānda of the Rāmāyaṇa, 43, 38, Uttarā Kuravas tatra krita-punya-pratīśrāyaḥ | “There are the Uttara Kurus, the abodes of those who have performed works of merit.” In v. 57 it is said: na kathanehāna gantavyāṁ kurūnām uttareṇa vaiḥ | anyeshāṁ api bhūtānām nānakramati vai gatiḥ | “You must not go to the north of the Kurus: other beings also may not proceed further.”

5 See Colebrooke’s Essays, i. 48; Dr. Haug’s translation; and Ind. Stud. ix. 346.
In the same way when Arjuna, in his career of conquest, arrives at the country of the Uttara Kurus in Harivarsha, he is thus addressed by the guards at the gate of the city, M. Bh. Sabhāparvan, 1045:

Pārtha neDaṁ teyā śakyaṁ puraṁ jetoṁ kathanchana | upāvartaṁ kalyāṇa paryāptam idam āchyaṁ | idam puraṁ yāḥ praviṣed dhruvaṁ na sa bhaved naraḥ | . . . na chaṭṭraṁ kinechiṁ jetevam Arjunātrā pra-
driṣyate | Uttarāḥ Kuravo hy ete nāttra yuddham pravarttate | praviśho 'pi hi Kaunteya neha drakṣhyasi kinchana | na hi mānusha-dehena śakyaṁ attrābhivikāṣhitum |

"Thou canst not, son of Prithā, subdue this city. Refrain, fortunate man, for it is completely secure. He who shall enter this city must be certainly more than man . . . Nor is there anything to be seen here which thou canst conquer. Here are the Uttara Kurus, whom no one attempts to assail. And even if thou shouldst enter, thou couldst behold nothing. For no one can perceive anything here with human senses."  

In the Anuśāsanapurvan, line 2841, Kuśika says, on seeing a magic palace formed by Chyavana (see above, p. 475):

Aho saha śaṁreṇa prāpto 'smi paramāṁ gatim | Uttarān vā Kurūn punyāṁ athava' 'py Amarāvatim |

"I have attained, even in my embodied condition, to the heavenly state; or to the holy Northern Kurus, or to Amarāvatī [the city of Indra]!"

"The country to the north of the ocean, and to the south of the Himādri (or snowy range), is Bhārata Varsha, where the descendants of Bharata dwell" (V.P. ii. 3, 1. Uttarāṁ yad samudraśya Himādres chaiva dakṣiṇam | varshaṁ tad Bhārataṁ nāma Bhārati yatra santatiḥ). It is divided into nine parts (bhedāḥ), Indradvipa, Kaśerumata, Tāmara-varna, Gābhāstimaṭ, Nāgadvipa, Saumya, Gāndharva, Vāruṇa; and "this ninth dvipa," which is not named, is said to be "surrounded by the ocean" ayaṁ tu navamāṁ teṣāṁ ṛṣiṇaṁ dvipaṁ sāgara-samhitōh, and to be a thousand yojanas long from north to south. "On the east side of it are the Kīrātas, on the west the Yavanas, and in the centre are the Brāhmans, Kshattriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras, following their respective occupations of sacrifice, arms, trade, etc." (The text of this passage, V.P. ii. 3, 7, has been already quoted in p. 485).

6 See the second vol. of this work, pp. 332-337, and vol. iv., p. 375.
The Vishṇu Purāṇa contains a very short list of the tribes inhabiting Bhārata Varsha. (See Wilson, vol. ii. pp. 132 f.) It specifies, as the principal, only the Kuras, Pāñchālas, the people of Kāmarūpa, the Puṇḍras, Kalingas, Magadhas, Saurāśṭras, Sūras, Bhīras, Arbudas, Kārūshas, Mālavas, Sauvīras, Saindhavas, Huṇas, Sālvas, Sākalas, Madras, Rāmas, Ambaśṭhas, and Pāraśikas. These tribes seem to be all confined to India and its vicinity.

The praises of Bhārata Varsha are celebrated as follows:


"In Bhārata Varsha, and nowhere else, do the four Yugas, Kṛita, Tretā, Dwāpara, and Kali exist. 12. Here devotees perform austerities, and priests sacrifice; here gifts are bestowed, to testify honour, for the sake of the future world. In Jambudvīpa Vishṇu, the sacrificial Man, whose essence is sacrifice, is continually worshipped by men with sacrifices; and in other ways in the other dvīpas. 13. In this respect Bhārata is the most excellent division of Jambudvīpa; for this is the land of works, while the others are places of enjoyment. Perhaps in a thousand thousand births, a living being obtains here that most excellent condition, humanity, the receptacle of virtue. The gods sing, 'Happy are those beings, who, when the rewards of their merits have

7 The list in the Mahābhārata (Bhishmaparvan, 346 ff.), is much longer. See Wilson's Vīṣṇu Purāṇa, vol. ii. pp. 132 f., and 156 ff.

8 ""In other ways," i.e. in the form of Soma, Vāyu, Śūryya, etc." (Anyathā Soma-vāyu-sūrya-vīdī-rūpaḥ | ). Commentator.
been exhausted in heaven, are, after being gods, again born as men in Bhārata Varsha; (14) who, when born in that land of works, resign to the supreme and eternal Vishnu their works, without regard to their fruits, and attain by purity to absorption in him. 15. We know not where we shall next attain a corporeal condition, when the merit of our works shall have become exhausted; but happy are those men who exist in Bhārata Varsha with perfect senses."

To the same effect the Bhāgavata Purāṇa says, v. 17, 11:

\[\text{Tatārāpi Bhāratam eva varṣaṁ kārmakhettram anyāny ashta-varṣśāni svargīṇāṁ punya-śeshopabhoga-sthānāṁ bhūmaṁ svarga-paddāni vyapādiśanti |} 12. \text{Eshu purushāṁ ayuta-purushāyur-varṣhuaṁ devakalpānam māyāyutam prāgaṁ vajra-saṁhanana-vayo-modamāru-maṁsauratam mithuna-vyavāyāpa-svarga-varsha-dhritaika-garbha-kalattrānāṁ tretā-yuga-saṁmah kālo varttate |}

"Of these, Bhāratavarsha alone is the land of works: the other eight Varshas are places where the celestials enjoy the remaining rewards of their works; they are called terrestrial paradises. 12. In them men pass an existence equal to that of the Tretā age, living for the space of ten thousand ordinary lives, on an equality with gods, having the vitality of ten thousand elephants, and possessed of wives who bear one child after a year's conception following upon sexual intercourse attended by all the gratification arising from adamantine bodies and from vigorous youth."

The commentator remarks on verse 11: \[\text{Divya-bhauma-bila-bhedāt trividhaḥ svargah | tatra bhauma-svargaya padāni sthānāṁ vyapa-diśanti | "Heaven is of three kinds, in the sky, on earth, and in the abyss. Here the other Varshas are called terrestrial heavens."}

It is curious to remark that in the panegyric on Bhārata Varsha it is mentioned as one of the distinguishing advantages of that division of Jambudvīpa that sacrifice is performed there, though, a little further on, it is said to be practised in Sālmali dvīpa also.

It would at first sight appear from the preceding passage (ii. 3, 11) of the Vishnu Purāṇa (as well as from others which we shall encounter below), to be the intention of the writer to represent the inhabitants of Bhārata Varsha as a different race, or, at least as living under quite different conditions, from the inhabitants of the other dvīpas, and even of the other divisions (varshas) of Jambu dvīpa itself. From the use
of the word mānushya (humanity) here applied to the inhabitants of Bhārata Varsha, viewed in reference to the context, it would seem to be a natural inference that all the people exterior to it were beings of a different race. Yet in the descriptions of Kuśa dvīpa and Pushkara dvīpa (see below) the words manujāḥ and mānavāḥ “descendants of Manu,” or “men,” are applied to the dwellers in those continents. In the passage of the Jātimālā, moreover, translated by Mr. Colebrooke (Misc. Essays, ii. 179), we are told that “a chief of the twice-born tribe was brought by Vishṇu’s eagle from Sāka dvīpa; thus have Sāka dvīpa Brāhmans become known in Jambu dvīpa.” According to this verse, too, there should be an affinity of race between the people of these two dvīpas. It is also to be noted that the descendants of Priyavrata became kings of all the dvīpas, as well as of all the varshas of Jambu dvīpa (see above, pp. 489, 491). And in the passage quoted above, p. 478, from the Vishṇu Purāṇa, iv. 11, 3, it is said of Arjuna, son of Kṛitavīrya, that he was “lord of the seven dvīpas,” “that he ruled over the earth with all its dvīpas.” If, however, the kings were of the human race, it is natural to infer the same of the people.

But, in a subject of this sort, where the writers were following the suggestions of imagination only, it is to be expected that we should find inconsistencies.

Jambu dvīpa is surrounded by a sea of salt water (Wilson, V.P. ii. 109); and that sea again is bounded on its outer side by the dvīpa or continent of Plaksha running all round it. (V.P. ii. 4, 1. Kshārodena yathā dvīpo Jambu-sanjno ‘bhīveshṭitaḥ | saṃveshṭya kṣhāraṃ udadhim Plaksha-dvīpas tathā sthitāḥ). According to this scheme the several continents and seas form concentric circles, Jambu dvīpa being a circular island occupying the centre of the system.

Plaksha dvīpa is of twice the extent of Jambu dvīpa. The character and condition of its inhabitants are described as follows:


9 Purārāvas is said to have possessed thirteen islands (dvīpas) of the ocean (above p. 307).
varṇas tatrāpi chatvāras tān nibodha gacchami te | Aryyakāh Kuravaś chaiva Vivāšāh Bhāvinaś cha ye | vipra-kṣatrīya-vaiśyās te śūdrās cha muni-sattama |

“In those seven provinces [which compose Plaksha dvīpa] the division of time into Yugas does not exist: but the character of existence is always that of the Tretā age. In the [five] dvīpas, beginning with Plaksha and ending with Śāka, the people live 5000 years, free from sickness. In those five dvīpas duties arise from the divisions of castes and orders. There are there also four castes, Āryyakas, Kurus, Vivāsas, and Bhāvins, who are the Brāhmans, Kṣatrīyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras,’’ and whose worship is thus described:

9. Ijyate tattra bhagavāns tair varnair Āryyakādibhiḥ | soma-rūpi jagat-srasṭā sarvah sarveśvare Hariḥ | “Hari who is All, and the lord of all, and the creator of the world, is adored in the form of Soma by these classes, the Āryyakas, etc.”

The inhabitants of this dvīpa receive different names in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, being there called (v. 20, 4) “Hansas, Patangas, Ārdhva-yanas, and Satyāngas, four castes, who, purified from passion and darkness by the touch of the waters of these rivers, live a thousand years, resemble the gods in their appearance and in their manner of procreation, and worship with the triple Veda the divine Soul, the Sun, who is the gate of heaven, and who is co-essential with the Vedas” (Yūsām jalopasperśana-viḍhūta-rajas-tamaso Hāmā-patangorudhāyāyana-satyāng-śanjñaś chatvāro varṇāḥ sahasrāyusha vibudhopama-sandarśana-prajananāḥ scarga-devāraṁ trayyā vidyāya bhagavantaṁ trayāmayaṁ sūryam ātmānaṁ yajante).

In regard to Plaksha and the other four following dvīpas, the Bhāgavata Purāṇa says, ibid. para. 6, that “their men are all alike in respect of natural perfection as shewn in length of life, senses, vigour, force, strength, intelligence, and courage” (Plakṣhāḍishu panchasu puruṣāḥ nam aṣṭar cakṣa vikramaḥ iti cha sarveshāṁ atपattiki siddhir avijñeyena vartate |).

Plaksha dvīpa is surrounded by a sea of sugar-cane juice of the same compass as itself. ii. 4, 9, Plaksha - dvīpa - pramāṇena Plaksha - dvīpaḥ samāvritaḥ | tathaivekshu-rasodena parivesānukāriṇā | Round the outer margin of this sea, and twice as extensive, runs Sālmala dvīpa (verse 11. Sālmaleṇa samudro 'sau dvīpenekshu - rasodakaḥ | vistara-
devugenaṇtha sarvataḥ saṁvritaḥ sthitah |. It is divided into seven Varshas, or divisions. Of their inhabitants it is said:

V. P. ii, 4, 12. Saptaitāni tu varṣaṇi chāturavarṣya-yutāni cha | Sālmale ye tu varṇās cha vasanti te mahāmune | kapilās chārṇaḥ pitaḥ kriṣṇaḥ chaiva prithak prithak | brāhmaṇaḥ khaṭṭriyāḥ vaiśyāḥ Śūdrās chaiva yajanti te | bhagavantāṁ samastasya Viṣṇum ātmānam ayyayam | Vāyubhātām makha-br̥hṭhāya yajvino yajna-saṁsthitam | 13. Devānāṁ atta saṁnīdyam ativa samanoharam |

"These seven Varshas have a system of four castes. The castes which dwell there are severally the Kapilas, Aruṇas, Pitkas, and Kṛishnas (or the Tawny, the Purple, the Yellow, and the Black). These, the Brāhmaṇas, Kshattriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras, worship with excellent sacrifices Viṣṇu, the divine and imperishable Soul of all things, in the form of Vāyu, and abiding in sacrifice. Here the vicinity of the gods is very delightful to the soul."

The Bhāgavata Purāṇa says of this dvīpa, v. 20, 11: Tad-varṣaḥ-purushāḥ Srutadhara-vīryadhara-vasundhreshudhara-saṁjñaḥ bhagavantām vedamayaṁ somaṁ ātmānaṁ vedena yajante | "The men of the different divisions of this dvīpa, called Srutadharas, Vīryadharas, Vasundharas, and Ishunndharas, worship with the Veda the divine Soul Soma, who is co-essential with the Veda."

This dvīpa is surrounded by a sea of wine of the same compass as itself (v. 13. Esha dvīpaḥ samudreṇa surodena saṁvritaḥ | vistārāḥ chhālmalasyaiva samena tu samanatataḥ). The exterior shore of this sea is encompassed by Kuśa dvīpa, which is twice as extensive as Sālmala dvīpa (v. 13. Surodaṇaḥ parīvritaḥ Kuśadvīpena sarvataḥ | Sālmalasya tu vistārād devugena samanatataḥ). The inhabitants of Kuśa dvīpa are thus described, V. P. ii 4, 14:

Tasyaṁ vasanti manuṣyaḥ sahasa Daitya-dānavaṁ | tathaiva deva-ganḍhara- yaksya- kimpurushādayah | varṇās tattraṇi chatvāro nijānushṭhāna-tatparaḥ | Damināḥ Sūshmināḥ Śnehaḥ Mandehās cha mahāmune | brāhmaṇaḥ khaṭṭriyāḥ vaiśyāḥ Śūdrās chānukramoditaḥ | 15. Yathoktaka- karma-karttītēt svadhikāra-kahayāya te | tattra te tu Kuṣa-dvīpe Brahmatu-paṁ Janārddanam | yajantaḥ kṣhapayanty ugranādhiśkāraṁ phala-pradam |

"In this set of Varshas (of Kuśa dvīpa) dwell men with Daityas, Dānavas, Devas, Gandharvas, Yaksas, Kimpurushas, and other beings.
There, too, there are four castes, pursuing their proper observances, Damins, Sushmins, Snehas, and Mandehas, who in the order specified are Brâhmans, Kshatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śûdras. In order to destroy their right [to reward] derived from the performance of these works, they worship Janârdana in the form of Brahma, and so neutralize this direful merit which brings rewards.”

Of Kuśa dvīpa the Mahâbhârata tells us, Bhîshmaparvan, verses 455–7: Eteshu deva-gandharvâḥ prajâścha jagatiśvara | viharante ramante cha na teshu mriyate janaḥ | na teshu dasyavaḥ santi mlechha-jâtyo ’pi vâ nripa | gaurya-prâyo janaḥ sarvaḥ sukumâras cha pârthiva | “In these (Varshas of Kuśa dvīpa), gods, Gandharvas, and living creatures, amuse and enjoy themselves. No one dies there. There are no Dasyus or Mlechhas there. The people are fair, and of very delicate forms.”

The Bhágavata Purâṇa, v. 20, 16, says, “The people of this dvīpa are called Kuśalas, Kovidas, Abhiyuktas, and Kulakas” (Kuśa-dvīpaukasaḥ Kuśala-kovidâbhiyukta-kulaka-sanjñāḥ).

Kuśa dvīpa is surrounded by a sea of clarified butter, of the same circumference as itself. Around this sea runs Krauncha dvīpa which is twice as large as Kuśa dvīpa. The V. P. says, ii. 4, 19: Sarvesh uv eteshu ramyeshu varsha-śaila-varshu cha | nivasaṇti nirâtankaḥ saha deva-gañâṭiḥ prajâḥ | Pushkarâḥ Pushkalâḥ Dhanyâs Tishmâś châttra mahâmune | brâhmanâḥ kshatriyâḥ vâisyâḥ âdârâs chânukrâmoditaḥ | “In all these pleasant division-mountains of this dvīpa the people dwell, free from fear, in the society of the gods. [These people are] the Pushkaras, Pushkalas, Dhanyas, and Tishmas, who, as enumerated in order, are the Brâhmans, Kshatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śûdras.” The inhabitants of this dvīpa are called in the Bhágavata Purâṇa, v. 20, 22, “ . . . . Purushas, Rishabhhas, Drâviṇas, and Devakas” (Purushashrshabha-dravîṇa-devaka-sanjñâḥ). This dvīpa is encompassed by the sea of curds, which is of the same circumference as itself. The sea again, on its exterior edge, is surrounded by Sâka dvīpa,10 a continent twice the size of Krauncha dvīpa.

Of Sâka dvīpa it is said in the Vishnu Purâṇa, ii. 4, 23 ff.: Tattva puyāḥ janapadâs châteurvarnya-samaneśṭaḥ | nadyâs châtra mahâpuryâḥ sarva-pâpa-bhayāpahâh | . . . . tâḥ pibanti mudâ yuktâh Jadadâdhu ye shtitaḥ | varveshhu te janapadâḥ svargâd abhyetya me—

10 In the M. Bh. (Bhishmap. v. 408 ff.) Sâkadvipa comes next after Jambudvîpa.
There are holy countries, peopled by persons belonging to the four castes; and holy rivers which remove all sin and fear. . . . The people who dwell in these divisions, Jalada, etc. [of Sāka dvīpa], drink these rivers with pleasure, even when they have come to earth from Śvarga. There is among them no defect of virtue; nor any mutual rivalry; nor any transgression of rectitude in those seven countries. [There dwell] Magas, Māgadhās, Mānasas, and Mandagas, of whom the first are principally Brāhmans; the second are Kshatriyas; the third are Vaiśyas, and the fourth are Śudras. By them Viṣṇu, in the form of the Sun, is worshipped with the prescribed ceremonies, and with intent minds."

Of this dvīpa the Mahābhārata tells us, Bīshmaparvan, verse 410, that the "people there are holy, and no one dies" (tattra punyāḥ janapadāḥ na tattra mriyate narāḥ). One of the mountains there is called Śyāma (black), "whence men have got this black colour" (verse 420. Tatāḥ śyānatvam āpannāḥ janāḥ janapādēsvaḥ). Dhṛtarāṣṭra then says to his informant Sanjaya that he has great doubts as to "how living creatures have become black." Sanjaya promises in the following lines, the sense of which is not very clear, to explain the mystery: 422. Sarveshu eva mahārāja dvīpesu Kuru-nandana | gaurah kristnāḥ cha pātango yato varṇāntare dvijāḥ | śyāmo yasmāt pravṛttito vai tat te vakṣyāmi Bhārata | But as he proceeds no further, we lose the benefit of his solution of this interesting physiological problem. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa, v. 20, 28, gives the four classes of men in this dvīpa the names of Ritavratas, Satyavratas, Dānavratas, and Anuvratas (tad-varṣa-puruṣaḥ Ritavrata-Satyavrata-Dānavrata-Anuvrata-nāmaṁ). This Sāka dvīpa is surrounded by the ocean of milk as by an armlet. This ocean again is encompassed on its outer side by Pushkara dvīpa, which is twice as extensive as Sāka dvīpa.

Of Pushkara dvīpa it is said, Viṣṇu Purāṇa, ii. 4, 28 ff.: 
Daśa-varṣa-sahasrāṇi tattra jīvanti mānavaḥ | nirāmayaḥ viśokāscha
rāga-devesha-vivarjitaḥ | adhamottamau na tesv āstām na badhya-badha-
kau deva | nershyā 'sūya bhayaṁ rosho dosho lohādiṁ ca na cha | . . . .
Tulya-veśāṁ tu manujāḥ devais tattraika-rūpiṇāḥ | 31. Varnāśramāchāra-
hinam dharmācharaṇa- varjīṭam | trayi - vārttā - daṇḍaniti- suśrūṣā-
rahitaṁ cha yat | 32. Vareha-devaṁ tu maitreya bhauna-svargo 'yam
uttamaṁ | saroṣya svāhu-daḥ kālo jāra-balā- varjīṭaḥ |

"In this dvīpa men live ten thousand years, free from sickness and
sorrow, from affection and hatred. There is no distinction among them
of highest and lowest, of killer and slain; there is no envy, nor ill-will,
nor fear, nor anger, nor defect, nor covetousness, nor other fault; there
is there neither truth nor falsehood. Men there are all of the same ap-
pearance, of one form with the gods. The two divisions of this dvīpa
have no rules of caste or orders, nor any observances of duty; the three
Vedas, the Purāṇas (or, trade), the rules of criminal law and service do
not exist. This [dvīpa] is a most excellent terrestrial heaven; where
time brings happiness to all, and is exempt from decay, sickness, and
all other evils." 11

Of all the dvīpas together, the Mahābhārata says, Bīṣhmaparvan,
verses 468 ff. :

Evāṁ dvīpesku sarveshu praṇāṁ Kuru-nandana | brahmacharyyena
satyena praṇāṁ hi damena cha | ārogyaṁ pramāṇābyam dvīgnaṁ
dvīgnaṁ tataḥ | eko janapado rājan dvīpesku etesu Bhārata | uktāḥ

11 In the same way as Pushkara, the remotest dvīpa, is here described to be the
scene of the greatest perfection, we find Homer placing the Elysian plains on the
furthest verge of the earth:

"Thee, favoured man, to earth's remotest end,
The Elysian plain, the immortal gods shall send,—
That realm which fair-haired Rhadamanthys sways,
Where, free from toil, men pass their tranquil days.
No tempests vex that land, no rain, nor snow;
But ceaseless Zephyrs from the ocean blow,
Which sweetly breathe and gently stir the air,
And to the dwellers grateful coolness bear."
Thus in all these dvīpas each country doubly exceeds the former one in the abstinence, veracity, and self-restraint, in the health and the length of life of its inhabitants. In these dvīpas the people is one, and one sort of action is perceivable. Prajāpati, the lord, wielding his sceptre, himself governs these dvīpas. He, the king, the auspicious one (śīva), the father, along with the patriarchs, protects all creatures, ignorant as well as learned.” (So there are differences of intellectual condition in these dvīpas after all) “All these people eat prepared food, which comes to them of itself.”

Pushkara is surrounded by a sea of fresh water equal to itself in compass. What is beyond is afterwards described:

V.P. ii. 4, 37. Svādādakasya parato dṛṣyate loka-saṁsthitiḥ | dvīpavā kāñcānā bhūmiḥ sarva-jantu-viśvarjītā | 38. Lokālokas tataḥ sailio yoja- nāyuta-visthitā | uchchhrānyāpi tāvantī sahasrāny acharo hi saḥ | tatas tamaḥ samāvṛtya tuṁ śailaṁ sarvataḥ sthitam | tamaḥ chanda-kaṭāhena samantāt parisveshṭitalam |

“On the other side of the sea is beheld a golden land of twice its extent, but without inhabitants. Beyond that is the Lokāloka mountain, which is ten thousand yojanas in breadth, and as many thousands in height. It is on all sides invested with darkness. This darkness is encompassed by the shell of the mundane egg.”

In a following chapter, however, (the seventh) of this same book, the

12 See Manu, i. verses 9 and 12, quoted above, p. 35. The thirteenth verse is as follows: Tābhyaṁ sa śakalābhyaṁ cha divam bhūmiṁ cha nirmane | madhye vyayama diśai chāśṭīvopūṁ sthānaṁ cha īśvētam | “From these two halves of the shell he fashioned the heaven and the earth, and in the middle (he formed) the sky, and the eight quarters, and the eternal abode of the waters.” In regard to the darkness (tamaḥ) with which the mountain Lokāloka is said to be enveloped, compare Manu iv. 242, where the spirits of the departed are said to pass by their righteousness through the darkness which is hard to be traversed (dharmena hi sahāyena tamaḥ tarati dūstaram); and Atharva-veda, ix. 5, 1, “Crossing the darkness, in many directions immense, let the unborn ascend to the third heaven” (tīrte tamaṁśi bahūdha mahānti ajo nākam a kramataṁ trītīyam). See Journal Royal Asiatic Society for 1865, pp. 298, note 2, and p. 304.
shell of the mundane egg is said to be outside of the seven spheres of which this system is composed:

V.P. ii. 7, 19. Ete sapta mayā lokāḥ Maitreya kathitās tava | pātālāni cha saptāva brahmāṇḍasyaūṣa vistarāḥ | etad anda-kaṭāhena tiryak chordāvam adhas tathā | kapitthasya yathā vijan sarvālo vai samāvritam |

“These seven spheres have been described by me; and there are also seven Pātalas: this is the extent of Brahmā’s egg. The whole is surrounded by the shell of the egg at the sides, above, and below, just as the seed of the wood-apple (is covered by the rind).”

This system, however, it appears, is but a very small part of the whole of the universe:

Ibid. verse 24. Andaṇāṁ tu sahasrāṇāṁ sahasrāṇy ayutāni cha | idrīśāṇāṁ tathā tattra koṭi-koṭi-śatāni cha |

“There are thousands and ten thousands of thousands of such mundane eggs; nay hundreds of millions of millions.”

Indian mythology, when striving after sublimity, and seeking to excite astonishment, often displays an extravagant and puerile facility in the fabrication of large numbers. But, in the sentence last quoted, its conjectures are substantially in unison with the discoveries of modern astronomy; or rather, they are inadequate representations of the simple truth, as no figures can express the contents of infinite space.
APPENDIX.

Page 6, line 24.

Professor Wilson’s analyses of the Agni, Brahma-vaivartta, Vishnu and Vayu Puranas, were originally published, not in the “Gleanings in Science,” but in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, vol. i.; and are reprinted in the 3rd vol. of Wilson’s Collected Works, edited by Dr. R. Rost.

Page 37, line 1.

“Abodes of gods.” Böhtlingk and Roth in their Sanskrit Lexicon, s.v. nikaya, shew that in other passages, if not here also, the compound word deva-nikaya should be rendered “classes, or assemblages, of gods.”

Page 50, line 25.

Compare the passage, quoted below, in the note on p. 115, from the Sastiparvan of the M. Bh., verses 6130 ff.

Pages 90 ff.

The representations of the Krita yuga are not always consistent. In the Droñaparvan, verses 2023 ff. a story is told of King Akampana, who lived in that age, and who was yet so far from enjoying the tranquillity generally predicated of that happy time that he was overcome by his enemies in a battle, in which he lost his son, and suffered in consequence severe affliction.

Page 97, note 190.

It is similarly said in the Droñaparvan, verse 2395: Kshatad nas trayate sarvan ity evaṁ kshattriyaḥ bhavat | “He (Prithu) became a Kshattriya by delivering us all from injuries.” See also Sastiparvan, verse 1031.
The Sāntiparvan of the M. Bh., verses 6130 ff., gives a similar description of the original state of all things, and of the birth of Brahmā. Bhīshma is the speaker: Salilaikāryavān tāta purā sarvam abhūd idam | nishprakampam anākāsam anirdesa-mahītalam | tamasā vṛtam asparśam api gambhira-dārśanam | niśabdaṁ vā 'prameyaṁ cha tattra jajne Pitāmahaḥ | so 'ṣrijād vātam agniṁ cha bhāskaraṁ chāpi vīryavān | ākāsas arsiṣajā chodddhevaṁ adho bhūmiṁ cha nairṛtitam | nabhaḥ sa-chandra-tāraṁ cha nakshatrāṇi grahāṁs tathā | saṁvatsaraṁ pītān māsān pakṣān atha lavan khaṇān | tataḥ sārīrān loka-sthānān sthāpayiteva Pitāmahaḥ | janayāmsa bhagavān putrān uttama-tejasāḥ | 6135. Marichim rishim Attriṇa cha Pulastyaṁ Pulahaṁ Kratun | Vaśishṭhāngirasau chobhau Rudraṁ cha prabhum āśvaram | Prachetasas tathā Dakshaḥ kanyāḥ shasṭhim ajjajanat | tāḥ vai brahmarshayaḥ sarvāḥ prajārtham pratis-pedire | tābhya viśeṁni bhūtāṁ devaṁ pītri-ghanās tatha | gardhavāpa-sarasāṁ chaiva rakshāṁsi vividhāni cha | . . . . . . 6149. Jajne tāta jagat sarvaṁ tathā sthāvāra-jangamam | 6150. Bhūta-sargam imaṁ kriṭeva sarva-loka-pitāmahāḥ | śāścataṁ ved-apāthitaṁ dharmam prayuyuṁ tataḥ | tasmin dharme sthitah devāḥ saḥācāryya-putohitāḥ | adityāḥ vasavo rudrāḥ sa-sādhyāḥ marud-āśvinaḥ | “This entire universe was formerly one expanse of water, motionless, without aether, without any distinguishable earth, enveloped in darkness, imperceptible to touch, with an appearance of (vast) depth, silent, and measureless. There Pitāmaha (Brahmā) was born. That mighty god created wind, fire, and the sun, the aether¹ above, and under it the earth belonging to Nirṛiti, the sky, with the moon, stars, constellations, and planets, the years, seasons, months, half-months, and the minute sub-divisions of time. Having established the frame of the universe, the divine Pitāmaha begot sons of eminent splendour, (6135) Marīchi, the rishi Attri, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu, Vaśishṭha, Angiras, and the mighty lord Rudra. Daksha, the son of Prachetas, also begot sixty daughters, all of whom were taken by the Brahmarshis² for the purpose of propagating offspring. From these females, all beings, gods, pitris, gandharvas, apsarases, and various kinds of rākṣases, . . . . (6149) this

¹ And yet it is elsewhere said (Anuśāsanap. 2161, quoted above in p. 130) that the aether (ākāsa) cannot be created.

² Here this word must mean “rishis, sons of Brahmā.”
entire world, moving and stationary, was produced. 6150. Having formed this creation of living beings, the parent of all worlds establish the eternal rule of duty as read in the Veda. To this rule of duty the gods, with their teachers and domestic priests, the Ádityas, Vasus, Rudras, Sádhyas, Maruts, and Aśvins conformed."

Another account of the creation is given in the same book of the M. Bh., verses 7518 ff., where it is ascribed to Vishnu in the form of Govinda, or Keśava (Krishṇa), who is identified with the supreme and universal Purusha. Resting on the waters (7527) he created by his thought Sankarshana, the first-born of all beings. Then (7529) a lotus sprang from his (either Sankarshana's or Vishnu's) navel, from which again (7530) Brahmā was produced. Brahmā afterwards created his seven mind-born sons, Marīchi, Attri, Angiras, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu, and Daksha (7534).

Compare Bhishmaparvan; verses 3017 ff.

Page 122, note 223.

Compare the passage quoted in the last note from the Sántiparvan, verse 6135.

Page 128, line 20.

The Sántiparvan, verses 7548 ff. ascribes the creation of the four castes to Krishṇa: Tutaḥ Krishṇo mahābhūgaḥ punar eva Yudhishtīrāḥ | brāhmaṇānāṁ sataṁ śresthām mukhād evāsrijat prabhuḥ | bāhubhyāṁ khattriya-sataṁ vaisyānāṁ urutāḥ sataṁ | padbhyāṁ śūdra-sataṁ chaiva Keśava Bharatarshabha | "Then again the great Krishṇa created a hundred Brāhmans, the most excellent (class), from his mouth, a hundred Khattriyas from his arms, a hundred Vaiśyas from his thighs, and a hundred Sūdras from his feet."

Compare Bhishmaparvan, verse 3029.

Page 128, note 238.

In another place also, verses 6208 f., the Anuśāsanaparvan ranks purohitas with Sūdras: Sūdra-karma tu yaḥ kuryād avahāya eva-karma cha | sa vijneyo yathā śūdro na cha bhujyaḥ kathanchana | chikitsakāḥ kāṇḍapṛṣṭhāḥ purādhyaśakaḥ purohitāḥ | sāṁvatsaro vṛthādhyāyaś sarve te śūdra-sammitāḥ | "He, who, abandoning his own work, does the work of a Sūdra, is to be regarded as a Sūdra, and not to be invided to a feast. A physician, a kāṇḍapṛṣṭha (see above, p. 442), a
city governor, a purohita, an astrologer, one who studies to no purpose, —all these are on a level with Südras."

Pages 144 ff.

See above, note on pp. 90 ff.

Page 150, line 4.

Compare Dronaparvan, verse 2397.

Page 220, line 14.

I am indebted to Professor Max Müller for pointing out to me two passages in Indian commentators in which Manu is spoken of as a Kshatriya. The first is from Madhusūdana Sarasvatī's Commentary on the Bhagavad-gitā, iv. 1. The words of the text are these: Śrī-Bhagavān uvācha | imaṁ Vivasvate yogam prakṛtavān aham avyayam | Vivasvān Manave prāha Manur Ikṣväkave 'bravīt' | evam paramparā-prāptam imaṁ rājasalyo vidyā | sa kālēneha mahatā yogo nāśtaḥ parantarā | sa evāya māyā te 'dya yogyo prktāḥ purūtanāḥ | bhakte 'si me sakhā cheti rāhasyam etad uttaman | "The divine Being (Krishṇa) said: I declared to Vivasvat (the Sun) this imperishable Yoga-doctrine. Vivasvat told it to (his son) Manu; and Manu to (his son) Ikṣvāku. Thus do royal rishis know it as handed down by tradition. Through lapse of time however it was lost. I have to day therefore revealed to thee (anew) this ancient system, this most excellent mystery; for thou art devoted to me and my friend."

On this Madhusūdana remarks: "Vivasvate" sarva-kshatriya-varīṣa-vijā-bhātāya Ādityāya prakṛtavān | "I declared it to Vivasvat, i.e. to Āditya (the Sun) who was the source of the whole Kshatriya race."

The second passage is from Someśvara’s Šīkā on Kumārila Bhātṭa’s Mimāṃsa-vārttika. I must, however, first adduce a portion of the text of the latter work which forms the subject of Someśvara’s annotation. For a copy of this passage, which is otherwise of interest, I am indebted to Professor Goldstücker, who has been kind enough to copy it for me. The first extract refers to Jaimini’s Sūtra, i. 3, 3; where the question under discussion is, in what circumstances authority can be assigned to

2 See Professor Müller’s Anc. Sansk. Lit. pp. 79 f. where this passage is partly extracted and translated. See also the same author’s Chips from a German Workshop, vol. ii. pp. 338 ff.
the Smṛiti when the Sruti, or Veda, is silent. After some other remarks Kumārila proceeds: Sākyādi-vachanāni tu katipaya-dama-dānādi vachana-varjuṁ sarvāny eva samasta-chaturdaśa-vidyā-sthāna-viruddhāni trayā-mārga-vyutthita-viruddhāhāranaṁ cha Buddhādidhiṁ prāṇi tāni trayā-bāhyebhyaṁ chaturtha-varja-nirvācasita-prāyebhyaḥ eyamudhe bhyaṁ samarthitāṁ itī na veda-mūlātvena sombhāvyaṁ | svadhmātrikamēna cha yena kshattriyēna satā pravakṛteva-pratigrahau pratipannau sa dharmam aviputam upadekṣhyati iti kā ṣamāśvāṣaḥ | uktāṁ cha "para-loka-viruddhāni kurvānaṁ dūrataṁ tyajet | ātmānaṁ yo visaṅdhate so 'nyusmaṁ syāt kathaṁ hitaḥ" itī | Buddhādēḥ punar ayaṁ evaṭikrāmo 'lankāra-buddhau sthito yena evam āha "kali-kalusha-kṛitiṁ yāṁ loke mayi nipatantu | vimuchyatāṁ tu lokāḥ" itī | sa kila loka-hitārtha-kshattriyādharmam atikramya brahmana-vṛttim pravakṛteva pratipadya pratischedhātikramasamarthhair ṛḥmanair ananuṣiṣṭaṁ dharmam bāhyājanān anuṣāsad dharma-pīḍām apy ātmano 'ntyikrītya parānugraham kīrtaṇāṁ ity evaṇvidhair eva gunaṁ stūyate | tad-anuṣiṣṭānuṣārīṇaṁ cha sarve eva śruti-smṛiti-vihita-dharmātikramēna vyacaharanto viruddhāhāra ratvena jñāyante | tena pratyaṅkhāya śṛutya virodhe grantha-kārīṇāṁ grahitrācharitrāṁ ṛṇaṁ grantha-prāmāṇya-bādhanaṁ | na hy eṣaṁ purvoktena nyāyena śruti-pratibaddhānāṁ eva-māla-śruti-anumāna-samarthyaṁ atī | "But the precepts of Sakya and others, with the exception of a few enjoining dispassion, liberality, etc., are all contrary to the fourteen classes of scientific treatises, and composed by Buddha and others whose practice was opposed to the law of the three Vedas, as well as calculated for men belonging mostly to the fourth caste who are excluded from the Vedas, debarred from pure observances, and deluded:—consequently they cannot be presumed to be founded on the Veda. And what confidence can we have that one (i.e. Buddha) who being a Kshatriya,3 transgressed the obligations of his own order, and assumed the function of teaching and the right to receive presents, would inculcate a pure system of duty? For it has been said: 'Let everyone avoid a man who practises acts destructive to future happiness. How can he who ruins himself be of any benefit to others?' And yet this very transgression of Buddha and his followers is conceived as being a feather in his cap; since he spoke thus, 'Let all the evils resulting from the sin of the Kali age fall upon me; and let the world be redeemed.' Thus, abandoning the

3 Compare Colebrooke's Misc. Essays, i. 312.
duties of a Kshattriya, which are beneficial to the world, assuming the function of a teacher which belongs only to the Brâhmans, and instructing men who were out of the pale in duty which was not taught by the Brâhmans who could not transgress the prohibition (to give such instruction), he sought to do a kindness to others, while consenting to violate his own obligations; and for such merits as these he is praised! And all who follow his instructions, acting in contravention of the prescriptions of the Sruti and Smriti, are notorious for their erroneous practices. Hence from the opposition in which the authors of these books, as well as those who receive and act according to them, stand to manifest injunctions of the Veda, the authority of these works is destroyed. For since they are by the above reasoning opposed by the Veda, the inference that they rest upon independent Vedic authority of their own possesses no force."

The next passage is from Kumârila's Vârttika on Jaimini's Sûtra, i. 3, 7: *Vedenaicâbhyanujñâta yeshâm eva pravaktvitaṁ nityânâm abhidheynâm manvantara-yugâdâh | teshâṁ viparivartteshu kurvatâm dharma-samhitâḥ | vachanâni pramânâni nânyeshâm iti nischayaḥ | tathâ cha Manor richâh sâmâdhento bhavanti ity asya vivder vâkya-śeshe śrîyate "Manur vai yat kîchid avadat tad bhesajam bhesajatâyai" iti prâyaśchittâdy-upâdesâ-vachanam pâpa-vyâdher bhesajam | 

"It is certain that the precepts of those persons only whose right to expound the eternal meanings of scripture in the different manvantaras and yugas has been recognized by the Veda, are to be regarded as authoritative, when in the revolutions (of those great mundane periods) they compose codes of law. Accordingly by way of complement to the Vedic passage containing the precept (eidhi) beginning ‘there are these sâmâdhena verses of Manu’ it is declared, ‘whatever Manu said is a healing remedy;’ i.e. his prescriptions in regard to expiatory rites, etc., are remedies for the malady of sin.”

4 The Nyâya-mâlâ-vistara, i. 3, 4, quotes Kumârila as raising the question whether the practice of innocence, which Sâkya (Buddha) inculcated, was, or was not, a duty from its conformity to the Veda, and as solving it in the negative, since cow’s milk put into a dogskin cannot be pure (Sâkyottâhiṁsunâm dharma na va dharmaḥ āruteśvânaḥ na dharma na hi pûtaṁ syâd gocâsyaṁ śva-dhritau dâritam).

5 These words are quoted by Bôthlingk and Roth, s.v. bhesajatâ, as taken from the Panchârîthâ Brâhmaṇa, 23, 16, 7. A similar passage occurs in the Taitt. Sanh. ii. 2, 10, 2.
From Someśvara's elaborate comment on the former of these two passages I need only extract the following sentences: \textit{Etad abhiyuktavachanena draḍhayati "uktaṁ cha" | Manos tu kshattriyasyāpi pravakritvam "yad vai kinchid Manur avadat tad bhesajam" iti vedānujnāta-teād aviruddham ity āsayaḥ | “This he confirms by the words of a learned man which he introduces by the phrase ‘for it has been said.’ But although Manu was a Kshattriya, his assumption of the office of teacher was not opposed to the Veda, because it is sanctioned by the Vedic text ‘whatever Manu said was a remedy: ’ Such is the purport.”

Page 254, line 12.

\textit{Yas tityāja sachi-vidam, etc.} This verse is quoted in the Taittirīya Āranyaka (pp. 159 f. of Cal. edit.), which, however, reads sakhi-vidam instead of sachi-vidam. An explanation of the passage is there given by the Commentator.

Page 264, line 14.

Professor Weber considers (Indische Studien, i. 52) that “the yaudhāḥ and the arhartah were the forerunners of the Rājanyas and the Brāhmans.” See the whole passage below in the note on p. 366.

Page 268, note 51.

Compare Āśvalāyana's Śrauta-Sūtras, i. 3, 3 and 4, and commentary (p. 22 of Cal. edit.). Prithi Vainya is, as I find from Böhtlingk and Roth's Lexicon, s.v., referred to also in the Atharva-veda, viii. 10, 24. The words are these: Sā udakraṁat sā manushyān āgaḥhat | tām manushyāḥ upāhavayāta “irāvaty chi” iti | tasyāḥ Manur Vaivasvato vatsaḥ aṣṭā prithiviḥ pātram | tām Prithi Vainyo 'dhok tāṁ krishīṁ cha sasyāṁ cha adhk | te kriśiṁ cha sasyāṁ cha manushyāḥ upajivantā ityādi | “She (i.e. Virāj) ascended: she came to men. Men called her to them, saying, ‘Come, Irāvati.’ Manu Vaivasvata was her calf, and the earth her vessel. Prithi Vainya milked her; he milked from her agriculture and grain. Men subsist on agriculture and grain.”

See Wilson's Vīṣṇu Purāṇa, vol. i. pp. 183 ff., where Prithu's (this is the Puranic form of the word) reign is described. It is there stated that this king, “taking the lord Manu Svāyambhuva for his calf, milked from the earth into his own hand all kinds of grain from a desire to benefit his subjects” (V.P. i. 13, 54. \textit{Sa kalpayitvā vatsaṁ tu}}
Manuṇ Śvāyambhucam prabhun | sve pānau prthivi-nātho dudhā prithivim Prithuḥ | 55. Sasya-jātani sarvāni prajānām hita-kāmyayaḥ). See also the passage quoted from the Bhāgavata Purāṇa by the editor Dr. Hall in pp. 189 ff. The original germ of these accounts is evidently to be found in the passage of the Atharva-veda, from which the short text I have cited is taken.

Prithu's reign is also described in the Droṇaparvan, 2394 ff., and Śāntiparvan, 1030 ff.

Page 286, line 8 from the foot.

The Śrīnijayas are mentioned in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, xii. 9, 3, 1 ff. and 13 (see Weber’s Indische Studien, i. 207), as opposing without effect the celebration of a sacrifice which was proposed to be offered for the restoration of Dushtaritu Paunsāyiṇa to his ancestral kingdom.

Page 345, line 24.

Professor Aufricht has pointed out to me a short passage in the Taittiriya Sanhitā, iii. 1, 7, 2, in which Viśvāmitra and Jamadagni are mentioned together as contending with Vasishṭha: Viśvāmitra-Jamadagni Vasishṭhena aparāddhetām | sa etāt Jamadagnir vihāyam apaśyat | tena vai sa Vasishṭhasya indriyāṁ viryām aerinkta | yad vihāyam sasyate indriyāṁ eva tad viryāṁ yajamāno bhṛatriveyasya erinkte | yasya bhūyāṁso yajna-kratavaḥ ity ākhuḥ sa devatāḥ erinkte | “Viśvāmitra and Jamadagni were contending with Vasishṭha. Jamadagni beheld this vihāyam text, and with it he destroyed the vigour and energy of Vasishṭha. When the vihāyam is recited, then the sacrificer destroys the vigour and energy of his enemy. He whose oblations and all attendant ceremonies are superior destroys the gods (of his opponent).”

Page 366, note 164.

In a notice of Lāṭyāyana's Sūtras, in Indische Studien, i. 50, Professor Weber observes: “At the same time I remark here that the presence of Śūdras at the ceremonies, although on the outside of the sacrificial ground, was permitted—a point which results from the fact that during the dikṣā they were not to be addressed (iii. 3). Here and there a Śūdra appears as acting, although in a degraded position. Compare iv. 3, 5: āryo (i.e. vaisyāḥ, according to the commentator Agnīsvāmin) antarvedi . . . bahirvedi śūdraḥ | āryābhāve yah kaś
Thus their position, like that of the Nishādas, was not so wretched as it became afterwards. Toleration was still necessary; indeed the strict Brahmanical principle was not yet generally recognized among the nearest Arian races. This is shown by the following fact. Before entering on the Vṛātya-stomas, Lātyāyana treats, viii. 5, of an imprecatory rite called Syena (the falcon), which is not taught in the Panchevīnsa, but in the Šaṭvīnsa (iv. 2). The tribes mentioned by Pāṇini, v. 3, 112 ff., are there described: Vṛātinānāṃ yaudhānāṃ putrān anuchānān rītvijō vriñīta śyenayā | “arhatāṃ eva” iti Saṃdiyaḥ | (“Let the learned sons of warriors, who live by the profession of Vṛātas, be chosen as priests for the Syena. ‘The sons of arhats only’ [should be chosen] says Saṃdiya”’). “Whilst,” proceeds Prof. W., “in the beginning of the Sūtra nine things are required for a rītvij (priest), viz. that he should be (1) ārsheyāḥ (ā dasamāt purushād avyavachhinnae ārshām yasya, ‘able to trace his unbroken descent for ten generations in the family of a rishi’); (2) anuchānāḥ (śīhyebhyo vidyā-sampadānae yah kriyāvān, ‘one who has imparted knowledge to pupils’); (3) sādhu-charaṇāḥ (śhaṭsu brāhmaṇa-karmase avasthitah prāsasta-karmā, ‘one who has practised the six duties of a Brāhman, a man of approved conduct’); (4) vāgīḥ (eloquent); (5) anyūnāngaḥ (without deficiency in his members); (6) anatiiktāṇgh (without superfluous members); (7) dvesaṭāḥ (equal in length above and below the navel); (8) anati-śrīṇgh; (9) anatiśvetāḥ (na atiśūlo na ati śṛiddhaḥ, ‘neither too young nor too old’).—Lātyāyana here contents himself with putting forward one only of these requirements, the second (i.e. that the priest should be ‘learned’), as essential. The title Arhat for teacher, which was at a later period used exclusively by the Buddhists, is found in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, (iii. 4, 3, 6) and the Taittiriya Araṇyaka, and

6 Nāma-śatyāḥ aniyata-śrittayāḥ utmedha-jīvināḥ sanghāḥ vrātāḥ | (Patanjali, quoted by Weber) “Vṛātas are the various classes of people who have no fixed profession, and live by violence.” Vṛātana sarirāṣaṇa jīvati vrātāḥ (Comm. on Pāṇini, v. 2, 21) “He who lives by bodily labour is a vrātina.” The word means “he who lives by the labour usual among Vṛātas,” according to another comment cited by Weber.

7 Arhatāṃ eva varṇam karttvayam iti Saṃdiyaḥ | “Arhats only are to be chosen, says Saṃdiya.” (Agnisvāmin, quoted by Weber).

8 It also occurs in Ait. Br. i. 15 (see Böthingk and Roth, s.v.). To his translation of this passage Dr. Haug appends the following note: “The term is arhat, a word
is known in the Gaṇa Brāhmaṇa (Pāṇini, v. 1, 124). The Yaudhāṇ and Arhantaṇ are the forerunners of the Rājanyas and the Brāhmans. According to Professor Weber, Ind. St. i. 207, note, a Sthapatī "means, according to Kātyāyana’s Srauta Sūtras, xxii. 11, 11, a Vaiśya, or any other person (according to Kātyāyana, i. 1, 12, he may even be a Nishāda) who has celebrated the Gosava sacrifice, after being chosen by his subjects to be their ruler."

Page 378, lines 1–3.

Compare Droṇaparvan, verse 2149: nanv eshāṁ niśchitā niśṭhā niśṭhā saptapadi smṛitā |

Page 400, line 9 from bottom.

If further proof of this sense of brahmarshi be wanted, it may be found in the words viprarshi and deijarshi, which must be regarded as its synonymes, and which can only mean "Brāhman-rishi."

Page 423, line 12, and foot-note.

The same verse with some variations is repeated in the Anuśāsanaparvan, verse 6262: Rājā Mitrasahas chaiva Vaśishṭhāya mahātmane | Madayantim priyam bhāryyām datvā cha tridivam gataḥ | "And king Mitrasaha, having bestowed his dear wife Madayanti on the great Vaśishṭha, went to heaven." Here, it will be observed, the name Madayanti is correctly given.

Page 423, line 17.

This stanza is repeated in Anuśāsanaparvan, verse 6250, with the following variation in the second line: arghyam pradāya vīdhival lebhē lokān anuttamān | 

Page 436, line 5 from the foot.

I find that two other instances of Brāhmans receiving instruction from Rājanyas are alluded to by Professor Weber, Ind. Stud. x. 117.

well known, chiefly to the students of Buddhism. Sāyana explains it by "a great Brāhman, or a Brāhman (in general)." In reference to another part of the sentence in which this word occurs, Dr. Hang adds: "That cows were killed at the time of receiving a most distinguished guest is stated in the Smrītis. But as Sāyana observes (which entirely agrees with opinions held now-a-days), this custom belongs to former yugas (periods of the world). Thence the word goghnā, i.e. 'cowkiller,' means in the more ancient Sanskrit books 'a guest' (see the commentators on Pāṇini, 3, 4, 73) for the reception of a high guest was the death of the cow of the house."
The first is recorded in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, x. 6, 1, 2 ff.; where it is stated that six Brāhmans, who were at issue with one another regarding Vaiśvānara (Agni), and were aware that king Aśvapati the Kaikeya was well informed on the subject, repaired to him for instruction and requested that he would treat them as his pupils. He first asked them if they were not themselves learned in the Veda as well as the sons of learned men, and how they could in that case come to consult him ("Yan nu bhagavanto'nucchānaḥ anucchāna-putrāḥ | kim idam" iti). They, however, persisted in their request, when he asked them severally what they considered Vaiśvānara to be, expressed his concurrence in their replies, though all different, as partial solutions of the question, and ended by giving them some further insight into the subject of their enquiry. The second instance is taken from the Chhândogyà Upanishad, i. 8, 1, which commences thus: Trayo ha udgīthe kuśālaḥ babhūvaḥ Sīlakaḥ Sālavatyaḥ Chaikitāyana Dālbhyaḥ Pravāhaṇa Jaivalir iti | te ha uchur "udgīthe kathāṁ vadaṁma" iti | 2. “Tathā” iti ha samupavivisuh | sa ha Pravāhaṇa Jaivalir uvācha “bhagavantāv agre vadatām | brāhmaṇayor vādator vāchaṁ śrasyāmi” iti | “Three men were skilled in the Udgītha, Sīlaka Sālavatya, Chaikitāyana Dālbhya, and Pravāhaṇa Jaivali. They said, ‘We are skilled in the Udgītha; come let us discuss it.’ (Saying) ‘so be it,’ they sat down. Pravāhaṇa Jaivali said, ‘Let your reverences speak first; I will listen to the discourse of Brāhmans discussing the question.’” Sīlaka Sālavatya then asked Chaikitāyana Dālbhya a series of questions; but was dissatisfied with his final reply. Being interrogated in his turn by Chaikitāyana, Sīlaka answered; but his answer was disapproved by Pravāhaṇa Jaivali, who finally proceeded to supply the proper solution.

In two other passages the same Upanishad, as quoted above in p. 195, and explained by the commentator, recognizes the fact of sacred science being possessed, and handed down, by Kshattriyas. See also the note on p. 220, above, p. 508. The doctrines held by Rājanyas are not, however, always treated with such respect. In the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, viii. 1, 4, 10, an opinion in regard to breath (prāṇa) is attributed to Svarījit Nāgajīta, or Nagnajit the Gāndhāra, of which the writer contemptuously remarks that “he said this like a Rājanya” (Yat sa tad uvācha rājanyabandhur iva te eva tad uvācha); and he then proceeds to refute it (see Weber’s Indische Studien, i. 218). It appears that the Smṛiti
recognizes the possibility of a Brähman becoming in certain circumstances the pupil of a Rājanya or a Vaiśya. Thus Manu says, ii. 241: 


“In a time of calamity it is permitted to receive instruction from one who is not a Brähman; and to wait upon and obey such a teacher during the period of study. 242. But let not a pupil, who aims at the highest future destiny, reside for an excessive period with such a teacher who is not a Brähman, or with a Brähman who is not learned in the Veda.” Kullūka explains this to mean that when a Brähman instructor cannot be had a Kshatriya may be resorted to, and in the absence of a Kshatriya, a Vaiśya.

_Page 457, note 241._

When I wrote this note, I did not advert to the difficulty presented by the word _didāsithā_, which has at once the form of a desiderative verb, and of the second person of the perfect tense. Böhtlingk and Roth, s.v. _dā_, on a comparison of the two parallel passages, suppose that the present reading of the Aitareya Brähmana is corrupt as regards this word, which, as they quote it, is _didāsithā_. May not the correct reading be _dādāsithā_ from the root _dās_?

_Page 461, line 14._

The Taittirīya Brähmana, ii. 2, 4, 4 f., says of Prajāpati; _So 'surān asrījata | tad asya apriyaṁ āsit | 5. Tad durvarṇaṁ hiranyam abhavat | tad durvarṇasya hiranyasya jānma | . . . . sa devān asrījata tad asya priyaṁ āsit | tat suvarṇasya hiranyasya jānma | “He created Asuras. That was displeasing to him. 5. That became the precious metal with the bad colour (silver). This was the origin of silver. . . . . He created gods. That was pleasing to him. That became the precious metal with the good colour (gold). That was the origin of gold.”_
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## A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhimāna</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhiṣṭāna</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhibnyuktas</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acchala</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achāhāväka</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhipurusha</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhārma</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhvaryu</td>
<td>41, 155, 251, 253, 294, 459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aditi</td>
<td>18, 20, 72, 116, 122, 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ādityas</td>
<td>10 f., 28, 52, 117, 126, 157, 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrīśyantu</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agastya, or Agasti</td>
<td>309 ff., 321, 330, 442, 461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aghanṛshaḥa</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aghanṛshaḥas</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agni</td>
<td>10, 16, 20 f., 33, 52, 71, 75, 165, 177 f., 180, 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— one of the triad of deities, 75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnīdhya</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnīdhra</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnīdhra (king)</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnīhotra</td>
<td>21, 428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agni Purānā</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnīsvāmin</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnivesya</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnivesyāyana</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahalyā</td>
<td>235, 310, 466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— the first woman, 121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahankāra</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhavanyā fire</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahi</td>
<td>250, 340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahura Mazda</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aindra - barhapaṭya oblation</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, 5 quoted—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>33, 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>34, 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>31, 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>34, 443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>14, 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii.</td>
<td>15, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii.</td>
<td>17, 355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix.</td>
<td>19, 367 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.</td>
<td>27, 436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi.</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii.</td>
<td>21, 325, 456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii.</td>
<td>23, 369, 493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv.</td>
<td>24, 27, 367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv.</td>
<td>33, 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ājaśva</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajaka</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajamidha</td>
<td>234, 267, 279, 360, 413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajātāśtra</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajigartta</td>
<td>355 ff., 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajita</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akampana</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ākāśa</td>
<td>115, 130, 506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akriya</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akshamāla</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akuli</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akūtī</td>
<td>65, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarka</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amārvatī</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amāvasu</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambirisha</td>
<td>224, 266, 279, 362, 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambeshtha</td>
<td>481, 495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambhāṃsi</td>
<td>23, 58, 79, 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsāśa</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anagha</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anālā</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ananta</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anantā</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anavadyā</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Andhras, 358, 483 f.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anenas</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anga</td>
<td>232, 298, 464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angas</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angirasces</td>
<td>192, 194, 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anila</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anu</td>
<td>232, 482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anus</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anugrahā-sarga</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anukramanikā</td>
<td>228, 266, 328, 348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anūpā</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anushtubb</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anuvratas</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apāṣya</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apastamba</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apava</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apaya</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apnavāna</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apratiratha</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aṣarasas</td>
<td>33, 37, 177, 320, 419, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Arāṇyakas</td>
<td>2, 5, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arhat</td>
<td>511, 513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arīṣṭāṇemi</td>
<td>116, 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arjuna</td>
<td>449 ff., 497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arjuna (the Pāṇḍu)</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arka</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrian, quoted</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aratiṣṭheṇa</td>
<td>272, 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artavas</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arūṇas</td>
<td>32, 449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arundhati</td>
<td>336, 389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arurmaghas</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arushi</td>
<td>124, 476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrākṣrotsas</td>
<td>57, 61, 65, 107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX.

Ārya, 18
Aryaman, 27, 158
Āryyas, 174 ff., 396, 481
— their language, 141, 482
Aryakas, 498
Asat, 46
Asita, 438
Asthaka, 279, 352, 357
Asvamārīn, 275
Āśramas, 98
Aṣura, 116
Āsuras, 23, 24, 29, 33, 37, 58, 79, 130, 139, 177, 197, 228, 469, etc., etc.
— their priests, 159 ff.
Āsuri, 430
Āsvalāyana’s Srāvā
Śrātras, 137, 511
Āsvamedha (proper name), 267
Āśvatara, 336
Āśvins, 166, 470, etc.
Atharvan (the sage), 162, 169
— his cow, 395
Atharvas, 293
Atharva-veda, 2
Atharva-veda continued—
xviii. 3, 15–330
— 3, 23–385
— 3, 34–179
xix. 6, 1 ff., –8, 9
— 6, 6–10
— 9, 12–288
— 22, 21–288
— 23, 30–288
— 43, 8–289
— 62, 1–282
Atibalā, 116
Ātmavat, 279
Atri, 36, 61, 116, 122 f., 171 f., 178, 225, 242, 248, 267, 303, 330, 468
Atraryāt, 493
Audumbaras, 353
Aufrecht, Professor, his Catalogue of Bodleian Sanskrit MSS. referred to, 203
— information or suggestions from him, 14, 19, 20, 29, 93, 137, 163 f., 210, 217 f., 254 ff., 319, 325 f., 340, 346, 389, 395, 512
Augtha, 217
Aupamanyava, 177
Aurva, 279, 445, 447, 448 f., 476
Avantyas, 486
Aryaka, 41
Ayāśva, 355
Ayodhyā, 115
Ayu, 170, 171 f., 174, 180
Ayus, 170
Ayus (king), 226, 308, 353

B
Bābhavas, 356
Babhrus, 353
Bādari, 199
Bāhu, 486
Bahunputra, 116
Bhāvasa, 235
Bala, 279
Bālā, 116
Bālāhaka, 207
Bālakāśva, 353
Bālakhyas, 32, 305, 400
Bāleya, 232
Bali, 232
Balas, 469

Banerjea, Rev. Prof., his Dialogues on Hindu Philosophy referred to, 120
— his edition of the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa referred to, 223
Bangā, 232
Barbaras, 482
Bāresma, 293
Baudhās, 305
Benfey, Prof., his translation of the Sāma-veda quoted, 164
— his glossary to ditto, 490
— his translation of the Rig-veda quoted or referred to, 167, 180, 247, 331, 348
Bhagavadgītā quoted, 508
Bhadra, 389, 467
Bhadraśva (a division of Jambūdīpā), 491
Bhaga, 27
Bhāgavata Purāṇa—
i. 3, 15–213
— 3, 20–350
— 3, 28–350
ii. 1, 37–156
— 5, 14–155
iii. 6, 29–156
— 12, 20–108
— 20, 25–157
— 22, 2–156
iv. 1, 40–335
v. 1, 30–489
— 16, 2–490
— 17, 11–496
— 20, 4, 6–498
— 20, 11–499
— 20, 16, 22–500
— 20, 28–501
vi. 6, 40–158
vii. 11, 24–366
viii. 5, 41–157
— 24, 7–208
ix. 2, 16–222
— 2, 17–223
— 2, 21–223
— 2, 23 ff., –222
— 6, 2–224
— 7, 358
— 7, 6, 386
— 13, 3–316
— 14, 48–158
— 15, 5–457
— 16, 17–458
— 16, 30–358
INDEX.

D
Dadhicha, 279
Dadhyanch, 162, 169, 172
Daiyasyas, 41, 139, 499
Davitavata, 348
Davodas, 348
Daksha, 9, 65, 72, 116, 122, 124 ff., 153, 221, 335
Dakshayanit, Aditi, 126
Dama, 222
Damayantit, 389
Damayantit, see Madayantit
Damits, 500
Damaivas, 139, 144, 209, 468 f., 499
Dauaravatas, 501
Danayita, 123
Danjalas, 467
Danu, 116, 123
Daradas, 459, 482
Darvas, or Darvass, 482, 488
Das, 174, 323, 396
Dashtarit, 29
Dasaratth, 362
Dasarittha, 222
Dasara, 222
Dasyas, 174 ff., 358, 460, 469, 482, 500
Datatreyas, 450, 473, 478
Day of Brahmat, 43, 48, 213
— gods, 43
Deities, triad of, produced from the three Gupsas, 75
Deluge, legend of, 183, 199, 203, 209, 211
— was the tradition of its indigenous or not, 215
— comparison of different Indian accounts of, 216
Devadeva, 351
Devakas, 500
Devala, 352
Devalas, 353
Dvapi, 269
Devaraja, 279
Devarattha, 279, 351 f., 356, 413
Devaratitas, 353
Devarehi, 400
Devas, 70, 499
Devasarman, 466
Devasarvas, 344, 352 f.
Devavat, 322
Devavata, 344
Dhanajayas, 353

Dhananjaya, 279
Dhanur-veda, 477
Dhanvantari, 226
Dhanyas, 500
Dharma, 20, 122, 124, 355, 400, 412
Dhushitkakas, 223
Dhunti, 18, 27, 124
Dhi, 241
Dhrishtu, 126
Dhrishta, 221, 223
Dhrisarshtri, 117
Dhrusva, 234, 298
Dhrithamas, 226, 232, 247, 268, 279
Dhrithatapas, 233
Dhritvasatra, 300
Dhista, 222
Diti, 116, 123
Divodasa, 229 f., 235, 268, 279, 322, 348
Dogs, whether they fast from religious motives, 365
Draupadi, 381, 389
Draavid, 209
Dravidas, or Dravidas, 482
Dravinas, 500
Dridhanetra, 400
Driptabakali Gargya, 432
Drishtadvati, 344
Drupa, 207
Druhyu, 232, 482
Druhyus, 179
Dushasita, 305
Durga, commentator on the Nirukta, quoted, 344, 417
Durgaha, 267
Durtakshaya, 237
Durvasas, 357, 359
Dushyanta, 234, 360
Dvapara, 39, 43 ff., 119, 146, 149 f., 447
Dvipas, 51, 489 ff.
Dwarf incarnation, 52, 54, 233
Dyaus (the sky), feminine, 108
— masculine, 163, 396, 434

E
Earth, the goddess, 51, 163
Earth fashioned, 51 ff., 76
— milked, 96
Egg, the mundane, 35, 74, 156, 503
Ekadasa, 16
Ekavimsa, 16
Elysian fields, 502
Emusha, 53

F
Families, hope of their reunion in a future life, 335
Fathers, see Pitris
Fish incarnation, 59, 64, 111, 183, 199, 205, 209, 211
Flood, see Deluge

G
Gabb互通, 494
Gabbira, 232
Gadhi, 343, 349, and passim
Galava, 232, 352, 411
Galavas, 353
Gandhamadana, 491
Gandharas, 484
Gandharvas, 494
Gandharvas, 33, 37, 59, 139, 144, 177, 250, 257, 499
— their heaven, 63, 98, 307
Ganga, 130, 199, 206, 461, 490
Garga, 227, 236, 279, 305
Gargyta Balaki, 481
Gargyas, 236
Gargapathy āśre, 186
Gathin, 348, 358
Gathins, 358, 363
Gattra, 335
Gautama, 121, 235, 316, 434, 466
Gavishthira, 330
Gaya, 227
Gavatri, 16, 110, 114, 137
Genesis, i. 2.—52
Gifts to priests, 259
Gir, 241
Gos, intercourse of men with, in early ages, 147
— whether they can practise Vedic rites, 366
Goldstuck, Professor, aid received from, 508
INDEX.

Gopatha Brähmana, 6
Gorresio, his edition of the Rāmāyaṇa referred to, 397, 399, etc.
Gotama, 330
Grāvan, 165
Griffith, Principal, M.S. obtained through him, 279
Grihya Sūtras, 5
Grits, 279
Gritsandama, 226
Gritsamati, 227
Gubernatis, Signor A. de, quoted, xii.
Gunas, 66, 75, 145
Gurudhira, 279

H
Haihaya, 477
Haihayas, 449, 486
Haimavati, 336
Hala, 121
Hall’s, Dr. Fitzedward, edition of Wilson’s Vīshnupurāṇa, 24, 265, 512 and passim
— information given by, 165
— Preface to his edition of the Śāṅkya-pravachana-bhāṣya referred to, 430
Hansa, 158
Hansas, 498
Hanumāt, 143
Hari, 51, 62
Harita, 224
Harita, 352
Harita, 226
Hārītaka, 351
Harischandra, 355, 379 ff., 413, 486
Harivaṃśa quoted—
292,— 302
652,— 223
659,— 221
718,— 376
773,— 487
789,— 230
1425,— 351
1456,— 351
1520,— 227
1596,— 231
1682,— 233
1732,— 227
1752,— 231
1766,— 362
Harivaṃśa continued—
1781,— 235
1819,— 273
8811,— 307
11656,— 154
11690,— 163
11698,— 162
Harivarsha, 491, 494
Harsha, 124
Hāryāśva, 279
Haug’s, Dr. Martin, Aitareya Brähmagha quoted or referred to, 4, 5, 48, 107, 127, 177, 180, 192, 246, 250, 286, 263, 355, 369, 438 ff., 492 ff., 513
— Origin of Drāma

Haus, 14, 292
Haughton, Sir G. C., his note on Manu, viii. 41,— 296
Hayagriva, 207, 212
Hayashinda, 400
Hayasirasa, 449
Hema, 232
Hemakīta, 491
Himavat, or Himālaya, 130, 183, 200, 229, 511, 491
Hiranyagāma, 491
Hiranyagārbha, 196, 220
Hiranyakāsha, 352
Hiranyakāscha, 353
Homer’s Odyssey quoted, 509
Hostility to Vedic worship, 259
Hṛtri, 155, 251, 263, 271, 294, 459
Houses, origin of, 93
Hṛṣiśikēsa, 206
Huhu, 336
Human sacrifices, 11 f.
Hūnas, 495
Hymns of the Rig-veda, 4, 318
— whether they allude to castes as already existing, 161 ff.
I
Ida, 268, 279, 306
Ida, daughter of Manu, 134 ff., see Ida
Ikshvāku, 115, 126, 177, 195, 221, 224, 263, 337, 355, 362, 401, 405, 508
Ikshvākus, 401, 418
Iltā, 126, 221, 306, see Ida
Hāvīrīta, 491
Indra, 3, 10, 18, 20, 33, 44, 163, 168, 171, 191, 438
Indra’s heaven, 63, 98
— wife, 341
— his adulteries, 121, 310, 466
Indra-dvipa, 494
Indraṇī, 310, 389
Indu (Somā), 124
Instrumental cause, 51
Isāiā vi, 9, 10,— 255
Īśāna, 20
Īśhrathā, 348
Īshunahras, 499
Īsvara, 75, 221
Īthāsas, 3, 5, 215

J
Jābālī, 115
Jāhṇu, 273, 349, 353, 360, 413
Jahns, 335
Jainiśī’s Sūtras, 508
Jainas, 305
Jāmadagnis, 342
Jambudīpī, 488, 490 ff.
Jambūnāda, 461
Janaka, 130, 334, 426 ff.
Janoaka, 44, 51, 88, 95, 99
Jānamejaya, 152, 438
Jānataṇapa, 493
Jānārdana, 206
Jāpa, 442
Jātyāya, 116
Jātimalī, 497
Iṣṭakārṇya, 223
Jāya, 352
Jayakrīta, 351
Jayāpīda, 424
Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society quoted, 3, 6, and passim
Jyotnā, 59

K
Kā, 125
Kachchhapa, 351 ff.
INDEX.

Kadru, 123
Kakshvat, 268, 279
Kala, 62
Kalá, 123
Kalaká, 116
Kalapá, 277
Kalí, 39, 43 ff., 120, 146, 150, 495
Kalindas, 482
Kalinga, 232
Kalingas, 459, 495
Kaláshapáda, 414, 423
Kalpa, 43 ff.
Kama, 112, 124
Kamarupa, 495
Kambojas, 482 ff., 485 ff.
Kanchana, 349
Kanchis, 391
Kandrapahita, 442, 507
Kandarpa, 408
Kángidarshi, 400
Káñina, 223
Kankas, 484
Kányaubája, 390
Kánya, 166, 170, 172, 234, 279
Kávyámaná, 234
Kapás, 472
Kapí, 237
Kapíla, 227, 414
Kapílás, 123
Kapílas, 499
Kápíleyas, 356
Kapíshthála, 344
Kárdama, 116, 123, 400
Kárisíshis, 353
Kármadevas, 46
Kártavírya, 450, 478
Kárرشa, 221 f.
Kárśha, 126
Kárśhas, 495
Káśa, or Káśaka, 226 f.
Káserumát, 494
Káśiréja, 226
Káśí, 431
Káśmíras, 459
Káśyá, 227, 279
Káśyapa, 37, 54, 115 f., 123 f., 126, 195, 330, 400, 451, 455 f., 459
Káśyapas, 438
Káthaka Brahmána quoted, 140, 186, 189, 332 f., 358
Káti, 352
Kátyáyanás, 352
Kátyáyaná's Srauta Sútras, 19, 136, 365 ff., 369, 514
Káumára-sarga, 58
Kausalakti Brahmána quoted, 328
— Upanishad, 10, 431
Kausíka, 342, 349
Kausíka (epithet of Indra), 347
Kausikas, 353, etc.
Kausikí, 350, 411
Kávi, 243, 279, 445
Kéralás, 488
Kesáraprabhadhá, 285
Kétumála, 491
Kétus, 32
Khalina, 468
Khandapáni, 235
Kándaváyanás, 451
Káhas, 482
Khyáti, 67
Kikatás, 342
Kilátá, 189
Kimpurusha, 491 f.
Kimpurushas, 499
Kinnás, 37
Kinnaras, 37
Kins'uka, 229
Kírútas, 391, 482, 484 f.
Kollásarpás, 482, 488
Konsúras, 482
Kovídas, 500
Kratu, 36, 63, 116, 122 f., 400
Kraunchea-dvípa, 491, 500
Kraunchí, 117
Karápa, 279
Kráshá, 113
Kráshás, 499
Kráshit, 178
Kriká, 39, 43 ff., 88, 90 ff., 119, 144, 148 f., 158 f., 492, 495, 505
Kramatála, 209, 212
Krátvírya, 449 ff., 478
Krodha, 123
Krodhavása, 116
Kshattravrdhidha, 226
Kshatri, 481
Kshattriyas, 7, and possess
— etymology of the word, 97, 904
— how their race was restored, 452
Kshemaka, 235
Kshudrákas, 459
Kuhn, Dr. A., quoted, 179
Kulakas, 500
Kullaka quoted, 36, 47, 129, 279, 480, 483
Kumárila Bháta referred to or quoted, 122, 509
Kuníts, 459
Kúrma avatára, see Tor
— toise incarnation
Kurús, 6, 269, 431, 495
Kurús, 498
Kusá, 227, 349, 351, 397
Kusá-dvípa, 491, 497, 499
Kusálas, 500
Kusámbha, 349, 351
Kusámahta, 351, 397
Kusíka, 338, 340, 346, 400, 474
Kusikas, 342 f., 346, 355, etc.
Kusumáyuđha (a name of Káma), 112
Kutsa, 330 f.
Kuvera, 140, 279, 400

L

Lakshmi, 124
Lalita-vistara, 32
Langlois, M., translator of the Harivañña, 151
of the Rig-veda, 273, 321
Lassen's Indian Antiqui
ties quoted, 394, 426
Látas, 482
Látyáyanós Sútras, 512
Lecky, Mr., his History of Rationalism, 407
Lessa, 226
Life of Brahma, 49
Linga Purāṇa quoted, 225
Lobhita, 279
Lobhitas, 353
Loiselier Deslongchamps, M., his note on Mann, vii. 41,—296
Lokáloka mountain, 503
Lunar race, 220, 225

M

Mada, 471 f.
Madyantí, 419, 514
Madhuchhandas, or M
dhusyanda, 279, 347, 351 f., 357, 400, 406
Madhusúdana Sarasvatí, his Commentary on the Bhágavad Gíttá quoted, 508
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mahābhārata continued</th>
<th>Mahābhārata continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhishma-parvan—</td>
<td>Anuśāsana-parvan—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410,—501</td>
<td>2158,—482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455,—500</td>
<td>2160,—130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468,—502</td>
<td>2262,—466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drona-parvan—</td>
<td>2718,—474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2149,—414</td>
<td>2841,—494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2395,—505</td>
<td>3732,—374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2443,—459</td>
<td>3960,—460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4747,—483</td>
<td>4104,—443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salya-parvan—</td>
<td>4527,—128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2295,—392</td>
<td>4679,—128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2281,—272</td>
<td>4745,—314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2360,—419</td>
<td>6208,—507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sānti-parvan—</td>
<td>6262,—514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>774,—32</td>
<td>6250,—514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741,1792,—423,452</td>
<td>6570,—132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2221,—304</td>
<td>7187,—462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2247,—97</td>
<td>1038,—57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2280,—370</td>
<td>Mahābhaya, 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2304,—366</td>
<td>Mahādeva, 75, 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2429,—484</td>
<td>—— taught by Angiras,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2674,—49, 149</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2682 ff,—49</td>
<td>Mahākalpa, 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2749,—127</td>
<td>Maharloka, 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2819,—140</td>
<td>Maharshi, 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3404, 3406,—150</td>
<td>Mahat, 41, 75, 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3408,—49</td>
<td>Mahāvīrya, 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4499,—388</td>
<td>Mahendra, 451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4507,—209</td>
<td>Mahesvara, 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5330,—376</td>
<td>Mahīdhara, 490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6130,—506</td>
<td>Māshīshas, or Māshīshakas, 482, 483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6640,—429</td>
<td>Māshīshmati, 462, 478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6930,—138</td>
<td>Mahodaya, 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7523,—125</td>
<td>Mahoragas, 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7548,—507</td>
<td>Maitrāvārūṇa, 155, 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7569,—122</td>
<td>Maitrāvārūṇi, 186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7573,—125</td>
<td>Maitrāvāya, 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7882,—430</td>
<td>Maitreyā, 56, 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8550,—60</td>
<td>Maitreyas, 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8591, 8604,—423</td>
<td>Mālavas, 459, 495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10058,—151</td>
<td>Mallaṇātha quoted, 395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10699,—430</td>
<td>Mamata, 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10118,—423</td>
<td>Māṇa (Agastya ?), 321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10861,—130</td>
<td>Māṇava-dharma-sāstra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11221,—334</td>
<td>(or Institutes of Manu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11545, 11854,—430</td>
<td>Quotations from—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12658,—215</td>
<td>i. 8 ff.—35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1285,—122</td>
<td>— 22, 25.—38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13088,—145</td>
<td>— 30,—60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13090,—40</td>
<td>— 31 ff,—35, 446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anuśāsana-parvan—</td>
<td>— 58 ff,—38, 446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183,—412</td>
<td>— 66 f,—43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186,—352</td>
<td>— 69 ff,—47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201,—354</td>
<td>— 79 f,—86,—39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867,—440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944,—229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2103,—482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX.

Mānava-dharma-sūtra continued—
  i. 87, 93, 97, —40
  — 88 ff., —364
  — 100, —129
  ii. 29, —137
  — 38 f., —481
  — 170, —138
  — 225, —138
  iii. 241, —515
  — 171, —275
  iv. 239 ff., —380
  v. 1, 3, —446
  vii. 2, —446
  — 3 ff., —300
  — 3 ff., —296
  viii. 17, —380
  — 110, —329
  ix. 22, —336
  — 66 f., —297
  — 149 ff., —282
  — 301 f., —49
  — 503, —300
  x. 4, —480
  — 7 ff., —282
  — 8, —481
  — 12, —481
  — 20, —481
  — 43 f., —481
  — 45, —482
  — 105, —358
  — 108, —377
  xi. 234 ff., —393
  — 32, —398
  xii. 39 ff., —40

Māñavī, 186
Māñavī, 189
Māñassas, 501
Mandagas, 601
Mandapāla, 336
Mandehas, 500
Māndhātṛi, 225, 268, 279, 484
Mantra, 2, 4 f.
Manu, progenitor of the Aryan Indians, 161 ff., 185 ff.
  — his bull, 188 ff.
Manu, 119, 122, 297
  — Autami, 38, 111
  — Chākāshuhā, 38, 298
  — Raiavāta, 38
  — Saññōvarāṇi, 217
  — Śāvarjī, 217
  — Śivrocchās, 38, 111
  — Śvāyambhūva, 25, 38 f., 44, 65, 72, 106, 111, 114, 295, 489, 511
  — Manu Tāmasa, 38
  — Vivasvat, 217
  — Manu (a female), 116
  — Manu (= mind), 23
  — Manu's Descent, 183, 217
  — Manuḥ (= Manu), 165 ff.
  — Manvantaras, 43 ff.
  — Mārgānāpiyā, 116
  — Marichi, 36 f., 65, 114 ff., 122 f., 126
  — Mārkandeya, 48, 199, 207
  — Mārkandeya Purāṇa quoted, 75, 81 ff., 221 ff., 379
  — Mārtanda, 126
  — Mārtikāvatas, 459
  — Maru, 277
  — Maruta, 20, 71
  — their heaven, 63, 98
  — Marutta, 222
  — Matanga, 411, 440
  — Mātarīvan, 128, 170, 256
  — Mati, 241
  — Mātkikā, 158
  — Matsuya-avatāra, see Fish-incarnation
  — Matsyas, 431
  — Matsya Purāṇa, 1, 12—203
  — 49, 39, —277
  — 132, 98, —278
  — 3, 32 ff., —108
  — Matthew, Gospel of St. xiii. 14 f., —255
  — Maudgalya, 235
  — Medhatithi on Manu, 47
  — Medhatithi, 234
  — Mehlīyatithi, 170
  — Mehlkas, 482
  — Men, Five races of, 163, 176
  — their original condition, 62, 117, 145, 147
  — Menakt, 407, 410
  — Meru, 417, 491
  — Metempsychosis, 385
  — Mīmāṃsā-vaśrītika quoted, 508
  — Mithilā, 279, 430
  — Mitra, 27, 184, 186, 221, etc.
  — Mitrasaha, 337, 414, 423, 514
  — Mitrayu, 230, 322
  — Mlochhas, 41 f., 141, 482, 494

Mṛikṣiṇī, 271
Mṛityu, 20, 124, 299, 303
Muchukunda, 140
Mugdha, 235, 279, 352
Mukhya-sarga, 57
Müller's, Professor Max, Ancient Sanskrit Literature quoted or referred to, 2, 4, 5, 8, 13, 48, 122, 181, 192, 283, 263, 326, 355, 358, 366, 426, 508
  — Art. in Journ. Germ. Or. Soc., 365
  — Art. in Journ. Roy. As. Soc., 115, 177
  — Art. in Oxford Essays, now reprinted in "Chips from a German Workshop," 226, 231
  — Chips from a German Workshop, 429, 431, 490
  — Preface to Rig-veda, 348, 417
  — Results of Turanian Researches, 327
Munḍaka Upanishad, i. 2, 1 quoted, 3, 39
Muni (a female), 123
Munis, 153
Mūtības, 358, 483

N
Nābhāga, 224, 268
Nābhāga, 126, 224
Nābhāgāraśtha, 126, 223
Nābhānādīśhtha, 221
Nābhānādedīśhtha, 192 ff., 221
Nāgas, 37, 140
Nāgnajītī Gāndhāra, 515
Nahush, 165, 179, 307
Nahusha, 133, 226, 232, 297, 307 ff., 393, 410
Nāgīsā kāhā of Śāma-Saṃhitā, 14
Nāmetiṣṭhī-ayā, 45, 209, 219
Nāyavandhana, 200
Nātrītas, 124
Namuchi, 175
Nara, 35, 76, 353, 400
Nārada, 36, 119, 126, 400
Nārāyana, 35, 50, 54, 76, 104, 400
— assumes different colours in different yugas, 146
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**P**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Pādma-kalpa, 44, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>Padma Purāṇa, 379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>Pahlavas, 351, 391, 398, 482, 484, 486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>Pajavana, 366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Pāka-yajna, 187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>Pakhyā, 342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>Panchachūḍa, 413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Panchadāsa, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panchajanaḥ and other parallel terms, 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>Panchālas or Pānchālas, 431, 434, 495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>Panchaśīka, 430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Panchaviśās Brahmāna, 5 quoted, 417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td>Panchaviśāsa stoma, 492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>Pāṇḍu, 5, 127, 381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pāṇini, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513</td>
<td>Pāṇins, 353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Pannagras, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>482</td>
<td>Para, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486</td>
<td>Pāradas, 482, 486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Paramarshi, 480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Parmeshtīn, 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Parāurā, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Parāvāra, 56, 68, 130, 322, 417, 430, 447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td>Parāśava, 481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>Pārāśikas, 495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>Parasurāma, 350, 422, 442, 447 ff., 474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455</td>
<td>Parāvān, 455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>Parakhit, 438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>Parivettri, 275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>Parivitti, 275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Parivṛṇya, 20, 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>Parśis, 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>Pārthivas, 353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Paruchhepa, 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>Parushgi, 490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Parvata, 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>Pās-adyumna, 319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Passion, 51, see Rājās Pāśupati, 108, 444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td>Pātālas, 604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>Patangas, 498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Pātnivata (Agni), 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>Paundayas, or Paundrakas, 391, 482, 484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>Paūrava, 353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>Paūrūkūṭi, 351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>Phena, 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>Phjavana, 268, 297, 322, 335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>482</td>
<td>Odras, 482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>Oha-brahman, 265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Paśčchas, 33, 37, 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499</td>
<td>Pitas, 499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Pitrī, 23, 37, 46, 58, 79, 88, 434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>Plaksha-dvīpa, 490, 497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Plants, origin of, 59, 90, 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Plato quoted, 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Potri, 155, 251, 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Prachetas, 36, 116, 125, 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Prachetasa, 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Prachetasaes, 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Pradhā, 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Pradhāna, 51, 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>Pradyumna, 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Prājāpati, 16 ff., 23 ff., 29 ff., 52 ff., 65 ff., 180, 184, 444, and parasitum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>—— born on a lotus-leaf, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>—— his exhaustion, 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>—— his heaven, 63, 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Prājāpati Parmeshtīn, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Prakṣā, 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Prākṛita-sarga, 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74f.</td>
<td>Prakṛiti, 74f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Pralaya, 214, 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>Prumaganda, 342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Prūṇa, 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Pragnya, 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Prāsvātri, 251, 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>Praskanya, 330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Praskanyakas, 234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Pratotre, 41, 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Prasūti, 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>Pratardana, 229, 268, 455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Pratibharti, 41, 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>Prātīpa, 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Pratiprasathṭi, 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Pratisanchara, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Pratisarga, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Pratisabhṭi, 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Pratyāśa, 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>Pravāhṣa-Jaivali, 433, 515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>Prāyaścitti, 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Pretas, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Pradhāsava, 224, 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Pradhādr, 126, 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494</td>
<td>Prithā, 494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Prithavana, 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>Prithi, or Prithu, 263, 279, 301, 304, 511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454</td>
<td>Prithvīr, 454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>Prithuddaka, 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>Priyamedha, 172, 235, 268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Priyavṛata, 66, 72, 106, 114, 489, 491, 497</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INDEX

| Pulaha, 36, 65, 116, 122 f., 400 |
| Pulastya, 36, 65, 116, 122 f., 400 |
| Pulindas, 358, 482 ff. |
| Pundra, 229 |
| Pundras, 358, 483, 495 |
| Purânas, 5, 81 |
| Purâñṣava, 279 |
| Purohitas, 41, 128, 507 |
| Pûru, 232, 277, 331, 360 |
| Pûrus, 179 |
| Pûrukutas, 266, 279, 331 |
| Pûrâtâkṣa, 267 |
| Purâjaśiha, 227 |
| Purâjarasas, 126, 128, 158, 172, 224, 226, 279, 306, 349, 497 |
| Purâsha, 25, 32, 34 ff., 75 f., 106, 155 |
| Purâsha-sûkta, translated and discussed, 7 ff., 24, 155 f., 159, 161 |
| Purâshas, 509 |
| Purâshottama, 51 |
| Pûshan, 19 f., 33, 71, 270 |
| Pûshkalas, 500 |
| Pûshkara, 405 |
| Pûshkara-dvipa, 491, 501 |
| Pûshkaras, 600 |
| Pûshkarin, 237 |
| Pûshpaka (Râmâyana's car), 120 |

### R

| Râbhasa, 232 |
| Raibhya, 455 |
| Râjânya, 10, 258, 264, etc. |
| Râjarâshi, 266, 400 |
| Râjas (the Guṇas) 41, 58, 62, 66, 75, 79, 89, 92, 141, 154 |
| Râjas (masculine) 335 |
| Râjasûya sacrifice, 20, 225 |
| Râjarângini quoted, 424 |
| Râjii, 226 |
| Râkhasas, 59, 140, 144, etc. |
| Râkshases, 33, 37, 59, 136, 177 |
| Râkshovâsas, 450 |
| Râma, 5, 112, 115, 129, 305, 337 |
| Râma Mûrgaveya, 438 |

### Râmas, 495

| Ramathas, 485 |
| Râmâyana, 5 f. |
| --- quoted--- |
| i. 37, 4, 405 |
| ii. 51-65, 397 |
| iii. 55, 5, 329 |
| iv. 70, 357 |
| v. 70, 41, 362 |
| vi. 110, 7, 115 |
| vii. 110, 9, 36 |
| viii. 111, 1, 337 |
| ix. 14, 5-15, 39-31, 115 |
| iv. 3, 38, 483 |
| v. 32, 13, 59 |
| vii. (or Uttara-kânda) 30, 19 ff., 129 |
| 74, 8 ff., 117 |
| Râmabhâ, 226, 232 |
| Râmâyana, 306, 408, 413 |
| Râmyaka, 491 |
| Rântibhâra and Rântinâra, 234 |
| Rântideva, 423 |
| Râsollâsa, 62 |
| Raspi, 292 |
| Rathasâstra, 336 |
| Rathakârâ, 336 |
| Rathaesthâs, 293 |
| Râthantara, 16 |
| Râthavî, 283 |
| Râthitara, 224 |
| Râthwa, 292 |
| Râti, 106, 114 |
| Râvingyama, 72 |
| Râvâna, 21, 478 |
| Re-marriage of Indian women in early times, 282 |
| Reṇu, 346, 350, 357 |
| Reṇukâ, 350 |
| Reṇumâ, 352 |
| Ribhuksânsa, 165 |
| Ribhus, 255 |
| Rîchika, 349, 405, 413, 450, 453, 476 |
| Rig-veda, 2 |
| Texts of, translated 1— |

### Rig-veda continued

| First Mandala |
| 14, 11, 167 |
| 15, 6, 253 |
| 31, 1, 172 |
| 26, 12, 490 |
| 33, 9, 246 |
| 35, 10, 167, 170 |
| 19, 166, 167 |
| 44, 11, 168 |
| 45, 3, 341 |
| 47, 6, 330 |
| 58, 6, 170 |
| 63, 7, 330 |
| 65, 4, 164 |
| 73, 6, 165 |
| 80, 1, 244 |
| — 16, 162 |
| 83, 9, 169 |
| 84, 7, 299 |
| 92, 11, 46 |
| 94, 6, 263 |
| 96, 6, 243 |
| 101, 4, 200 |
| — 5, 246 |
| 102, 2, 322 |
| 106, 5, 167 |
| 108, 7, 246 |
| — 8, 179 |
| 112, 10, 171 |
| — 19, 373 |
| 114, 2, 163 |
| 117, 3, 178 |
| — 21, 171, 174 |
| 122, 9, 260 |
| 124, 2, 45 |
| 125, 7, 260 |
| 130, 5, 173 |
| — 8, 174 |
| 139, 9, 172 |
| 144, 4, 45 |
| 168, 6, 46, 247 |
| 162, 7, 11, 15, 16, 163, 3, 12 |
| 164, 10, 362 |
| — 34, 35, 244 |
| 45, 252 |
| — 60, 11 |
| 167, 7, 173 |
| 175, 3, 174 |
| 177, 5, 183 |
| 182, 3, 260 |
| 185, 9, 331 |

---

1 A large number of texts are referred to in pp. 45, 163, 170, 171, 241, 243, 245, 250, 329, etc., but as they have not been translated they are not included in this list.
### INDEX.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rig-veda continued</th>
<th>Rig-veda continued</th>
<th>Rig-veda continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second Mandala</td>
<td>Fifth Mandala</td>
<td>Seventh Mandala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3,—234</td>
<td>12,—248</td>
<td>87, 4,—325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ff.—270</td>
<td>37, 4,—247</td>
<td>88, 5,—326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 10,—178</td>
<td>40, 5 ff., 6,—242, 469</td>
<td>91, 1,—172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 2,—170</td>
<td>8,—248</td>
<td>97, 1,—176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 1, 5,—348</td>
<td>46, 6,—166</td>
<td>—,—3,—242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 6,—244</td>
<td>55, 2,—331</td>
<td>100, 4,—172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19, 8,—243</td>
<td>64, 7, 14,—247</td>
<td>103, 1, 7, 8,—253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20, 4,—243</td>
<td>6,—174</td>
<td>104, 13,—258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,—174</td>
<td>23, 1, 2,—242</td>
<td>—,—12,—16,—326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27, 1,—72</td>
<td>4,—260</td>
<td>Eighth Mandala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 1,—184</td>
<td>3,—174</td>
<td>2, 21,—46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,—163</td>
<td>16, 1,—107</td>
<td>4, 20,—262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36, 5,—253</td>
<td>9,—167</td>
<td>7, 20,—249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39, 1,—247</td>
<td>13, 14,—169</td>
<td>9, 10,—268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43, 2,—262</td>
<td>19,—349</td>
<td>10, 2,—166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Mandala</td>
<td>21, 8,—243</td>
<td>10, 5,—171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 21,—345</td>
<td>11,—175</td>
<td>16, 7,—245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 6,—165</td>
<td>44, 11,—201</td>
<td>17, 2,—249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 10,—170</td>
<td>45, 7,—244</td>
<td>18, 22,—173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18, 4,—346</td>
<td>46, 7,—179</td>
<td>19, 21,—167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23, 2,—345, 348</td>
<td>48, 8,—105</td>
<td>23, 13,—165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26, 1,—346</td>
<td>49, 13,—172</td>
<td>27, 7,—168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29, 15,—347, 362</td>
<td>61, 5,—163</td>
<td>30, 3,—164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30, 20,—347</td>
<td>61, 12,—176, 178</td>
<td>31, 1,—249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 10,—244</td>
<td>70, 2,—167</td>
<td>32, 16,—249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 1—12,—339</td>
<td>75, 10,—252, 253</td>
<td>33, 19,—249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34, 9,—176, 258</td>
<td>19,—242</td>
<td>34, 8,—168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42, 9,—347</td>
<td>32, 9,—168</td>
<td>36, 7,—263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43, 4, 5,—344</td>
<td>—,—3,—339</td>
<td>37, 7,—263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,—247</td>
<td>7, 5,—249</td>
<td>43, 13, 27,—168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49, 1,—176</td>
<td>8, 4,—349</td>
<td>45, 39,—249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53, 6—16, 2, 24,—340, 354, 372</td>
<td>15, 2,—178</td>
<td>50, 9,—264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,—362</td>
<td>18, 4, 5, 21—24,—321</td>
<td>52, 1,—163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,—242</td>
<td>19, 3,—331</td>
<td>—,—17,—176, 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55, 19,—181</td>
<td>20, 2,—331</td>
<td>55, 1,—261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Mandala</td>
<td>22, 9,—243</td>
<td>—,—7,—250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 11,—173</td>
<td>25, 3,—331</td>
<td>66, 6,—341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 3, 4,—252</td>
<td>26, 1, 2,—241</td>
<td>68, 5,—250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, 9,—242</td>
<td>28, 2,—243</td>
<td>—,—8,—253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25, 4,—348</td>
<td>32, 10,—332</td>
<td>81, 30,—250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,—7,—260</td>
<td>26,—332</td>
<td>83, 5,—250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26, 7,—175</td>
<td>33, 1,—13,—318</td>
<td>—,—6,—181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37, 1,—165</td>
<td>—,—3,—242</td>
<td>87, 5,—175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42, 8, 9,—266</td>
<td>—,—11,—244</td>
<td>—,—9,—250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44, 6,—268</td>
<td>35, 7,—242</td>
<td>91, 1,—172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50, 7,—247</td>
<td>42, 1,—249</td>
<td>92, 2,—348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58, 2,—248</td>
<td>53, 3,—332</td>
<td>Ninth Mandala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Mandala</td>
<td>60, 8,—332</td>
<td>65, 22, 25,—177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 12,—173</td>
<td>64, 3,—332</td>
<td>66, 20,—178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21, 1,—168</td>
<td>69, 2,—176</td>
<td>86, 28,—181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29, 3,—248</td>
<td>70, 2,—173</td>
<td>92, 5,—175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, 4,—248</td>
<td>—,—3,—184</td>
<td>96, 6,—260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 11,—178</td>
<td>—,—5,—243</td>
<td>—,—11,—166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72, 2,—329</td>
<td>112, 1, 3,—250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83, 1,—8,—323</td>
<td>113, 6,—261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rig-veda continued—Tenth Mandala—</td>
<td>Rig-veda continued—Tenth Mandala—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 1,—217</td>
<td>125, 5,—246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, 6,—253</td>
<td>129,—13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17, 1, 2,—217</td>
<td>— 4,—32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21, 5,—169</td>
<td>141, 3,—251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26, 5,—167</td>
<td>148, 5,—268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28, 11,—251</td>
<td>161, 4,—13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 4,—262</td>
<td>167, 4,—345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45, 6,—178</td>
<td>Rijrāśva, 266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46, 2, 9,—170</td>
<td>Riksha, 235, 274, 360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49, 7,—175</td>
<td>Rikhavat, 456</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52, 2,—252</td>
<td>Ripu, 298</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53, 4,—177</td>
<td>Rishabhā, 279, 357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54, 3,—181</td>
<td>Rishabhās, 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60, 4,—177</td>
<td>Rishi, 243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61, 7,—242</td>
<td>Rishiś, 36, 44, 88, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62, 5,—341</td>
<td>Rishṭiḥena, 269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— 7,—193</td>
<td>Ritabādha, 279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63, 7,—166</td>
<td>Ritayu, 234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68, 3, 4, 5,—72</td>
<td>Ritavrata, 501</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— 8, 11,—217</td>
<td>Rituparna, 322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69, 3,—166</td>
<td>Roer, Dr. E., his translations of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 and 72,—13</td>
<td>the Upanishads referred to, 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71, 1,—254</td>
<td>Rohidasva, 268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— 11,—245</td>
<td>Rohiṃ, 389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72, 2,—46</td>
<td>Rohita, 355</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— 4,—5,—72</td>
<td>Rohitāśva, 382 3 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— 5,—9</td>
<td>Roth, Dr. R., his Literature and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73, 7,—175</td>
<td>History of the Veda referred to,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75, 5,—490</td>
<td>289, 318,324, 331, 339, 342, 360,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77, 1,—245</td>
<td>364, 372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80, 6,—165</td>
<td>— articles in Journ. of Germ. Or.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 and 82,—13</td>
<td>Society, 8, 192, 194, 217, 218,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81, 2, 3,—181</td>
<td>289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82, 3,—163, 181</td>
<td>— article in Indische Studien, 48,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85, 3, 16, 34,—245</td>
<td>355, 376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89, 16,—243</td>
<td>— Dissertation on the Atharva-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89, 16,—243</td>
<td>vedā, 395</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— 17,—346</td>
<td>— Illustrations of Nirukta, 177,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90, 1,—32</td>
<td>253, 256, 321, 339</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— 1,—16,—9</td>
<td>— Remarks on the story of S’uṇasśepa,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91, 9,—173</td>
<td>359</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92, 10,—169</td>
<td>Ruchi (male), 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95, 7,—306</td>
<td>Ruchi (female), 466</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97, 1,—46</td>
<td>Rudra, 3, 20, 65, 163, 194, 225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97, 17, 19, 22,—256</td>
<td>Rudras, 19 f., 52, 117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98, 1,—256</td>
<td>Rūpin, 360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99, 7,—173</td>
<td>S’abarasa, or S’avaras, 391,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— 100,—164</td>
<td>393, 483 f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105, 8,—241, 242</td>
<td>S’akalas, 495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107, 6,—245</td>
<td>S’ākhā, 401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109, 1,—256</td>
<td>S’akas, 391, 398, 482, 484, 486</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— 4,—244</td>
<td>S’akti, or S’akti, 315, 322, 328,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117, 7,—246</td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121,—13</td>
<td>S‘akuntalā, 410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S’akvarśa, 255, 320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S‘ākya (Buddha) 509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sālankāyaṇa, 279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sālankāyaṇasa, 353</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S‘ālavatī, 352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S‘ālavatyas, 353</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S‘ālimali-dvīpa, 490, 498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sālvas, 438</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sālvas, 495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S‘ama, 124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samantapanchakā, 451</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sāmas-veda, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— quoted—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. 262,—180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— 355,—163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samprakshālaya-kāla, 217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saṃśraya, 116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saṃvarṣa, 360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saṃvarṛtta, 207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saṅkha, 51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saṅandana, 51, 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saṅktūmāra, 114, 307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saṅgālīya, 513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saṅhitā, 2, 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saṅsaya, 148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saṅkara on the Brahma-sūtras, 147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Chhāndogya Upanishad, 195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saṅkarahāya, 207, 507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saṅkhāyana Brāhmaṇa, 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saṅkhya, 126, 210, 334, 430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Kārikā, 158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Pravachana, 158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saṅkirtti, a Vaiśya author of Vedic hymns, 279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX.

Sākapuṣṭa Śāhamaṇa con-
tained—
Mādhyanidina Sākāh—
vi. 6, 1, 19,—188
— 8, 1, 14,—349
vii. 4, 1, 19,—125
— 5, 1, 5,—54
— 5, 2, 6,—24
viii. 1, 4, 10,—515
— 4, 2, 11,—19
— 4, 3, 1,—19
x. 4, 1, 10,—438
— 4, 2, 2,—69
— 4, 4, 1,—69
xi. 1, 3, 1,—31
— 1, 6, 1,—35
— 1, 6, 7,—30
— 1, 6, 8,—29
— 5, 1, 1,—226
— 6, 1, 1,—443
— 6, 2, 1,—426
xii. 1, 6, 38,—333
xiii. 4, 1, 3,—369
— 4, 3, 3,—217
— 5, 4, 14,—168
— 6, 1, 1,—9
— 7, 1, 15,—456
xiv. 1, 2, 11,—53
— 4, 2, 1,—24, 36
— 4, 2, 23,—19
— 5, 1, 1,—432
— 7, 1, 33,—46
— 9, 1, 1,—438
Satarūpā, 25, 65, 72, 106, 110, 114
Satarūta, 322
Satendriyā, 114
Sattva, 41, 62, 66, 75 f., 79, 89, 92
Sāttvikā, 42
Śattyaḥāvya, 493
Satyaketu, 231
Satyāṅgas, 498
Satyavatī, 349, 405, 450, 453
Satyavrata, 207, 375
Satyavratas, 501
Sātyayana Brāhmana quoted, 302, 328
Saudāsā, 343, 414
Saudāsās, 328, 337
Saunmya, 494
Saunnakā, 226, 279
Saunāḍikās, 482
Saunāḍītras, 495
Saunvīras, 495
Saunvratas, 353
Savana, 335, 445

Sāvarṇya and Sāvarṇi, 217
Savitri, 71, 181
Savitri, 110
Sāyakāyana, 438
Sāyāya quoted, 2, 164 and possīn
Sāyu, 171
Schlegel, A. W. von, his edition of the Rāmāyaṇa referred to, 397, 399, etc.
Semitic source, was the Indian legend of the deluge derived from a, 216
S'ēsha, 44, 116
Seven rishis, 200, 400, 404
Seven seas surrounding the continents of the earth, 491
Sexes, their primitive relations, 418
Shadgurushāhya quoted, 343
Shadviṁśa Brāhmana quoted or referred to, 354, 513
Sīmihikā, 123
Sindhudvīpa, 268, 272, 353
Sindhuśab, 268
Sinhala, 391
S'īni, 326
S'īva, 389
S'īvis, 459, 493
S'ishtī, 298
S'mriti, 6, 139
Snehās, 500
Solar race, 220
Soma, 10, 19 f., 30, 71 f., 124, 153, 166, 175, 181, 221, 225, 467, 469
Soma Mātrāyāna, 239
Somaśūṣma Sātyayajni, 423
Somesvara quoted, 511
Sons, may be begotten by third parties, 418
S'ṇāmāb, 207
S'rādhdadeva, 207
S'rāddhadeva, 207, 335
S'rāuda-sūtras, 5
S'ravasāya, 279
S'rī, 67
S'rīdhara, Commentator or Bhāgavata Purāṇa, quoted, 210 f., 317
S'ṛingin, 491
S'ṛinjayas, 283, 512

Sankṛiti, 327
Sankṛityas, 333
S'antu, 269
S'aphaṁ (fish), 205, 209
Saptadāsā, 16
Sapta sindhavaṁ, 489 ff.
Sārabhas, 391
S'aradvat, 279
S'aradvata, 279
S'ārangī, 336
Sarasvati, 71, 110, 141, 178, 315, 344, 421, 490
Sārasvatyas, 305
Sarga, 49
Sarvakāma, 322
Sarvakarman, 422, 456
Sarvasaṅga Upanishad, 361
S'āryāta, 221
S'āryātī, 126, 221
Sasarpārī, 343
Sat, 46
S'atadrā, 417
Satānanda, 235
S'atapatha Brāhmana, 5
— Kāṅga S'ākāh, i. 6, 167, 382
—Mādhyanidina Sākāh,
Texts from, translated or referred to—

| i   | 1, 4, 12,—366 |
| i   | 1, 4, 14,—188 |
| ii  | 3, 2, 21,—136 |
| ii  | 4, 2, 2,—348 |
| ii  | 4, 2, 5,—166 |
| vi  | 5, 1, 7,—168 |
| vi  | 5, 2, 16,—137 |
| v   | 5, 3, 2,—163 |
| v   | 7, 4, 1,—35, 107 |
| vi  | 8, 1, 1,—181 |
| i   | 1, 4, 11,—17 |
| i   | 2, 2, 6,—262 |
| i   | 3, 4, 1,—147 |
| ii  | 3, 4, 1,—96 |
| i   | 4, 4, 1,—125 |
| i   | 5, 1, 1,—69 |
| v   | 5, 2, 20,—136 |
| iii | 2, 1, 39,—369 |
| ii  | 2, 1, 40,—136 |
| ii  | 4, 3, 6,—513 |
| i   | 6, 2, 26,—147 |
| i   | 9, 1, 1,—68 |
| iv  | 1, 5, 1,—221 |
| i   | 3, 4, 4,—262 |
| i   | 5, 4, 1,—9 |
| v   | 5, 6, 4,—268 |
| v   | 5, 4, 9,—367 |
| vi  | 1, 2, 11,—30 |
INDEX.

S'rotriya, 442
Srutadharmas, 499
Srurtashis, 279, 400
Sthâgu, 116, 122
Sthâquirltha, 420
Shapati, 514
Stoma, 241
Streiter, Dr., his Dissertation de Sunahsepho, 48, 355
Subhagâ, 116
S'uchi, 445
Sudâsâ, Sudeshâ, 233, S'dras, 7 and passim
—— etymology of the word, 97
Sudyunnâ, 221
Suhma, 232
Suhotra, 227, 267, 349, 355, 360
Suhotri, 227
Sukanyâs, 283
S'uki, 117
S'ukra, 305, 335, 445
Sûkta, 241
Sukumâra, 231
Sulabhâ, 430
Sumantu, 439
Sumati, 234
Sumeru, 96
Sumitra, 167
Sumukha, 297
Sunahotra, or Sunahotra, 226, 228
S'unas'ëpa, 350, 353
355 ff., 376, 405, 413
Sûnâthâ, 299, 303
S'unaabhuccha, 352
Surâdhas, 266
S'uras, 495
S'urparâka, 455
Sûrya, 245, 251
Sûryavarchas, 336
S'ushmâs, 500
S'ushmina, 493
Sûta, 207
Sutapas, 232, 233
S'tras, 5
S'tudhir, 338, 490
Sushadman, 438
Suvrâchas, 279
Suvitte, 279
Suyavasa, 355
Svâhâ, 389
Svarbhânu, 249, 469
Svarjit Nâgnajita, 515
Svayambhû, 55
Svayamabhû, 96, 111, 122
Sveta, 491
Svetaketu Arûgeya, 428, 434
S'yâparnas, 438
S'yâvâsya, 283
S'ye, 513
S'yâmaras'mi, 171

T

Taittirîya-âranyaka quoted, 31
Taittirîya Brâhmaña, 5
—— quoted——
   i. 1, 2, 6,—68
   ——— 1, 3, 5,—53
   ——— 1, 4, 4,—186
   ——— 1, 9, 10,—26
   ——— 1, 10, 1,—68
   ——— 2, 6, 1,—68
   ——— 2, 6, 7,—21
   ——— 6, 2, 1,—70
   ——— 6, 4, 1,—71
   ——— 8, 8, 1,—26
   ——— 8, 2, 5,—445
   ii. 2, 1, 1,—72
   ——— 2, 4, 4,—515
   ——— 2, 9, 1,—27
   ——— 3, 6, 1,—68
   ——— 3, 8, 1,—23
   ——— 7, 9, 1,—71
   iii. 2, 3, 9,—21
   ——— 2, 5, 9,—189
   ——— 3, 3, 1,—25
   ——— 3, 3, 5,—25
   ——— 3, 10, 4,—26
   ——— 4, 1, 16,—49
   ——— 8, 18, 1,—24
   ——— 9, 22, 1,—43, 46
   ——— 10, 9, 1,—71 [163
   ——— 12, 9, 2,—41
Taittirîya Sanhitâ, 2
—— quoted——
   i. 5, 4, 1,—29
   ——— 7, 1, 8,—187
   ——— 7, 3, 1,—262
   ——— 8, 16, 1,—20
   ——— 16, 11, 1,—187
   ii. 2, 10, 2,—188, 510
   ——— 3, 5, 1,—124
   ——— 4, 13, 1,—21
   ——— 5, 9, 1,—187
   ——— 6, 7, 1,—186
   iii. 1, 7, 2,—512

Taittirîya Sanhitâ continued——
   i. 1, 2, 4,—193
   ——— 5, 2, 2,—332
   iv. 3, 10, 1,—16
   ——— 5, 6, 5,—184
   vi. 2, 5, 2,—187
   ——— 3, 10, 4,—32
   ——— 5, 6, 1,—26
   ——— 6, 6, 1,—191
   ——— 6, 8, 2,—26
   ——— 6, 10, 3,—26
   vii. 1, 1, 4,—15
   ——— 1, 5, 1,—32
   ——— 5, 15, 3,—187
   ——— p. 47 of MS., 328
   ——— Commentator on, quoted, 3
Taittirîya Upanishad quoted, 443
Taittirîya Yajurveda, 12
Takshapa, 279
Tâlaçanghas, 467, 486
Tamas, 41, 57, 58, 62, 66, 75, 80, 89, 92, 141
Tâmasa, 42
Tâmû, 116
Tûmaliptakas, 459
Tûmarvarna, 494
Tûndya Brâhmaña, 5, 329
Tansu, 234
Tapas, 119, 141
—— its great power, 394, 410
Tapolokâ, 88
Târâ, 225
Târâkâyañas, 553
Tîryak-srotas, 57
Tishmas, 500
Tîshya (= Kali) age, 148
Tortoise incarnation, 51, 54
Trasadasyu, 263, 266, 331
Trayyaruna, 257, 267
Treta, 39, 43 ff., 92 ff., 119, 145, 149 f., 158,
447, 495 f.
Triad of deities, see Deities
Trigarttas, 459
Trisanku, 362, 375, 401, 413
Trishtha, 190
Trishthubh, 16
Trisâras, 268
Trîvîrsha, 267
Trîvritt, 16
Trîtus, 320, 324
INDEX.

V

Vāch, 241, 246, 325
Vachas, 241
Vāhika, 273
Vaihikas, 482
Vaidya, 481
Vaiikanāsas, 32
Vairājita-sarga, 58
Vain, 268, 279
Vairāja, 16, 111
Vairūpa, 16
Vaiśāṃpāyana, 122, 153 f.
Vaiśānta, 319

Vaiśāsas, 97
Vaiśyas, 7, and passim — etymology of the word, 97
Vaiśavasā Manvantara, 112, 214
Vaiṣṇa, 165
Vaiṣāsaneyi Sanhitā quoted or referred to—
xi. 32,—169
xii. 34,—349
xiv. 28,—16
xxx. 18,—49
xxxii. 1,—9
— 1—16,—8
— 18,—10
xxvii. 26,—490
Vaiśārasvas, 445
Vaiśārasa, 349
Vaiśākhās, 349
Vaiśīkhī, iii. 1,—217
— iv. 1,—217
Vaiṣṇava, 5
Vaiśnādeva, 114, 279, 330
Vaiśnava-avatāra, see Dwarf incarnation
Vandya, a Vaiśīna composer of Vedic hymns, 279
Vanga, 233, see Banga
Vangas, 459
Vangsā, 116
Vapushmat, 222
Varāha-avatāra, 53, see Boar incarnation
Vārāha-kalpa, 44, 50, 67
Varēṇya, 445
Varūṇa (colour or caste), 140, 158, 176
Vārṣāgaras, 266
Varuna, 18, 20, 27, 71, 136, 168, etc.
— his adultery, 467
Varuṇa, 494
Varuṇag-prāchāsa, 136
Varūtri, 190
Varvaras, 484
Vaṣas, 391
Vaṣathākās, 487
Vaṣākālas, 353
Vaṣāśṭhā, or Vaṣāśṭha, 36, 65, 110, 115, 122, 211, 244, 316 ff., 468, 486
— begets a son to king Kalashapāda, 418
Vaṣāśistas, 242, 319 ff., 402
Vaṣṭrīya sāhī, 293
Vaṣudeva, 206

Vasumanas, 268
Vasundharas, 499
Vasus, 19, 32, 117, 124, 184, 186, 221, 444
Vātārasanas, 32
Vatsa, 231
Vatsabhūmi, 231
Vayata, 319
Vāyu, 10, 19, 33, 76, 128, 172, 464
Vāyu Purāṇa quoted, 225, 227, 232
— i. 5, 11 ff., —74
— 6, 1 ff., —75
— 7, 22 ff., —81
— 9, 1 ff., —77
— 9, 100, —446
Vedāngas, 5, 126
Vedānta, 223
Vedas, 63
— antiquity of, 2
— undivided in the Kṛita age, 144
Vedārasvas, 279
Vedhas, 65
Vedhas, a sage, 243
Vedhasa, 279
Vena, 126
Vena, 297 ff., 481
Vepuhotra, 231
Venya, 268
Vibhu, 445
Videha, 426
Videhas, 431, 459
Vidhātṛi, 124
Vidūrathā, 465
Vidyutpatāka, 207
Vījñāna Bhikṣuha, 158
Vikrīta, 123
Vinātā, 123
Vipās, or Vipāsā, 338, 417
Vippa, 243
Vipula, 466
Virū (masc.), 9, 36 ff., 106, 111, 195
Viranj, 112
Virṣi, 125
Virochana, 233
Virūpa, 224
Virūpas, 341
Viryadhāras, 499
Vis, 157
Vishnu, 3, 10, 51, 54, 62, 67, 75, 153, 172, 211, 496, etc.
— assumes different colours in different yugas, 145
INDEX.

Vishnu Purâna quoted—
Book i.—
3, 10 ff., and 14 f., 43
5, 16 ff., 44
5, 1 ff., 55
6, 1 ff., 60
7, 1 ff., 64
8, 12, 66
9, 15, 389
10, 10, 335
13, 7, 298
13, 54, 311
15, 52, 72

Book ii.—
4, 1, and 5 ff., 497
4, 9, 498
4, 12 ff., 499
4, 19 ff., 500
4, 23 ff., 500
3, 25 ff., 501
4, 37 ff., 503
7, 19, 24, 504
10, 8, 336

Book iii.—
1, 3, 44
1, 6, and 9, 335
1, 14, 335
3, 9, 336
6, 21, 400

Book iv.—
1, 4, 220
1, 5, 72
1, 12, 221
1, 13, 14, 222
2, 2, 223
3, 5, 224
3, 13, 375
3, 18, 337
4, 25, 337
6, 2, 225
6, 19, 226
7, 1, 226
7, 4, and 14 ff., 349
8, 6, 232
10, 12, 232
18, 1, 232
18, 9, 236
19, 10, 234
19, 16, 235
21, 4, 236
24, 44, 277

Book vi.—
1, 4, 43
Visisāpa, 166
Visvajit, 352
Visvakarm, 52, 76, 173, 181
— Bhauvana, 456
Visvakrit, 352

Visvāmitra, 128, 232, 243, 247, 265, 272, 279, 329
ff., 337 ff., 474, 483
Visvāmitra, 342, 345 f.
Visvantara, 438
Visvarath, 352
Visvaśrijab, 37
Visvedevas, 16, 20, 71, 380
Vitahavva, 228, 268, 279, 285, 297
Vitatha, 227
Vitihotras, 439
Vivāsas, 498
Vivavat, 26 f., 37, 115 ff., 122, 126, 169, 195, 199, 201
Vrajana, 360
Vrātya, 22, 481
Vrātya-stomas, 513
Vrahapati, 310, see Brihaspati
Vrishāgir, 266
Vrāhala, 482
Vṛishan, 170
Vṛittra, 174, 310
Vṛisā, 6
Vṛṣṇi, 268

W
Weber's Indische Literaturgeschichte referred to, 2, 5
— his opinion on the origin of the Indian tradition of the Delhi, 216
— Vajra-sūtr, 140
Williams's, Prof. Monier, Indian Epic poetry referred to, 6, 34
Wilson's, Prof. H. H., Analyses of the Vishnu, Vāyu, and other Purānas, 6, 505
— translation of the Rig-veda referred to, 360, 372, 390
Wilson's Sāṅkhya. Kūrikā referred to, 430
— Vishnu Purāna referred to, 6, 49, 353, 446, and passim
— article on man's Sacrifrices in India in Journ. R. As. Soc., 355
Women, estimation in which the ancient Indians held them, 26, 136

Y
Yadavas, 112
Yadu, 232, 477
Yadus, 179
Yajna-paribhāṣā-sūtras, 2, 365, 367
Yajñāpata, 336
Yajñavalkya, 25, 136, 428
Yajñavalkya, 353
Yajur-veda, 2
Yakshas, 37, 139, 144, 499
Yama, 20, 122, 126, 129, 171, 217, 320
Yamadūtas, 553
Yamunā, 467
Yaska, 3, 6, see Nirukta
Yātudhānas, 326 ff.
Yandhāḥ (warriors), 511, 514
Yavanas, 391, 398, 482, 485 ff.
Yayūti, 232, 455
Year of Brahmas, 44
Year of gods, 43
Yoga 210, 334, 466, 478
— philosophy, 430, 508
Yogin, 153
Yudhājita, 279
Yudhishṭhīra, 127, 133, 309
Yudhīyadvādhi, 322
Yugas, 39, 43 ff.
— system of, not mentioned in the hymns of the Rig-veda, 45
— their several characteristics, 39, 90 ff., 144
Yuga of the Kashattriyas, 152
Yuvanāśva, 225, 268, 279

Z
Zendavesta, 293
Zota, 294