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PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

The work of my youth, which here appears in a new edition, had been several years out of print. To have republished it without alteration would scarcely have done; and, owing to the pressure of other labours, it was impossible for me, from lack of time, to subject it to a complete and systematic remodelling. So the matter rested. At last, to meet the urgent wish of the publisher, I resolved upon the present edition, which indeed leaves the original text unchanged, but at the same time seeks, by means of the newly added notes, to accommodate itself to the actual position of knowledge. In thus finally deciding, I was influenced by the belief that in no other way could the great advances made in this field of learning since the first appearance of this work be more clearly exhibited than precisely in this way, and that, consequently, this edition might at the same time serve in some measure to present, in nuce, a history of Sanskrit studies during the last four-and-twenty years. Another consideration was, that only by so doing could I furnish a critically secured basis for the English translation contemplated by Messrs. Trübner & Co., which could not possibly now give the original text alone, as was done in the French transla-
tion,* which appeared at Paris in 1859. It was, indeed, while going over the work with the view of preparing it for this English translation, that the hope, nay, the conviction, grew upon me, that, although a complete reconstruction of it was out of the question, still an edition like the present might advantageously appear in a German dress also. I rejoiced to see that this labour of my youth was standing well the test of time. I found in it little that was absolutely erroneous, although much even now remains as uncertain and unsettled as formerly; while, on the other hand, many things already stand clear and sure which I then only doubtfully conjectured, or which were at that time still completely enveloped in obscurity.

The obtaining of critical data from the contents of Indian literature, with a view to the establishment of its internal chronology and history—not the setting forth in detail of the subject-matter of the different works—was, from the beginning, the object I had before me in these lectures; and this object, together with that of specifying the publications which have seen the light in the interval, has continued to be my leading point of view in the present annotation of them. To mark off the new matter, square brackets are used.† . . . .

The number of fellow-workers has greatly increased during the last twenty-four years. Instead of here running over their names, I have preferred—in order thus to faci-


† In the translation, these brackets are only retained to mark new matter added in the second edition to the original notes of the first; the notes which in the second edition were entirely new are here simply indicated by numbers.—Th.
PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

It is a general view of this part of the subject—to add to the Index, which in other respects also has been considerably enlarged, a new section, showing where I have availed myself of the writings of each, or have at least referred to them. One work there is, however, which, as it underlies all recent labours in this field, and cannot possibly be cited on every occasion when it is made use of, calls for special mention in this place—I mean the Sanskrit Dictionary of Böhtlingk and Roth, which was completed in the course of last summer.* The carrying through of this great work, which we owe to the patronage of the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences, over a period of a quarter of a century, will reflect lasting honour upon that body as well as upon the two editors.

A. W.

BERLIN, November, 1875.

* The second edition bears the inscription: 'Dedicated to my friends, Böhtlingk and Roth, on the completion of the Sanskrit Dictionary.'—Tt.
PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

The lectures herewith presented to the narrow circle of my fellows in this field of study, and also, it is hoped, to the wider circle of those interested in researches into the history of literature generally, are a first attempt, and as such, naturally, defective and capable of being in many respects supplemented and improved. The material they deal with is too vast, and the means of mastering it in general too inaccessible, not to have for a lengthened period completely checked inquiry into its internal relative chronology—the only chronology that is possible. Nor could I ever have ventured upon such a labour, had not the Berlin Royal Library had the good fortune to possess the fine collection of Sanskrit MSS. formed by Sir R. Chambers, the acquisition of which some ten years ago, through the liberality of his Majesty, Frederick William IV., and by the agency of his Excellency Baron Bunsen, opened up to Sanskrit philology a fresh path, upon which it has already made vigorous progress. In the course of last year, commissioned by the Royal Library, I undertook the work of cataloguing this collection, and as the result a detailed catalogue will appear about simultaneously with these lectures, which may in some sense be regarded as a
commentary upon it. Imperfect as, from the absolute point of view, both works must appear, I yet cherish the hope that they may render good service to learning.

How great my obligations are, in the special investigations, to the writings of Colebrooke, Wilson, Lassen, Burnouf, Roth, Reinaud, Stenzler, and Holtzmann, I only mention here generally, as I have uniformly given ample references to these authorities in the proper place.

The form in which these lectures appear is essentially the same in which they were delivered,* with the exception of a few modifications of style: thus, in particular, the transitions and recapitulations belonging to oral delivery have been either curtailed or omitted; while, on the other hand, to the incidental remarks—here given as foot-notes—much new matter has been added.

A. W.

Berlin, July, 1852.

* In the Winter-Semester of 1851–52.
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LECTURES
ON THE
HISTORY OF INDIAN LITERATURE.

At the very outset of these lectures I find myself in a certain degree of perplexity, being rather at a loss how best to entitle them. I cannot say that they are to treat of the history of "Indian Literature;" for then I should have to consider the whole body of Indian languages, including those of non-Aryan origin. Nor can I say that their subject is the history of "Indo-Aryan Literature;" for then I should have to discuss the modern languages of India also, which form a third period in the development of Indo-Aryan speech. Nor, lastly, can I say that they are to present a history of "Sanskrit Literature;" for the Indo-Aryan language is not in its first period "Sanskrit," i.e., the language of the educated, but is still a popular dialect; while in its second period the people spoke not Sanskrit, but Prākrit dialects, which arose simultaneously with Sanskrit out of the ancient Indo-Aryan vernacular. In order, however, to relieve you from any doubt as to what you have to expect from me here, I may at once remark that it is only the literature of the first and second periods of the Indo-Aryan language with which we have to do. For the sake of brevity I retain the name "Indian Literature."

I shall frequently in the course of these lectures be forced to draw upon your forbearance. The subject they discuss may be compared to a yet uncultivated tract of
LECTURES ON THE

country, of which only a few spots have here and there been cleared, while the greater part of it remains covered with dense forest, impenetrable to the eye, and obstructing the prospect. A clearance is indeed now by degrees being made, but slowly, more especially because in addition to the natural obstacles which impede investigation, there still prevails a dense mist of prejudice and preconceived opinions hovering over the land, and enfolding it as with a veil.

The literature of India passes generally for the most ancient literature of which we possess written records, and justly so. But the reasons which have hitherto been thought sufficient to establish this fact are not the correct ones; and it is indeed a matter for wonder that people should have been so long contented with them. In the first place, Indian tradition itself has been adduced in support of this fact, and for a very long time this was considered sufficient. It is, I think, needless for me to waste words upon the futile nature of such evidence. In the next place, astronomical data have been appealed to, according to which the Vedas would date from about 1400 B.C. But these data are given in writings, which are evidently of very modern origin, and they might consequently be the result of calculations instituted for the express purpose. Fur-

1 In so far as this claim may not now be disputed by the Egyptian monumental records and papyrus rolls, or even by the Assyrian literature which has but recently, been brought to light.

2 Besides, these calculations are of a very vague character, and do not yield any such definite date as that given above, but only some epoch lying between 1820-360 B.C., see J. St., x. 236; Whitney in Journ. E. A. S., i. 317, ff. (1864). True, the circumstance that the oldest records begin the series of nakshatras with the sign Krittika, carries us back to a considerably earlier period even than these dates, derived from the so-called Vedic Calendar, viz., to a period between 2780-1820 B.C., since the vernal equinox coincided with η Tauri (Krittika), in round numbers, about the year 2300 B.C., see J. St., x. 234 235. But, on the other hand, the opinion expressed in the first edition of this work (1852), to the effect that the Indians may either have brought the knowledge of these lunar mansions, headed by Krittika, with them into India, or else have obtained it at a later period through the commercial relations of the Phenicians with the Pianjiks, has recently gained considerably in probability; and therewith the suggestion of Babylon as the mother country of the observations on which this date is established. See the second of my two treatises, Die vedischen Nachrichten von den Nakshatras (Berlin, 1862), pp. 362-420; my paper, Uber den Vedikalender Namens Jyotisha (1862), p. 15; J. St., x. 429. ix. 241, ff.; Whitney, Oriental and Linguistic Studies (1874), ii. 418.—Indeed a direct reference to Babylon and its sea trade, in which the exportation of peacocks is mentioned, has lately come to light.
ther, one of the Buddhist eras has been relied upon, according to which a reformer is supposed to have arisen in the sixth century B.C., in opposition to the Brahmanical hierarchy; but the authenticity of this particular era is still extremely questionable. Lastly, the period when Pāṇini, the first systematic grammarian, flourished, has been referred to the fourth century B.C., and from this, as a starting-point, conclusions as to the period of literary development which preceded him have been deduced. But the arguments in favour of Pāṇini's having lived at that time are altogether weak and hypothetical, and in no case can they furnish us with any sort of solid basis.

The reasons, however, by which we are fully justified in regarding the literature of India as the most ancient literature of which written records on an extensive scale have been handed down to us, are these:

In the more ancient parts of the Rigveda-Samhitā, we find the Indian race settled on the north-western borders of India, in the Panjāb, and even beyond the Panjāb, on the Kubhā, or Kāshmir, in Kabul. The gradual spread of

in an Indian text, the Rāverujātaka, see Minayeff in the Mélanges Asiatiques (Imperial Russian Academy), vi. 577, ff. (1871), and Monatsberichte of the Berlin Academy, p. 622 (1871). As, however, this testimony belongs to a comparatively late period, no great importance can be attached to it.—Direct evidence of ancient commercial relations between India and the West has recently been found in hieroglyphic texts of the seventeenth century, at which time the Aryas would appear to have been already settled on the Indus. For the word kāpi, 'ape,' which occurs in 1 Kings x. 22, in the form qōp, Gr. κηφαλή, is found in these Egyptian texts in the form kāfu, see Joh. Dümichen, Die Flotte einer egypt. Königin aus dem 17. Jahrh. (Leipzig, 1865), table ii. p. 17. Lastly, ḫathim, the Hebrew name for peacocks (1 Kings x. 22, 2 Chron. ix. 21) necessarily implies that already in Solomon's time the Phoenician ophir-merchant 'ont eu auffaire soit au pays même des Aṣḥira soit sur un autre point de la côte de l’Inde avec des peuples des dravidiennes.' Julien, Vinson, Revue de Linguistique, vi. 120, ff. (1873). See also Burnell, Elements of South Indian Palaeography, p. 5 (Mangalore, 1874).

Or even, as Goldstücker supposes, earlier than Buddha.

One of the Vedāṇī Ṛṣis, asserted to be Vatsa, of the family of Kanva, extols, Ṛik, viii. 6. 46-48, the splendid presents, consisting of horses, cattle, and Ṛṣiras yoked four together.—(Roth in the St. Petersburg Dict. explains Ṛṣiras as 'buffalo, humped bull;' generally it means 'camel')—which, to the glory of the Vādvas, he received whilst residing with Tirumārdra and Parśu. Or have we here only a single person, Tirumārdra Parśu? In the Śaiḥkhyana Srauta-Sūtra, xvi. 11. 20, at least, he is understood as Tirumārdra Pārāsavya. These names suggest Tirumārdas and the Pārāsias; see I. St., iv. 379, et seq., but compare Girard de Riaule, Revue de Linguistique, iv. 227 (1872). Of course, we must not think of the
the race from these seats towards the east, beyond the Sarasvatī and over Hindustān as far as the Ganges, can be traced in the later portions of the Vedic writings almost step by step. The writings of the following period, that of the epic, consist of accounts of the internal conflicts among the conquerors of Hindustān themselves, as, for instance, the Mahā-Bhārata; or of the farther spread of Brahmanism towards the south, as, for instance, the Rāmāyana. If we connect with this the first fairly accurate information about India which we have from a Greek source, viz., from Megasthenes,* it becomes clear that at the time of this writer the Brahmanising of Hindustān was already completed, while at the time of the Periplus (see Lassen, I. Ak., ii. 150, n.; I. St., ii. 192) the very southernmost point of the Dekhan had already become a seat of the worship of the wife of Śiva. What a series of years, of centuries, must necessarily have elapsed before this boundless tract of country, inhabited by wild and vigorous tribes, could have been brought over to Brahmanism!! It may perhaps here be objected that the races and tribes found by Alexander on the banks of the Indus appear to stand entirely on a Vedic, and not on a Brahmanical footing. As a matter of fact this is true; but we should not be justified in drawing from this any conclusion whatever with regard to India itself. For these peoples of the Panjāb never submitted to the Brahmanical order of things, but always retained their ancient Vedic standpoint, free and independent, without either priestly domination or system of caste. For this reason, too, they were the objects of a cordial hatred on the part of their kinsmen, who had wandered farther on, and on this account also Buddhism gained an easy entrance among them.

Persians after Cyrus: that would bring us too far down. But the Persians were so called, and had their own princes, even before the time of Cyrus. Or ought we rather, as suggested by Olekhausen in the Berliner Monatsberichte (1874), p. 705, to think of the Parthavas, i.e., Parthians, who as well as Pārthas are mentioned in the time of the Achemenides! The derivation, hitherto current, of the word Tīrī in Tiridates, &c., from the Pahlavi tir = Zend tīrīya (given, e.g., by M. Bréal, De Persicis nominibus (1863), pp. 9, 10), is hardly justified.

* Who as ambassador of Seleucus resided for some time at the court of Chandragupta. His reports are preserved to us chiefly in the Itāried of Arrian, who lived in the second century A.D.
And while the claims of the written records of Indian literature to a high antiquity—its beginnings may perhaps be traced back even to the time when the Indo-Aryans still dwelt together with the Persa-Aryans—are thus indisputably proved by external, geographical testimony, the internal evidence in the same direction which may be gathered from their contents, is no less conclusive. In the songs of the Rik, the robust spirit of the people gives expression to the feeling of its relation to nature, with a spontaneous freshness and simplicity; the powers of nature are worshipped as superior beings, and their kindly aid besought within their several spheres. Beginning with this nature-worship, which everywhere recognises only the individual phenomena of nature, and these in the first instance as superhuman, we trace in Indian literature the progress of the Hindu people through almost all the phases of religious development through which the human mind generally has passed. The individual phenomena of nature, which at first impress the imagination as being superhuman, are gradually classified within their different spheres; and a certain unity is discovered among them. Thus we arrive at a number of divine beings, each exercising supreme sway within its particular province, whose influence is in course of time further extended to the corresponding events of human life, while at the same time they are endowed with human attributes and organs. The number—already considerable—of these natural deities, these regents of the powers of nature, is further increased by the addition of abstractions, taken from ethical relations; and to these as to the other deities divine powers, personal existence, and activity are ascribed. Into this multitude of divine figures, the spirit of inquiry seeks at a later stage to introduce order, by classifying and co-ordinating them according to their principal bearings. The principle followed in this distribution is, like the conception of the deities themselves, entirely borrowed from the contemplation of nature. We have the gods who act in the heavens, in the air, upon the earth, and of these the sun, the wind, and fire are recognised as the main representatives and rulers respectively. These three gradually obtain precedence over all the other gods, who are only looked upon as their creatures and servants. Strength-
enched by these classifications, speculation presses on and seeks to establish the relative position of these three deities, and to arrive at unity for the supreme Being. This is accomplished either speculatively, by actually assuming such a supreme and purely absolute Being, viz., "Brahman" (neut.), to whom these three in their turn stand in the relation of creatures, of servants only; or arbitrarily, according as one or other of the three is worshipped as the supreme god. The sun-god seems in the first instance to have been promoted to this honour; the Persa-Aryans at all events retained this standpoint, of course extending it still further; and in the older parts of the Brāhmaṇas also—to which rather than to the Samhitās the Avesta is related in respect of age and contents—we find the sun-god here and there exalted far above the other deities (prasāvitā devānām). We also find ample traces of this in the forms of worship, which so often preserve relics of antiquity. Nay, as "Brahman" (masc.), he has in theory retained this position, down even to the latest times, although in a very colourless manner. His colleagues, the air and fire gods, in consequence of their much more direct and sensible influence, by degrees obtained complete possession of the supreme power, though constantly in conflict with each other. Their worship has passed through a long series of different phases, and it is evidently the same which Megasthenes found in Hindustān, and which at the time of the Periplus had penetrated, though in a form already very corrupt, as far as the southernmost point of the Dekhan.

But while we are thus justified in assuming a high antiquity for Indian literature, on external geographical grounds, as well as on internal evidence, connected with the history of the Hindū religion, the case is sufficiently unsatisfactory, when we come to look for definite chrono-

---

5 * Cf. my paper, "Zwei vedische Texte über Omnā und Pārvata" (1859), pp. 352-393.

To these, thirdly, we have to add evidence derived from the language. The edicts of Piyadasi, whose date is fixed by the mention therein of Greek kings, and even of Alexander himself, are written in popular dialects, for whose gradual development out of the language of the Vedic hymns into this form it is absolutely necessary to postulate the lapse of a series of centuries.

* According to Strabo, p. 117, Ἀδρέως (Rudra, Soma, Siva) was worshipped in the mountains, Ἀρεός (Indra, Vīshṇu) in the plain.
logical dates. We must reconcile ourselves to the fact that any such search will, as a general rule, be absolutely fruitless. It is only in the case of those branches of literature which also became known abroad, and also in regard to the last few centuries, when either the dates of manuscripts, or the data given in the introductions or closing observations of the works themselves, furnish us some guidance, that we can expect any result. Apart from this, an internal chronology based on the character of the works themselves, and on the quotations, &c., therein contained, is the only one possible.

Indian literature divides itself into two great periods, the Vedic and the Sanskrit. Turning now to the former, or Vedic period, I proceed to give a preliminary general outline of it before entering into the details.
FIRST PERIOD.

VEDIC LITERATURE.

We have to distinguish four Vedas—the Rig-Veda, the Sáma-Veda, the Yajur-Veda, which is in a double form; and the Atharva-Veda. Each of these is again subdivided into three distinct parts—Samhitá, Bráhmaṇa, and Sútra.

Their relation to each other is as follows:—

The Samhitá of the Rík is purely a lyrical collection, comprising the store of song which the Hindús brought with them from their ancient homes on the banks of the Indus, and which they had there used for "invoking prosperity on themselves and their flocks, in their adoration of the dawn, in celebration of the struggle between the god who wields the lightning and the power of darkness, and in rendering thanks to the heavenly beings for preservation in battle."† The songs are here classified according to the families of poets to which they are ascribed. The principle of classification is consequently, so to speak, a purely scientific one. It is therefore possible, though more cannot be said, that the redaction of the text may be of later date than that of the two Samhitás which

---

* The name Samhitá (collection) first occurs in the so-called Aranyakas, or latest supplements to the Bráhmaṇas, and in the Sútras; but whether in the above meaning, is not as yet certain. The names by which the Samhitás are designated in the Bráhmaṇas are—either ríkṣás, ádhdá, yajñódá,—or Rigveda, Sáma-veda, Yajurveda,—or Babhríshas, Chhandogas, Adhvaryus,—or śvetá, śudhá, adhyápya, also 'Veda' alone. It is in the Sútras that we first find the term Chhlandas specially applied to the Samhitás, and more particularly in Páṇini, by whom Ríkhi, Nigama, Mantra (?) are also employed in the same manner.

† See Roth, Zur Litteratur und Geschichte des Weda, p. 8 (Stuttgart, 1845).
THE SAMHITAS.

will come next under our consideration, and which, providing as they do for a practical want, became necessary immediately upon the institution of a worship with a fixed ritual. For the Sāma-Samhitā of the Sāman, and both the Sāmhitās of the Yajus, consist only of such rīchas (verses) and sacrificial formulas as had to be recited at the ceremonies of the Soma offering and other sacrifices, and in the same order in which they were practically used; at least, we know for certain, that this is the case in the Yajus. The Sāma-Samhitā of the Sāman contains nothing but verses (rīchas); those of the Yajus, sentences in prose also. The former, the rīchas, all recur, with a few exceptions, in the Rik-Samhitā, so that the Sāma-Samhitā is nothing more than an extract from the songs of the latter, of the verses applied to the Soma offering. Now the rīchas found in the Sāma-Samhitā and Yajuḥ-Samhitā appear in part in a very altered form, deviating considerably from the text of the Rik, the Rik-Samhitā. Of this a triple explanation is possible. First, these readings may be earlier and more original than those of the Rik, liturgical use having protected them from alteration, while the simple song, not being immediately connected with the sacred rite, was less scrupulously preserved. Or, secondly, they may be later than those of the Rik, and may have arisen from the necessity of precisely adapting the text to the meaning attributed to the verse in its application to the ceremony. Or, lastly, they may be of equal authority with those of the Rik; the discrepancies being merely occasioned by the variety of districts and families in which they were used, the text being most authentic in the district and family in which it originated, and less so in those to which it subsequently passed. All three methods of explanation are alike correct, and in each particular case they must all be kept in view. But if we look more closely at the relation of these verses, it may be stated thus: The rīchas occurring in the Sāma-Samhitā generally stamp themselves as older and more original by the greater antiquity of their grammatical forms; those in the two Sāmhitās of the Yajus, on the contrary, generally give the impression of having undergone a secondary alteration. Instances which come under the third method of explanation are found in equal
numbers, both in the Sáma-Samhitá and the Yajuḥ-Samhitá. Altogether, too much stress cannot be laid on this point, namely, that the alterations which the songs and hymns underwent in the popular mouth during their oral transmission, must in any case be regarded as very considerable; since preservation by means of writing is not to be thought of for this period. Indeed we can hardly admit it for the time of the Bráhmaṇas either, otherwise it would be difficult to account for the numerous deviations of the various schools with regard to the text of these works also, as well as for the great number of different schools (Sákhás) generally.

But although the songs of the Rík, or the majority of them, were composed on the banks of the Indus, their final compilation and arrangement can only have taken place in India proper; at what time, however, it is difficult to say. Some portions come down to an age so recent, that the system of caste had already been organised; and tradition itself, in ascribing to Sákalya and Pañchála Bábhravya a leading part in the arrangement of the Rík-Samhitá, points us to the flourishing epoch of the Videhas and Pañchálas, as I shall show hereafter. The Samhitá of the Sáman, being entirely borrowed from the Rík, gives no clue to the period of its origin; only, in the fact that it contains no extracts from any of the later portions of the Rík, we have perhaps an indication that these were not then in existence. This, however, is a point not yet investigated. As for the two Samhitás of the Yajus, we have in the prose portions peculiar to them, most distinct proofs that both originated in the eastern parts of Hindustán,7 in the country of the Kurupañchálas, and that they belong to a period when the Brahmanical element had already gained the supremacy, although it had still to encounter many a hard struggle, and when at all events the hierarchy of the Brahmans, and the system of caste, were completely organised. Nay, it may be that we have even external grounds for supposing that the present redaction of the Samhitá of the White Yajus dates from the third century B.C. For Megasthenes mentions a people called Māđiavó, and this name recurs in the Má-

7 Or rather to the east of the Indus, in Hindustán.
dhyamdnas, the principal school of the White Yajus. More of this later on.

The origin of the Atharva-Samhitá dates also from the period when Brahmanism had become dominant. It is in other respects perfectly analogous to the Rik-Samhitá, and contains the store of song of this Brahmanical epoch. Many of these songs are to be found also in the last, that is, the least ancient book of the Rik-Samhitá. In the latter they are the latest additions made at the time of its compilation; in the Atharvan they are the proper and natural utterance of the present. The spirit of the two collections is indeed entirely different. In the Rik there breathes a lively natural feeling a warm love for nature; while in the Atharvan there prevails, on the contrary, only an anxious dread of her evil spirits, and their magical powers. In the Rik we find the people in a state of free activity and independence; in the Atharvan we see it bound in the fetters of the hierarchy and of superstition. But the Atharva-Samhitá likewise contains pieces of great antiquity, which may perhaps have belonged more to the people proper, to its lower grades; whereas the songs of the Rik appear rather to have been the especial property of the higher families.* It was not without a long struggle that the songs of the Atharvan were permitted to take their place as a fourth Veda. There is no mention made of them in the more ancient portions of the Bráhmanas of the Rik, Sáman, and Yajus; indeed they only originated simultaneously with these Bráhmanas, and are therefore only alluded to in their later portions.

We now come to the second part of Vedic literature, the Bráhmanas.

The character of the Bráhmanas † may be thus gene-

* This surmise, based upon certain passages in the Atharvan, would certainly be at variance with the name ‘Atharvágrisnasas,’ borne by this Samhitá; according to which it would belong, on the contrary, to the most ancient and noble Brahman families. But I have elsewhere advanced the conjecture, that this name was simply assumed in order to impart a greater sanctity to the contents, see J. St., i. 295. [Zwei vedische Texte über Omina und Portenta, pp. 346-348.]

† This term signifies ‘that which relates to prayer, brahman.’ Brahman itself means ‘drawing forth,’ as well in a physical sense ‘producing,’ ‘creating,’ as in a spiritual one ‘lifting up,’ ‘elevating,’ ‘strengthening.’ The first mention of the name Bráhmanas, in the above sense, is found in the Bráhmana of the White Yajus, and especially in its thir-
rally defined: Their object is to connect the sacrificial songs and formulas with the sacrificial rite, by pointing out, on the one hand, their direct-mutual relation; and, on the other, their symbolical connection with each other. In setting forth the former, they give the particular ritual in its details; in illustrating the latter, they are either directly explanatory and analytic, dividing each formula into its constituent parts, or else they establish that connection dogmatically by the aid of tradition or speculation. We thus find in them the oldest rituals we have, the oldest linguistic explanations, the oldest traditional narratives, and the oldest philosophical speculations. This peculiar character is common generally to all works of this class, yet they differ widely in details, according to their individual tendency, and according as they belong to this or that particular Veda. With respect to age they all date from the period of the transition from Vedic civilisation and culture to the Brahmanic mode of thought and social order. Nay, they help to bring about this very transition, and some of them belong rather to the time of its commencement, others rather to that of its termination.* The Brāhmaṇas originated from the opinions of individual sages, imparted by oral tradition, and preserved as well as supplemented in their families and by their disciples. The more numerous these separate traditions became, the more urgent became the necessity for bringing them into harmony with each other. To this end, as time went on, compilations, comprising a variety of these materials, and in which the different opinions on each subject were uniformly traced to their original represen-

teenth book. In cases where the dogmatical explanation of a ceremonial or other precept has already been given, we there find the expression tasyo' kramāḥ brāhmaṇāḥ, 'of this the Brāhmaṇa has already been stated;' whereas in the books preceding the thirteenth, we find in such cases tasya dhāntāḥ 'its connection has already been set forth.' [I. St., v. 60, ix. 351.]—Besides Brāhmaṇa, Pravachana is also used in the Śāma-Sūtras, according to the commentary, in the same sense; they also mention Anubrāhmaṇa, a term which does not occur elsewhere except in Pāṇini.

* Pāṇini, iv. 3. 105, directly mentions 'older (puruṣopakta) Brāhmaṇas;' and in contradistinction to these there must, of course, have been in existence in his day 'more modern (or as the schoolists says, tulāyakta) Brāhmaṇas.' [See on this Goldsticke'r, Pāṇini, p. 132, 57, and my rejoinder in I. St., v 64, 57.]
tatives, were made in different districts by individuals peculiarly qualified for the task. But whether these compilations or digests were now actually written down, or were still transmitted orally only, remains uncertain. The latter supposition would seem probable from the fact that of the same work we here and there find two texts entirely differing in their details. Nothing definite, however, can be said on the subject, for in these cases there may possibly have been some fundamental difference in the original, or even a fresh treatment of the materials. It was, moreover, but natural that these compilers should frequently come into collision and conflict with each other. Hence we have now and then to remark the exhibition of strong animosity against those who in the author's opinion are heterodox. The preponderant influence gradually gained by some of these works over the rest—whether by reason of their intrinsic value, or of the fact that their author appealed more to the hierarchical spirit*—has resulted, unfortunately for us, in the preservation of these only, while works representative of the disputed opinions have for the most part disappeared. Here and there perhaps in India some fragments may still be found; in general, however, here as everywhere in Indian literature, we encounter the lamentable fact that the works which, in the end, came off victorious, have almost entirely supplanted and effaced their predecessors. After all, a comparatively large number of Brāhmanas is still extant—a circumstance which is evidently owing to their being each annexed to a particular Veda, as well as to the fact that a sort of petty jealousy had always prevailed among the families in which the study of the different Vedas was hereditarily transmitted. Thus in the case of each Veda, such works at least as had come to be considered of the highest authority have been preserved, although the practical significance of the Brāhmanas was

* The difficulty of their preservation is also an important factor in the case, as at that time writing either did not exist at all, or at any rate was but seldom employed. ["In considering the question of the age and extent of the use of writing in India, it is important to point out that the want of suitable materials, in the North at least, before the introduction of paper, must have been a great obstacle to its general use."—Burnell, Elements of South Indian Palæography, p. 10.]
gradually more and more lost, and passed over to the Śūtras, &c. To the number of the Brāhmaṇas, or recensions of the Samhitās, which were thus lost, belong those of the Vāshkalas, Paiṅgins, Bhāllavins, Śātyāyanins, Kālabavins, Lāmakāyanins, Śāmbuvins, Khāḍāyanins, and Śālāṅkāyanins, which we find quoted on various occasions in writings of this class; besides all the Chhandas works (Samhitās) specified in the gaṇa ‘Śaunaka’ (Pān., iv. 3. 106), whose names are not so much as mentioned elsewhere.

The difference between the Brāhmaṇas of the several Vedas as to subject-matter is essentially this: The Brāhmaṇas of the Rīk, in their exposition of the ritual, generally specify those duties only which fell to the Hotar, or reciter of the pīkās, whose office it was to collect from the various hymns the verses suited to each particular occasion, as its āstra (canon). The Brāhmaṇas of the Sāman confine themselves to the duties of the Udgātar, or singer of the sāmans; the Brāhmaṇas of the Yajus, to the duties of the Adhvaryu, or actual performer of the sacrifice. In the Brāhmaṇas of the Rīk, the order of the sacrificial performance is on the whole preserved, whereas the sequence of the hymns as they occur in the Rīk-Samhitā is not attended to at all. But in the Brāhmaṇas of the Sāman and Yajus, we find a difference corresponding to the fact that their Samhitās are already adapted to the proper order of the ritual. The Brāhmaṇa of the Sāman enters but seldom into the explanation of individual verses; the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus, on the contrary, may be almost considered as a running dogmatic commentary on its Samhitā, to the order of which it adheres so strictly, that in the case of its omitting one or more verses, we might perhaps be justified in concluding that they did not then form part of the Samhitā. A supplement also has been added to this Brāhmaṇa for some of those books of the Samhitā which were incorporated with it at a period subsequent to its original compilation, so that the Brāhmaṇa comprises 100 adhyāyas instead of 60, as formerly seems to have been the case. The Brāhmaṇa of the Black Yajus does not, as we shall see further on, differ in its contents, but only in point of time, from its Samhitā. It is, in fact, a supplement to it. The Brāhmaṇa of the
Athanavan is up to the present time unknown, though there are manuscripts of it in England.

The common name for the Brāhmaṇa literature is Śruti, ‘hearing,’ i.e., that which is subject of hearing, subject of exposition, of teaching, by which name their learned, and consequently exclusive, character is sufficiently intimated. In accordance with this we find in the works themselves frequent warnings against intruding the knowledge contained in them to any profane person. The name Śruti is not indeed mentioned in them, but only in the Sūtras, though it is perfectly justified by the corresponding use of the verb śru which occurs in them frequently.

The third stage in Vedic literature is represented by the Sūtras.* These are, upon the whole, essentially founded

---

* It has since been published, see below. It presents no sort of direct internal relation to the Ath. Samhila.

The word Sūtra in the above sense occurs first in the Madhukūtpa, one of the latest supplements to the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yājus, next in the two Grihya-Sūtras of the Rik, and finally in Pāṇini. It means ‘thread,’ ‘band,’ cf. Lat. aure.

Would it be correct to regard it as an expression analogous to the German band (volume)? If so, the term would have to be understood of the fastening together of the leaves, and would necessarily presuppose the existence of writing (in the same way, perhaps, as grāmā does, a term first occurring in Pāṇini!). Inquiry into the origin of Indian writing has not, unfortunately, led to much result as yet. The oldest inscriptions, according to Wilson, date no earlier than the third century B.C. Nevertheless, however, as is well known, mentions writing; and his time corresponds very well upon the whole to the period to which we must refer the origin of the Sūtras. But as these were composed chiefly with a view to their being committed to memory—a fact which follows from their form, and partly accounts for it—there might be good grounds for taking exception to the etymology just proposed, and for regarding the signification ‘guiding-line,’ ‘cinct,’ as the original one. [This is the meaning given in the St. Petersburg Dictionary.—The writing of the Indians is of Semitic origin; see Benfey, Indien (in Erssch and Gruber’s Encyclopaedia, 1840), p. 254; my Indische Schriften (1836), p. 127, f.); Burrell, Elecs. of South Indians, 2nd., p. 3, f. Probably it served in the first instance merely for secular purposes, and was only applied subsequently to literature. See Müller, Amer. S. Lit., p. 507; J. St., v. 20, ff.; J. Str., ii. 339. Goldstücker (Pāṇini, 1860, p. 28, ff.) contends that the words śrīra and grāmā must absolutely be connected with writing. See, however, J. St., v. 24, ff.; xii. 476.]—Nor does etymology lead us to a more certain result in the case of another word found in this connection, viz., aṣṭāhara, ‘syllable.’ This word does not seem to occur in this sense in the Sanskrit of the Rik (or Sāman); it there rather signifies ‘imperishable.’ The connecting link between this primary signification and the meaning ‘syllable,’ which is first met with in the Samhīta of the Yājus, might perhaps be the idea of writing, the latter being the making imperishable, as it were, of otherwise
on the Brāhmaṇas, and must be considered as their necessary supplement, as a further advance in the path struck out by the latter in the direction of more rigid system and formalism. While the Brāhmaṇas, with the view of explaining the sacrifice and supporting it by authority, &c., uniformly confine themselves to individual instances of ritual, interpretation, tradition, and speculation, subjecting these to copious dogmatic treatment, the object of the Sūtras is to comprehend everything that had any reference whatever to these subjects. The mass of matter became too great; there was risk of the tenor of the whole being lost in the details; and it gradually became impossible to discuss all the different particulars consecutively. Diffuse discussion of the details had to be replaced by concise collective summaries of them. The utmost brevity was, however, requisite in condensing this great mass, in order to avoid overburdening the memory; and this brevity ultimately led to a remarkably compressed and enigmatical style, which was more and more cultivated as the literature of the Sūtras became more independent, and in proportion as the resulting advantages became apparent. Thus the more ancient a Sūtra, the more intelligible it is; the more enigmatical it is, the more modern will it prove.

But the literature of the Sūtras can by no means be said to rest entirely upon the Brāhmaṇas, for these, as a rule, give too exclusive a prominence to the ritual of the sacrifice. Indeed, it is only one particular division of the Sūtras—viz., the Kalpa-Sūtras, aphorisms exclusively devoted to the consideration of this ritual—which bears

---

fleeting and evanescent words and syllables (!). Or is the notion of the imperishable λόγος at the root of this signification? [In the Errata to the first German edition, it was pointed out, on the authority of a communication received from Professor Aufrechte, that σακχάρα is twice used in the Rik of the ‘measuring of speech,’ viz., i. 164. 24 (47), and ix. 13. 3, and consequently may there mean ‘syllable.’ According to the St. Petersburg Dictionary, this latter meaning is to be derived from the idea of ‘the constant, simple’ element in language.]

9 On the mutual relations of the Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras, see also J. St., viii. 76, 77; ix. 353, 354.

10 Precisely as in the case of the Brāhmaṇas, so also in the case of the Kalpas, i.e., Kalpa-Sūtras, Pāṇini, iv. 3. 105, distinguishes those composed by the ancients from those that are nearer to his own time.

11 On the sacrifice and sacrificial implements of the Brāhmaṇas, see M. Müller in Z. D. M. G., IX. xxxvi., xxxvii.; Haug’s notes to his translation of the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa; and my paper, Zur Kenntniss des vedischen Opferrituales, I. St., x. xiii.
the special name of Śrauta-Sūtras, i.e., "Sūtras founded on the Śruti." The sources of the other Sūtras must be sought elsewhere.

Side by side with the Śrauta-Sūtras we are met by a second family of ritual Sūtras, the so-called Grihya-Sūtras, which treat of domestic ceremonies, those celebrated at birth and before it, at marriage, as well as at death and after it. The origin of these works is sufficiently indicated by their title, since, in addition to the name of Grihya-Sūtras, they also bear that of Smāra-Sūtras, i.e., "Sūtras founded on the Smṛiti." Smṛiti, 'memory,' i.e., that which is the subject of memory, can evidently only be distinguished from Śruti, 'hearing,' i.e., that which is the subject of hearing, in so far as the former impresses itself on the memory directly, without special instruction and provision for the purpose. It belongs to all, it is the property of the whole people, it is supported by the consciousness of all, and does not therefore need to be specially inculcated. Custom and law are common property and accessible to all; ritual, on the contrary, though in like manner arising originally from the common consciousness, is developed in its details by the speculations and suggestions of individuals, and remains so far the property of the few, who, favoured by external circumstances, understand how to inspire the people with a due awe of the importance and sanctity of their institutions. It is not, however, to be assumed from this that Smṛiti, custom and law, did not also undergo considerable alterations in the course of time. The mass of the immigrants had a great deal too much on their hands in the subjugation of the aborigines to be in a position to occupy themselves with other matters. Their whole energies had, in the first instance, to be concentrated upon the necessity of holding their own against the enemy. When this had been effected, and resistance was broken down, they awoke suddenly to find themselves bound and shackled in the hands of other and far more powerful enemies; or rather, they did not awake at all; their physical powers had been so long and so exclusively exercised and expended to the detriment of their intellectual energy, that the latter had gradually dwindled away altogether. The history of these new enemies was this: The knowledge of the ancient songs
with which, in their ancient homes; the Indians had worshipped the powers of nature, and the knowledge of the ritual connected with these songs, became more and more the exclusive property of those whose ancestors perhaps composed them, and in whose families this knowledge had been hereditary. These same families remained in the possession of the traditions connected with them, and which were necessary to their explanation. To strangers in a foreign country, anything brought with them from home becomes invested with a halo of sacredness; and thus it came about that these families of singers became families of priests, whose influence was more and more consolidated in proportion as the distance between the people and their former home increased, and the more their ancient institutions were banished from their minds by external struggles. The guardians of the ancestral customs, of the primitive forms of worship, took an increasingly prominent position, became the representatives of these, and, finally, the representatives of the Divine itself. For so ably had they used their opportunities, that they succeeded in founding a hierarchy the like of which the world has never seen. To this position it would have been scarcely possible for them to attain but for the enervating climate of Hindustán, and the mode of life induced by it, which exercised a deteriorating influence upon a race unaccustomed to it. The families also of the petty kings who had formerly reigned over individual tribes, held a more prominent position in the larger kingdoms which were of necessity founded in Hindustán; and thus arose the military caste. Lastly, the people proper, the Viṣās, or settlers, united to form a third caste, and they in their turn naturally reserved to themselves prerogatives over the fourth caste, or Sudras. This last was composed of various mixed elements, partly, perhaps, of an Aryan race which had settled earlier in India, partly of the aborigines themselves, and partly again of those among the immigrants, or their Western kinsmen, who refused adherence to the new Brahmanical order. The royal

* Who were distinguished by their colour, for caste. [See I. St., x. 4, very colour from the three other.]

cañes; hence the name Varṇa, i.e.
families, the warriors, who, it may be supposed, strenuously supported the priesthood so long as it was a question of robbing the people of their rights, now that this was effected turned against their former allies, and sought to throw off the yoke that was likewise laid upon them. These efforts were, however, unavailing; the colossus was too firmly established. Obscure legends and isolated allusions are the only records left to us in the later writings, of the sacrilegious hands which ventured to attack the sacred and divinely consecrated majesty of the Brahmans; and these are careful to note, at the same time, the terrible punishments which befell those impious offenders. The fame of many a Barbarossa has here passed away and been forgotten!

The Smārta-Sūtras, which led to this digression, generally exhibit the complete standpoint of Brahmanism. Whether in the form of actual records or of compositions orally transmitted, they in any case date from a period when more than men cared to lose of the Smṛiti—that precious tradition passed on from generation to generation—was in danger of perishing. Though, as we have just seen, it had undergone considerable modifications, even in the families who guarded it, through the influence of the Brahmans, yet this influence was chiefly exercised with reference to its political bearings, leaving domestic manners and customs untouched in their ancient form; so that these works cover a rich treasure of ideas and conceptions of extreme antiquity. It is in them also that we have to look for the beginnings of the Hindú legal literature, whose subject-matter, indeed, in part corresponds exactly to theirs, and whose authors bear for the most part the same names as those of the Grihya-Sūtras. With the strictly legal portions of the law-books, those dealing with

11 For the ritual relating to birth see Speijer's book on the Jātakarma (Leyden, 1872)—for the marriage ceremonies, Haska's paper, Über die Heirathsgebrauche der alten Inder, with additions by myself in J. St., v. 267, ff.; also my papers Vediche Hochzeitsgespräche, ibid., p. 177, ff. (1862)—on the burial of the dead, Roth in Z. D. M. G., viii. 487, ff. (1854), and M. Müller, ibid.; IX. i.-xxxvi. (1855); and lastly, O. Donner’s Pindacauriṣayna (1870).

12 Besides the Grihya-Sūtras we find some texts directly called Dharmasūtras, or Samayādharma-Sūtras, which are specified as portions of the Śrauta-Sūtras, but which were no doubt subsequently inserted into these.
civil law, criminal law, and political law, we do not, it is true, find more than a few points of connection in these Sūtras; but probably these branches were not codified at all until the pressure of actual imminent danger made it necessary to establish them on a secure foundation. The risk of their gradually dying out was, owing to the constant operation of the factors involved, not so great as in the case of domestic customs. But a far more real peril threatened them in the fierce assaults directed against the Brahmanical polity by the gradually increasing power of Buddhism. Buddhism originally proceeded purely from theoretical heterodoxy regarding the relation of matter to spirit, and similar questions; but in course of time it addressed itself to practical points of religion and worship, and thenceforth it imperilled the very existence of Brahmanism, since the military caste and the oppressed classes of the people generally availed themselves of its aid in order to throw off the overwhelming yoke of priestly domination. The statement of Megasthenes, that the Indians in his time administered law only ἀπὸ μνήμης, 'from memory,' I hold therefore to be perfectly correct, and I can see no grounds for the view that μνήμη is but a mistranslation of Smṛiti in the sense of Smṛiti-Sūtra, 'a treatise on Smṛiti.'* For the above-mentioned reason, however—in consequence of the development of Buddhism into an anti-Brahmanical religion—the case may have altered soon afterwards, and a code, that of Manu, for example (founded on the Mānava Gṛhya-Sūtra), may have been drawn up. But this work belongs not to the close of the Vedic, but to the beginning of the following period.

As we have found, in the Smṛiti, an independent basis for the Gṛhya-Sūtras—in addition to the Brāhmaṇas, where but few points of contact with these Sūtras can be traced—so too shall we find an independent basis for those Sūtras the contents of which relate to language. In this case it is in the recitation of the songs and formulas at the sacrifice that we shall find it. Although, accordingly, these

---

* This latter view has been negated, Elements of S. Ind. Palæogr., set forth by Schwanbeck, Megasthenes, pp. 50, 51. [But see also Bur-
Sūtras stand on a level with the Brāhmaṇas, which owe their origin to the same source, yet this must be understood as applying only to those views on linguistic relations which, being presupposed in the Sūtras, must be long anterior to them. It must not be taken as applying to the works themselves, inasmuch as they present the results of these antecedent investigations in a collected and systematic form. Obviously also, it was a much more natural thing to attempt, in the first instance, to elucidate the relation of the prayer to the sacrifice, than to make the form in which the prayer itself was drawn up a subject of investigation. The more sacred the sacrificial performance grew, and the more fixed the form of worship gradually became, the greater became the importance of the prayers belonging to it, and the stronger their claim to the utmost possible purity and safety. To effect this, it was necessary, first, to fix the text of the prayers; secondly, to establish a correct pronunciation and recitation; and, lastly, to preserve the tradition of their origin. It was only after the lapse of time, and when by degrees their literal sense had become foreign to the phase into which the language had passed—and this was of course much later the case with the priests, who were familiar with them, than with the people at large—that it became necessary to take precautions for securing and establishing the sense also. To attain all these objects, those most conversant with the subject were obliged to give instruction to the ignorant, and circles were thus formed around them of travelling scholars, who made pilgrimages from one teacher to another according as they were attracted by the fame of special learning. These researches were naturally not confined to questions of language, but embraced the whole range of Brahmanical theology, extending in like manner to questions of worship, dogma, and speculation, all of which, indeed, were closely interwoven with each other. We must, at any rate, assume among the Brahmans of this period a very stirring intellectual life, in which even the women took an active part, and which accounts still further for the superiority maintained and exercised by the Brahmans over the rest of the people. Nor did the military caste hold aloof from these inquiries, especially after they had succeeded in securing a time of repose from
external warfare. We have here a faithful copy of the scholastic period of the Middle Ages; sovereigns whose courts form the centres of intellectual life; Brahmans who with lively emulation carry on their inquiries into the highest questions the human mind can propound; women who with enthusiastic ardour plunge into the mysteries of speculation, impressing and astonishing men by the depth and loftiness of their opinions, and who—while in a state which, judging from description, seems to have been a kind of somnambulism—solve the questions proposed to them on sacred subjects. As to the quality of their solutions, and the value of all these inquiries generally, that is another matter. But neither have the scholastic subtleties any absolute worth in themselves; it is only the striving and the effort which ennobles the character of any such period.

The advance made by linguistic research during this epoch was very considerable. It was then that the text of the prayers was fixed, that the redaction of the various Samhitás took place. By degrees, very extensive precautions were taken for this purpose. For their study (Páthá), as well as for the different methods of preserving them—whether by writing or by memory, for either is possible—such special injunctions are given, that it seems

---

12 All the technical terms, however, which occur for study of the Veda and the like, uniformly refer to speaking and reciting only, and thereby point to exclusively oral tradition. The writing down of the Vedic texts seems indeed not to have taken place until a comparatively late period. See J.St., v. 18, ff. (1861). Müller, Anc. S. Lit., p. 507, ff. (1859): Westergaard, Über den ältesten Zeitraum der indischen Geschichte (1860, German translation 1862, p. 42, ff.); and Haug, Über das Wesen des vedischen Accents (1873, p. 16, ff.), have declared themselves in favour of this theory. Haug thinks that those Brahmans who were converted to Buddhism were the first who consigned the Veda to writing—for polemical purposes—and that they were followed by the rest of the Brahmans. On the other hand, Goldstücker, Böllingk, Whitney, and Roth (Der Atkharasveda in Kashmir, p. 10), are of the opposite opinion, holding, in particular, that the authors of the Prátyákhyās must have had written texts before them. Benfey also formerly shared this view, but recently (Erläuterung in die Grammatik der ved. Sprache, p. 31), he has expressed the belief that the Vedic texts were only committed to writing at a late date, long subsequent to their 'disanekamatis.' Burnett also, I. e., p. 10, is of opinion that, amongst other things, the very scarcity of the material for writing in ancient times "almost precludes the existence of MSS. of books or long documents."
all but impossible that any alteration in the text, except in the form of interpolation, can have taken place since. These directions, as well as those relating to the pronunciation and recitation of the words, are laid down in the Prátiśákhya-Sútras, writings with which we have but recently been made acquainted. Such a Prátiśákhya-Sútra uniformly attaches itself to the Samhítá of a single Veda only, but it embraces all the schools belonging to it; it gives the general regulations as to the nature of the sounds employed, the euphonic rules observed, the accent and its modifications, the modulation of the voice, &c. Further, all the individual cases in which peculiar phonetic or other changes are observed are specially pointed out; and we are in this way supplied with an excellent critical means of arriving at the form of the text of each Samhítá at the time when its Prátiśákhya was composed. If we find in any part of the Samhítá phonetic peculiarities which we are unable to trace in its Prátiśákhya, we may rest assured that at that period this part did not yet belong to the Samhítá. The directions as to the recital of the Veda, i.e., of its Samhítá, in the schools—each individual word being repeated in a variety of connections—present a very lively picture of the care with which these studies were pursued.

For the knowledge of metre also, rich materials have been handed down to us in the Sútras. The singers of the hymns themselves must naturally have been cognisant of the metrical laws observed in them. But we also find the technical names of some metres now and then mentioned in the later songs of the Rík. In the Bráhmaṇas the oddest tricks are played with them, and their harmony is in some mystical fashion brought into connection with the harmony of the world, in fact stated to be its funda-

* By Roth in his essays, Zur Literatur und Geschichte des Weda, p. 53, ff. (translated in Journ. As. Soc. Bengal, January 1848, p. 6, ff.).

14 This indeed is the real purpose of the Prátiśákhyas, namely, to show how the continuous Samhítá text is to be reconstructed out of the Pada text, in which the individual words of the text are given separately in their original form, unaffected by any of the influence of the words which immediately precede and follow. Whatever else, over and above this, is found in the Prátiśákhyas is merely accessory matter. See Whitney in Journal As. Or. Soc., iv. 259 (1853).

† Strictly speaking, only those (the Samhítás) are Veda.
mental cause. The simple minds of these thinkers were too much charmed by their rhythm not to be led into these and similar symbolisings. The further development of metre afterwards led to special inquiries into its laws. Such investigations have been preserved to us, both in Sūtras treating directly of metre, e.g., the Nidāna-Sūtra, and in the Anukramanīs, a peculiar class of works, which, adhering to the order of each Samhitā, assign a poet, a metre, and a deity to each song or prayer. They may, therefore, perhaps belong to a later period than most of the Sūtras, to a time when the text of each Samhitā was already extant in its final form, and distributed as we there find it into larger and smaller sections for the better regulation of its study. One of the smallest sections formed the pupil’s task on each occasion.—The preservation of the tradition concerning the authors and the origin of the prayers is too intimately connected herewith to be dissociated from the linguistic Sūtras, although the class of works to which it gave rise is of an entirely different character. The most ancient of such traditions are to be found, as above stated, in the Brāhmaṇas themselves. These latter also contain legends regarding the origin and the author of this or that particular form of worship; and on such occasions the Brāhmaṇa frequently appeals to Gāthás, or stanzas, preserved by oral transmission among the people. It is evidently in these legends that we must look for the origin of the more extensive Itihāsas and Purāṇas, works which but enlarged the range of their subject, but which in every other respect proceeded after the same fashion, as is shown by several of the earlier fragments preserved, e.g., in the Mahā-Bhārata. The most ancient work of the kind hitherto known is the Brihaddevatā by Saunaka, in lokas, which, however, strictly follows the order of the Rīk-Samhitā, and proves by its very title that it has only an accidental connection with this class of works. Its object properly is to specify the deity for each verse of the Rīk-Samhitā. But in so doing, it supports its views with so many legends, that we are fully justified in classing it here. It, however, like the other Anukramanīs, belongs to a much later period than most

13 See Part i. of my paper on Indian Prosody, J. St., viii. 1, ff. (1863).
of the Sūtras, since it presupposes Yāska, the author of the Nirukti, of whom I have to speak presently; it is, in fact, essentially based upon his work. [See Adalb. Kuhn in I. St., i. 101–120.]

It was remarked above, that the investigations into the literal sense of the prayers only began when this sense had gradually become somewhat obscure, and that, as this could not be the case among the priests, who were familiar with it, so soon as amongst the rest of the people, the language of the latter may at that time have undergone considerable modifications. The first step taken to render the prayers intelligible was to make a collection of synonyms, which, by virtue of their very arrangement, explained themselves, and of specially obsolete words, of which separate interpretations were then given orally. These collected words were called, from their being "ranked," "strung together," Nigranthu, corrupted into Nighanthu, and those occupied with them Naighanthukas. One work of this kind has been actually preserved to us. It is in five books, of which the three first contain synonyms; the fourth, a list of specially difficult Vedic words; and the fifth, a classification of the various divine personages who figure in the Veda. We also possess one of the ancient expositions of this work, a commentary on it, called Nirukti, "interpretation," of which Yāska is said to be the author. It consists of twelve books, to which two others having no proper connection with them were afterwards added. It is reckoned by the Indians among the so-called Vedaángas, together with Śikshá, Chhandas, and Jyotishá—three very late treatises on phonetics, metre, and astronomical calculations—and also with Kalpa and Vyákarana, i.e., ceremonial and grammar, two general categories of literary works. The four first names likewise originally signified the class in general, and it was only later that they were applied to the four individual works.

* See Roth, Introduction to the Nirukti, p. xii.

16 To this place belong, further, the Nighanṭu to the Atharva-S., mentioned by Haug (cf. J. St., ix. 175, 176,) and the Nigama-Parishehta of the White Yajna.

17 Śikshá still continues to be the name of a species. A considerable number of treatises so entitled have recently been found, and more are constantly being brought to light. Cf. Riehorn, J. St., xiv. 160.
now specially designated by those titles. It is in Yāska’s work, the Nirukti, that we find the first general notions of grammar. Starting from the phonetic rules, the observance of which the Prātiśākhyā-Sūtras had already established with so much minuteness—but only for each of the Veda-Samhitās—advance was no doubt gradually made, in the first place, to a general view of the subject of phonetics, and thence to the remaining portions of the domain of language. Inflection, derivation, and composition were recognised and distinguished, and manifold reflections were made upon the modifications thereby occasioned in the meaning of the root. Yāska mentions a considerable number of grammatical teachers who preceded him, some by name individually, others generally under the name of Nairukta, Vaiyākaraṇas, from which we may gather that a very brisk activity prevailed in this branch of study. To judge from a passage in the Kaushitaki-Brāhmaṇa, linguistic research must have been carried on with peculiar enthusiasm in the North of India; and accordingly, it is the northern, or rather the north-western district of India that gave birth to the grammarian who is to be looked upon as the father of Sanskrit grammar, Pāṇini. Now, if Yāska himself must be considered as belonging only to the last stages of the Vedic period, Pāṇini—from Yāska to whom is a great leap—must have lived at the very close of it, or even at the beginning of the next period. Advance from the simple designation of grammatical words by means of terms corresponding to them in sense, which we find in Yāska, to the algebraic symbols of Pāṇini, implies a great amount of study in the interval. Besides, Pāṇini himself presupposes some such symbols as already known; he cannot therefore be regarded as having invented, but only as having consistently carried out a method which is certainly in a most eminent degree suited to its purpose.

Lastly, Philosophical Speculation also had its peculiar development contemporaneously with, and subsequently to, the Brāhmaṇas. It is in this field and in that of grammar that the Indian mind attained the highest pitch of its marvellous fertility in subtle distinctions, however abstruse or naïve, on the other hand, the method may occasionally be.
- Several hymns of a speculative purport in the last book of the Rik-Śamhitā testify to a great depth and concentration of reflection upon the fundamental cause of things, necessarily implying a long period of philosophical research in a preceding age. This is borne out by the old renown of Indian wisdom, by the reports of the companions of Alexander as to the Indian gymnosophists, &c.

It was inevitable that at an early stage, and as soon as speculation had acquired some vigour, different opinions and starting-points should assert themselves, more especially regarding the origin of creation; for this, the most mysterious and difficult problem of all, was at the same time the favourite one. Accordingly, in each of the Brāhmaṇas, one at least, or it may be more, accounts on the subject may be met with; while in the more extensive works of this class we find a great number of different conjectures with regard to cosmogony. One of the principal points of difference naturally was whether indiscrte matter or spirit was to be assumed as the First Cause. The latter theory became gradually the orthodox one, and is therefore the one most frequently, and indeed almost exclusively, represented in the Brāhmaṇas. From among the adherents of the former view, which came by degrees to be regarded as heterodox, there arose, as thought developed, enemies still more dangerous to orthodoxy, who, although they confined themselves in the first place solely to the province of theory, before long threw themselves into practical questions also, and eventually became the founders of the form of belief known to us as Buddhism. The word buddha, "awakened, enlightened," was originally a name of honour given to all sages, including the orthodox. This is shown by the use both of the root budh in the Brāhmaṇas, and of the word buddha itself in even the most recent of the Vedāntic writings. The technical application of the word is as much the secondary one as it is in the case also of another word of the kind, śramaṇa, which was in later times appropriated by the Buddhists as peculiarly their own. Here not merely the corresponding use of the root śram, but also the word śramaṇa itself, as a title of honour, may be pointed out in several passages in the Brāhmaṇas. Though Megasthenes, in a passage quoted by Strabo, draws a distinct line between two sects
of philosophers, the Ḡṛṣṇaṁbaṁ and the Śaquṣvam, yet we should hardly be justified in identifying the latter with the Buddhist mendicants, at least, not exclusively; for he expressly mentions the Ṛṣiṁbhośi—i.e., the Brahmachārins and Vānaprasthas, the first and third of the stages into which a Brahman's life is distributed—as forming part of the Śaquṣvam. The distinction between the two sects probably consisted in this, that the Ḡṛṣṇaṁbaṁ were the "philosophers" by birth, also those who lived as householders (Gṛihasthas); the Śaquṣvam, on the contrary, those who gave themselves up to special mortifications, and who might belong also to other castes. The Ḡṛṣṇaṁ, mentioned by Strabo in another passage (see Lassen, I. A.K. i. 336), whom, following the accounts of Alexander's time, he describes as accomplished polemical dialecticians, in contradistinction to the Ḡṛṣṇaṁbaṁ, whom he represents as chiefly devoted to physiology and astronomy, appear either to be identical with the Śaquṣvam—a supposition favoured by the fact that precisely the same things are asserted of both—or else, with Lassen, they may be regarded as Prāmāṇas, i.e., founding their belief on pramāṇa, logical proof, instead of revelation. As, however, the word is not known in the writings of that period, we should in this case hardly be justified in accepting Strabo's report as true of Alexander's time, but only of a later age. Philosophical systems are not to be spoken of in connection with this period; only isolated views and speculations are to be met with in those portions of the Brāhmaṇas here concerned, viz., the so-called Upanishads (upanishad, a session, a lecture). Although there prevails in these a very marked tendency to systematise and subdivide, the investigations still move within a very narrow and limited range. Considerable progress towards systematising, and expansion is visible in the Upanishads found in the Arāṇyakas,* i.e., writings supplementary to the Brāhmaṇas, and especially designed for the Ṛṣiṁbhośi; and still greater progress in those Upanishads which stand by themselves, i.e.,

* The name Arāṇyaka occurs first in the udātīka to Pāñj. iv. 2. 129 [see 'Veda'], iii. 116, 303; and in the Atharvopanishads (see I St., i 179).
those which, although perhaps originally annexed to a Brāhmaṇa or an Aranyaka of one of the three older Vedas, have come down to us at the same time—or, it may be, have come down to us only—in an Atharvan recension. Finally, those Upanishads which are directly attached to the Atharva-Veda are complete vehicles of developed philosophical systems; they are to some extent sectarian in their contents, in which respect they reach down to the time of the Purāṇas. That, however, the fundamental works now extant of the philosophical systems, viz., their Sūtras, were composed much later than has hitherto been supposed, is conclusively proved by the following considerations. In the first place, the names of their authors are either not mentioned at all in the most modern Brāhmaṇas and Aranyakas, or, if they are, it is under a different form and in other relations—in such a way, however, that their later acceptance is already foreshadowed and exhibited in the germ. Secondly, the names of the sages mentioned in the more ancient of them are only in part identical with those mentioned in the latest liturgical Sūtras. And, thirdly, in all of them the Veda is expressly presupposed as a whole, and direct reference is also made to those Upanishads which we are warranted in recognising as the latest real Upanishads; nay, even to such as are only found attached to the Atharvan. The style, too, the enigmatical conciseness, the mass of technical terms—although these are not yet endowed with an algebraic force—imply a long previous period of special study to account for such precision and perfection. The philosophical Sūtras, as well as the grammatical Sūtra, should therefore be considered as dating from the beginning of the next period, within which both are recognised as of predominant authority.

In closing this survey of Vedic literature, I have lastly to call attention to two other branches of science, which, though they do not appear to have attained in this period to the possession of a literature—at least, not one of which direct relics and records have reached us—must yet have enjoyed considerable cultivation—I mean Astronomy and Medicine. Both received their first impulse from the exigencies of religious worship. Astronomical observations—though at first, of course, these were only of the
rudest description—were necessarily required for the regulation of the solemn sacrifices; in the first place, of those offered in the morning and evening, then of those at the new and full moon, and finally of those at the commencement of each of the three seasons. Anatomical observations, again, were certain to be brought about by the dissection of the victim at the sacrifice, and the dedication of its different parts to different deities. The Indo-Germanic mind, too, being so peculiarly susceptible to the influences of nature, and nature in India more than anywhere else inviting observation, particular attention could not fail to be early devoted to it. Thus we find in the later portions of the Vājasaneyi-Samhitā and in the Chhāndogyopaniśad express mention made of "observers of the stars," and "the science of astronomy," and, in particular, the knowledge of the twenty-seven (twenty-eight) lunar mansions was early diffused. They are enumerated singly in the Taittirīya-Samhitā, and the order in which they there occur is one that must necessarily* have been established somewhere between 1472 and 536 B.C. Strabo, in the above-mentioned passage, expressly assigns ṛṣipostumia as a favourite occupation of the Bṛhaspates. Nevertheless, they had not yet made great progress at this period; their observations were chiefly confined to the course of the moon, to the solstice, to a few fixed stars, and more particularly to astrology.

As regards Medicine, we find, especially in the Samhitā of the Atharvan, a number of songs addressed to illnesses and healing herbs, from which, however, there is not much to be gathered. Animal anatomy was evidently thoroughly understood, as each separate part had its own distinctive name. Alexander's companions, too, extol the Indian physicians, especially for their treatment of snake-bite.

---

* See J. St., ii. 240, note. [The correct numbers are rather 2700-1820 B.C., see J. St., x. 234-236 (1865); and for the Jyotisha, we obtain the years 1820-850 B.C., ibid. p. 236, ff. See further the remarks in note 2 above.]
From this preliminary survey of Vedic literature we now pass to the details. Adhering strictly to the Indian classification, we shall consider each of the four Vedas by itself, and deal with the writings belonging to them in their proper order, in connection with each Veda separately.

And first of the Rigveda. The Rigveda-Samhita presents a twofold subdivision—the one purely external, having regard merely to the compass of the work, and evidently the more recent; the other more ancient, and based on internal grounds. The former distribution is that into eight ashīvakas (eighths), nearly equal in length, each of which is again subdivided into as many adhyāyas (lectures), and each of these again into about 33 (2006 in all) vargas (sections), usually consisting of five verses. The latter is that into ten mandalas (circles), 85 anusūkhas (chapters), 1017 sūktas (hymns), and 10,580 rīchas (verses); it rests on the variety of authors to whom the hymns are ascribed: Thus the first and tenth mandalas contain songs by Rishis of different families; the second mandala, on the contrary (ashī. ii. 71–113), contains songs belonging to Grītsamāda; the third (ashī. ii. 114–119, iii. 1–56) belongs to Viśvāmitra; the fourth (ashī. iii. 57–114) to Vāmadeva; the fifth (ashī. iii. 115–122, iv. 1–79) to Atri; the sixth (ashī. iv. 80–140, v. 1–14) to Bharadvāja; the seventh (ashī. v. 15–118) to Vasishtha; the eighth (ashī. v. 119–129, vi. 1–81) to Kanva; and the ninth (ashī. vi. 82–124, vii. 1–71) to Angrīs. By the names of these Rishis we must understand not merely the individuals, but also their families. The hymns in each separate mandala are arranged in the order of the deities addressed. Those addressed to Agni occupy the first place, next come those

18 For particulars see L. St., iii. 255; Müller, Anc. S. Lit., p. 220.

19 The first mandala contains 24 anusūkhas and 191 sūktas; the second 4 an. 43 s.; the third 5 an. 68 s.; the fourth 5 an. 58 s.; the fifth 6 an. 87 s.; the sixth 6 an. 75 s.; the seventh 6 an. 104 s.; the eighth 10 an. 92 s. (besides 11 vañkkhīya-sūktas); the ninth 7 an. 114 s.; and the tenth 12 an. 191 s.

20 Delbrück, in his review of Siebenzig Lieder des Rigveda (cf. note 32) in the Jenaer Literaturzeitung (1875, p. 367), points out that in books 2–7 the hymns to Agni and Indra are arranged in a descending gradation as regards the number of verses.
to Indra, and then those to other gods. This, at least, is the order in the first eight maṇḍalas. The ninth is addressed solely to Soma, and stands in the closest connection with the Sāma-Samhitā, one-third of which is borrowed from it; whereas the tenth maṇḍala stands in a very special relation to the Atharva-Samhitā. The earliest mention of this order of the maṇḍalas occurs in the Aitareya-Āranyaka, and in the two Grīhya-Sūtras of Āvalāyana and Sāṅkhāyana. The Prātiṣākhyaṇas and Yāska recognise no other division, and therefore give to the Rik-Samhitā the name of daśatayyas, i.e., the songs "in ten divisions," a name also occurring in the Sāma-Sūtras. The Anukramāṇī of Kātyāyana, on the contrary, follows the division into ashtakas and adhyāyas. The name sākta, as denoting hymn, appears for the first time in the second part of the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus; the Rīg-Brāhmaṇas do not seem to be acquainted with it, but we find it in the Aitareya-Āranyaka, &c. The extant recension of the Rik-Samhitā is that of the Śakalas, and belongs specially, it would seem, to that branch of this school which bears the name of the Śāśiśīrīyas. Of another recension, that of the Vāshkalas, we have but occasional notices, but the difference between the two does not seem to have been considerable. One main distinction, at all events, is that its eighth maṇḍala contains eight additional hymns, making 100 in all, and that, consequently, its sixth ashtaka consists of 132 hymns. The name of the Śakalas is evidently related to Śākalya, a sage often mentioned in the Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras, who is

---

20 This is a mistake. They know the word not only in the above, but also in a technical sense, viz., as a designation of one of the six parts of the śattra ("canon"), more especially of the main substance of it; when thus applied, sākta appears in a collective meaning, comprising several sāktas. Cf. Śāntki Brāhmaṇa, xiv. 1.

21 I am at present unable to corroborate this statement in detail. I can only show, from Saunaka's Anuvākānukramāṇī, that the recension of the Vāshkalas had eight hymns more than that of the Śakalas, but not that these eight hymns formed part of the eighth maṇḍala. When I wrote the above I was probably thinking of the Vāsākhīlyas, whose number is given by Śāyana, in his commentary on the Ait. Br., as eight (cf. Roth, Zur Litt. und Gesch. des Vedas, p. 35; Haug on Ait. Br., 6, 24, p. 416), whereas the editions of Müller and Aufrecht have eleven. But as to whether these eight or eleven Vāsākhīlyas belong specially to the Vāshkalas, I cannot at present produce any direct evidence. On other differences of the Vāsākhīlyaschool, &c., see Adalb. Kuhn, in J. St., l. 108, ff.
RIGVEDA-SAMHITĀ.

stated by Yāska to be the author of the Padapātha of the Rik-Samhitā.† According to the accounts in the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus (the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa), a Sākalya, surnamed Vidagdha (the cunning?), lived contemporaneously with Yājñavalkya as a teacher at the court of Janaka, King of Videha, and that as the declared adversary and rival of Yājñavalkya. He was vanquished and cursed by the latter, his head dropped off, and his bones were stolen by robbers.—Vārkali also (a local form of Vāshkali) is the name of one of the teachers mentioned in the second part of the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa.‡

The Sākalas appear in tradition as intimately connected with the Sunakas, and to Šaunaka in particular a number of writings are attributed,† which he is said to have composed with a view to secure the preservation of the text (rigveda-guptaye), as, for instance, an Anukramani of the Rishis, of the metres, of the deities, of the axisas, of the hymns, an arrangement (Vidhāna) of the verses and their constituent parts, the above-mentioned Brahaddevatā,  

---

† His name seems to point to the north-west (I). The scholiast on Pāṇini (iv. 2, 117), at least, probably following the Mahābhāshya, cites Sākalya in connection with the Bāhi-kaś; see also Burnouf, Introduction à l’Histoire du Bouddhisme, p. 620. ff. The passage in the sūtra of Pāṇini, iv. 3, 128, has no local reference [on the data from the Mahābhāshya bearing on this point, see I. St., xii. 366, 372, 409, 428, 445]. On the other hand, we find Sākryas also in the Koḍa country in Kapilavatī, of whom, however, as of the Sākryanas in the Yajus, we do not exactly know what to make (see below). [The earliest mention of the word Sākali, is immediate reference to the Rik, occurs in a memorial verse, yajnapāthā, quoted in the Alt. Brāhmaṇa, i. 43 (see I. St., ii. 277).—For the name Sāsāra I can only cite the pravara section added at the close of the Āśvalāyana-Srauta-Sūtra, in which the Sāsāra are mentioned several times, partly by themselves, partly beside and in association with the Sūngas.]  

‡ This form of name, which might be traced to eva, occurs also in the Śākhyāyana Aranyaka, vii. 2: "akṣiṣṭhaṃ eva Vārkalino bṛhatīśvar abhisamayayast:," though the parallel passage in the Altar, Arany., iii. 8, otherwise similarly worded, reads instead of "Vārcalino," "ud (i.e., uṣṭ) Ardhalino/"  

† By Śadgurudhāya, in the introduction to his commentary on the Rīg-Anukramin of Kātyāyana.  

‡ Rather see Vidhāna texts (see below), the one of which has for its object the application of particular śicas, the other probably that of particular gedas, to superstitious purposes, after the manner of the Śāmavidhāna-Brāhmaṇa.
the Prātiśākhya of the Rīk, a Śmārtā-Sūtra,* and also a Kalpa-Sūtra referring specially to the Āitareyaka, which, however, he destroyed after one had been composed by his pupil, Āśvalāyana. It is not perhaps, on the face of it, impossible that all these writings might be the work of one individual Śaunaka; still they probably, nay, in part certainly, belong only to the school which bears his name. But, in addition to this, we find that the second mandala of the Samhitā itself is attributed to him; and that, on the other hand, he is identified with the Śaunaka at whose sacrificial feast Sauti, the son of Vaśampāyana, is said to have repeated the Mahā-Bhārata, recited by the latter on an earlier occasion to Janamejaya (the second), together with the Harivanśa. The former of these assertions must, of course, only be understood in the sense that the family of the Śunakas both belonged to the old Rishi families of the Rīk, and continued still later to hold one of the foremost places in the learned world of the Brahmans. Against the second statement, on the contrary, no direct objection can be urged; and it is at least not impossible that the teacher of Āśvalāyana and the sacrificer in the Naimisha† forest are identical.—In the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus we have, further, two distinct Śaunakas mentioned; the one, Indrota, as sacrificial priest of the prince who, in the Mahā-Bhārata, appears as the first Janamejaya (Pārikshita, so also in M.-Bh. xii. 5595, ff.), the other, Śvaidyāya, as Audichya, dwelling in the north.

As author of the Kṛma-pātha, of the Rīk-Samhitā a Pañchāla Bābhṛavya25 is mentioned. Thus we see that to the Kuru-Pañcālas and the Kosala-Videhas (to whom Śākalya belongs) appertains the chief merit of having fixed and arranged the text of the Rīk, as well as that of the Yajus;

* On the Grihya of Śaunaka, see Stenzler, I. St., i. 243.

† The sacrifice conducted by this Śaunaka in the Naimisha forest would, in any case, have to be distinguished from the great sacrificial festival of the Naimishāyas, so often mentioned in the Brāhmaṇas.

25 In the Rīk-Prātiś., xi. 33, merely Bābhṛavya; only in Uṇḍa's scholium is he designated as a Pañchāla. As, however, the Pañchālas are twice quoted as an authority in the text of the Rīk-Prātiśākhya itself, viz., ii. 12, 44, and that beside the Prātiśyas (people of the east), the above conclusions still hold good. See Regnier on Rīk-Pr., ii. 12, p. 113. Compare also Śākalya, S. R., xii. 13. 6 (pañchālāpadarasyātīḥ), and Samhitapancashad-Brāhmaṇa, § 2 (surattā Prātiśya Pañchālahau muktam, surattard 'muktam').
and this was probably accomplished, in the case of both Vedas, during the most flourishing period of these tribes.

For the origin of the songs themselves we must go back, as I have already repeatedly stated, to a far earlier period. This is most clearly shown by the mythological and geographical data contained in them.

The former, the mythological relations, represented in the older hymns of the Rīk, in part carry us back to the primitive Indo-Germanic time. They contain relics of the childlike and naïve conceptions then prevailing, such as may also be traced among the Teutons and Greeks. So, for instance, the idea of the change of the departed spirit into air, which is conducted by the winged wind, as by a faithful dog, to its place of destination, as is shown by the identity of Sārameya and Ἐπεμέλαις, of Sābala and Κόρβερος.† Further, the idea of the celestial sea, Varuṇa, Οὐρανός, encompassing the world; of the Father-Heaven, Dyauspītar, Zeus, Diespiter; of the Mother-Earth, Ἡμαθήρᾳ; of the waters of the sky as shining nymphs; of the sun’s rays as cows at pasture; of the dark cloud-god as the robber who carries off these maidens and cows; and of the mighty god who wields the lightning and thunderbolt, and who chastises and strikes down the ravisher; and other such notions.‡ Only the faintest outlines of this comparative mythology are as yet discernible; it will unquestionably, however, by degrees claim and obtain, in relation to classical mythology, a position exactly analogous to that which has already, in fact, been secured by comparative Indo-Germanic grammar in relation to classical grammar. The ground on which that mythology has hitherto stood trembles beneath it, and the new light about to be shed upon it we owe to the hymns of the Rigveda, which enable us to glance; as it were, into the workshop whence it originally proceeded.§

* See Kuhn, in Haupt’s Deutsche Zeitschrift, vi. 125, ff.
† I. St., ii. 297, ff. [and, still earlier, Max Müller; see his Chips from a German Workshop, ii. 182].
‡ See Kuhn, l. c., and repeatedly in the Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung, edited by him jointly with Aucrecht (vol. i., 1851).
§ See Z. D. M. G., v. 112. [Since I wrote the above, comparative mythology has been enriched with much valuable matter, but much also that is crude and fanciful has been advanced. Deserving of special mention, besides various papers by Adalh. Kuhn in his Zeitschrift, are two papers by the same author, entitled,
Again, secondly, the hymns of the Rik contain sufficient evidence of their antiquity in the invaluable information which they furnish regarding the origin and gradual development of two cycles of epic legend, the Persian and the Indian. In both of these the simple allegories of natural phenomena were afterwards arrayed in an historic garb. In the songs of the Rik we find a description, embellished with poetical colours, of the celestial contest between light and darkness, which are depicted either quite simply and naturally, or else in symbolical guise as divine beings. In the Persian Veda, the Avesta, on the other hand, "the contest* descends from heaven to earth, from the province of natural phenomena into the moral sphere. The champion is a son, born to his father, and given as a saviour to earth, as a reward for the pious exercise of the Soma worship. The dragon slain by him is a creation of the Power of Evil, armed with demoniacal might, for the destruction of purity in the world. Lastly, the Persian epic enters upon the ground of history. The battle is fought in the Aryan land; the serpent, Aji Dahaka in Zend, Ahi (Dásaka) in the Veda, is transformed into Zohak the tyrant on the throne of Irán; and the blessings achieved for the oppressed people by the warlike Ferédún—Traítana in the Veda, Thraetaonó in Zend—are freedom and contentment in life on the paternal soil." Persian legend traversed these phases in the course of perhaps 2000 years, passing from the domain of nature into that of the epic, and thence into the field of history. A succession of phases, corresponding to those of Ferédún, may be traced also in the case of Jemšíd (Yama, Yima); a similar series in the case of Kaikavús (Kávya Uśanas, Kava Uś); and probably also in the case of Kai Khosrú (Suśravás, Huśravañih). Indian legend in its development is the counterpart of the Persian myth. Even in the time of the Yajurveda the natural significance

---

*See Roth, in *Z. D. M. G.*, ii. 216, ff.
of the myth had become entirely obliterated. Indra is there but the quarrelsome and jealous god, who subdues the unwieldy giant by low cunning; and in the Indian epic the myth either still retains the same form, or else Indra is represented by a human hero, Arjuna, an incarnation of himself, who makes short work of the giant, and the kings who pass for the incarnations of the latter. The principal figures of the Mahâ-Bhârata and Râmâyana fall away like the kings of Firdûsî, and there remain for history only those general events in the story of the people to which the ancient myths about the gods have been applied. The personages fade into the background, and in this representation are only recognisable as poetic creations.

Thirdly, the songs of the Rik unfold to us particulars as to the time, place, and conditions of their origin and growth. In the more ancient of them the Indian people appear to us settled on the banks of the Indus, divided into a number of small tribes, in a state of mutual hostility, leading a patriarchal life as husbandmen and nomads; living separately or in small communities, and represented by their kings, in the eyes of each other by the wars they wage, and in presence of the gods by the common sacrifices they perform. Each father of a family acts as priest in his own house, himself kindling the sacred fire, performing the domestic ceremonies, and offering up praise and prayer to the gods. Only for the great common sacrifices—a sort of tribe-festivals, celebrated by the king—are special priests appointed, who distinguish themselves by their comprehensive knowledge of the requisite rites and by their learning, and amongst whom a sort of rivalry is gradually developed, according as one tribe or another is considered to have more or less prospered by its sacrifices. Especially prominent here is the enmity between the families of Vasîshtha and Visvâmîtra, which runs through all Vedic antiquity, continues to play an important part in the epic, and is kept up even to the latest times; so that, for example, a commentator of the Veda who claims to be descended from Vasîshtha leaves passages unexpounded in which the latter is stated to have had a curse imprecated upon him. This implacable hatred owes its origin to the trifling circumstance of Vasîshtha
having once been appointed chief sacrificial priest instead of Viśvāmītra by one of the petty kings of these early times.—The influence of these royal priests does not, however, at this early period, extend beyond the sacrifice; there are no castes as yet; the people is still one united whole, and bears but one name, that of viśas, settlers. The prince, who was probably elected, is called Viśpātī, a title still preserved in Lithuanian. The free position held by women at this time is remarkable. We find songs of the most exquisite kind attributed to poetesses and queens, among whom the daughter of Atri appears in the foremost rank. As regards love, its tender, ideal element is not very conspicuous; it rather bears throughout the stamp of an undisguised natural sensuality. Marriage is, however, held sacred; husband and wife are both rulers of the house (dampati), and approach the gods in united prayer. The religious sense expresses itself in the recognition of man's dependence on natural phenomena, and the beings supposed to rule over them; but it is at the same time claimed that these latter are, in their turn, dependent upon human aid, and thus a sort of equilibrium is established. The religious notion of sin is consequently wanting altogether, and submissive gratitude to the gods is as yet quite foreign to the Indian. 'Give me, and I will render to thee,' he says, claiming therewith a right on his part to divine help, which is an exchange, no grace. In this free strength, this vigorous self-consciousness, a very different, and a far more manly and noble, picture of the Indian is presented to us than that to which we are accustomed from later times. I have already endeavoured above to show how this state of things became gradually altered, how the fresh energy was broken, and by degrees disappeared, through the dispersion over Hindustān, and the enervating influence of the new climate. But what it was that led to the emigration of the people in such masses from the Indus across the Sarāsvatī towards the Ganges,

26 'Quite foreign' is rather too strong an expression. See Roth's paper, Die höchsten Götter der arischen Völker, in Z. D. M. G., vi. 72 (1851). There are different phases to be distinguished.
27 Völ. S., iii. 50; or, 'Kill him, then will I sacrifice to thee,' Taitt. S., vi. 4. 5. 6.
what was its principal cause, is still uncertain. Was it
the pressure brought about by the arrival of new settlers?
Was it excess of population? Or was it only the longing
for the beautiful tracts of Hindustán? Or perhaps all
these causes combined? According to a legend preserved
in the Bráhmana of the White Yajus, the priests were in
a great measure the cause of this movement, by urging
it upon the kings, even against their will [I. St., i. 178].
The connection with the ancestral home on the Indus
remained, of course, at first a very close one; later on,
however, when the new Brahmanical organisation was
completely consolidated in Hindustán, a strong element of
bitterness was infused into it, since the Brahmins looked
upon their old kinsmen who had remained true to the cus-
toms of their forefathers as apostates and unbelievers.

But while the origin of the songs of the Rík dates from
this primitive time, the redaction of the Rík-Samhitá only
took place, as we observed, at a period when the Brah-
manical hierarchy was fully developed, and when the
Kosala-Videhas and Kuru-Pañchálas, who are to be re-
garded as having been specially instrumental in effect-
ing it, were in their prime. It is also certain that not
a few of the songs were composed either at the time of
the emigration into Hindustán, or at the time of the
compilation itself. Such songs are to be found in the last
book especially, a comparatively large portion of which, as
I have already remarked, recurs in the Atharvaveda-Sam-
hitá. It is for the critic to determine approximately in the
case of each individual song, having regard to its con-

* Mandala x. 98 is a dialogue
between Devápi and Saḿtanu, the
two "Kauuravan," as Yáśka calls
them. In the Maha-Bhdrata Saḿ-
tanu is the name of the father of
Bhishma and Vichitravirya, by
whose two wives, Ambiká and Am-
biiká, Vyása became the father of
Dhrítaráṣṭra and Pándu. This
Saḿtanu is, therefore, the grand-
father of these latter, or the great-
grandfather of the Kauravas and
Pándavas, the belligerents in the
Maha-Bhdrata. We should thus
have to suppose that the feud de-
scribed in this epic had been fought
out long before the final arrange-
ment of the Rík-Samhitá! It is,
however, questionable whether the
Saḿtanu of the Maha-Bhdrata is
identical with the Saḿtanu men-
tioned in the Rík; or, even if we
take this for granted; whether he
may not merely have been associated
with the epic legend in majores rei
gloriam. Devápi, at least, who,
according to Yáśka, is his brother,
has in the Rík a different father
from the one given in the epic. See
I. St., i. 203.
tents, its ideas, its language, and the traditions connected with it, to what period it ought possibly to be ascribed. But as yet this task is only set; its solution has not yet even begun. 22

The deities to whom the songs are for the most part addressed are the following:—First, Agni, the god of fire. The songs dedicated to him are the most numerous of all—a fact sufficiently indicative of the character and import of these sacrificial hymns. He is the messenger from men to the gods, the mediator between them, who with his far-shining flame summons the gods to the sacrifice, however distant they may be. He is for the rest adored essentially as earthly sacrificial fire, and not as an elemental force. The latter is rather pre-eminently the attribute of the god to whom, next to Agni, the greatest number of songs is dedicated, viz., Indra. Indra is the mighty lord of the thunderbolt, with which he rends asunder the dark clouds, so that the heavenly rays and waters may descend to bless and fertilise the earth. A great number of the hymns, and amongst them some of the most beautiful, are devoted to the battle that is fought because the malicious demon will not give up his booty; to the description of the thunderstorm generally; which, with its flashing lightnings, its rolling thunders, and its furious blasts, made a tremendous impression upon the simple mind of the people. The break of day, too, is greeted; the dawns are praised as bright, beautiful maidens; and deep reverence is paid to the flaming orb of the mighty sun, as he steps forth vanquishing the darkness of night, and dissipating it to all the quarters of the heavens. The brilliant sun-god is besought for light and warmth, that seeds and flocks may thrive in gladsome prosperity.

Besides the three principal gods, Agni, Indra, and Súrya, we meet with a great number of other divine personages, prominent amongst whom are the Maruts, or winds, the faithful comrades of Indra in his battle; and Rudra, the howling, terrible god, who rules the furious tempest. It is not, however, my present task to discuss the whole of the Vedic Olympus; I had only to sketch generally

22 See now Perusch, Upalekha, p. 250 (1854; compare Literarisches Cent-
the groundwork and the outlines of this ancient edifice. Besides the powers of nature, we find, as development progresses, personifications also of spiritual conceptions, of ethical import; but the adoration of these, as compared with the former, is of later origin.

I have already discussed the precautions taken to secure the text of the Rik-Samhitá, i.e., the question of its authenticity, and I have likewise alluded to the aids to its explanation furnished by the remaining Vedic literature. These latter reduce themselves chiefly to the Nighántus, and the Nirukta of Yáska. Both works, in their turn, found their commentators in course of time. For the Nighántus, we have the commentary of Devarájayajvan, who belongs to about the fifteenth or sixteenth century. In the introduction he enlarges upon the history of their study, from which they appear to have found only one other complete commentator since Yáska, viz., Skanda-svámin. For Yáska’s Nirukta a commentary has been handed down to us dating from about the thirteenth century, that of Durga. Both works, moreover, the Nighántus as well as the Nirukta, exist in two different recensions. These do not materially differ from one another, and chiefly in respect of arrangement only; but the very fact of their existence leads us to suppose that these works were originally transmitted orally rather than in writing. A commentary, properly so called, on the Rik-Samhitá, has come down to us, but it dates only from the fourteenth century, that of Sáyanáchárya.* “From the long series of

---

28 Muir’s Original Sanskrit Texts, vol. v. (1870), is the best source of information for Vedic mythology.
29 This name appears both in the Väjása in the last book of the Śatap. Br., and in the Kárgánakrama of the Aitreyi school, where he is called Paṅgi, and described as the pupil of Váikampáyana, and teacher of Tátrí. From Pág., ii. 4. 63, it follows that Paṅgi was cognisant of the name Yáska, for he there teaches the plural form Yáskas for the patronymic Yáska. Compare on this the previous section in the Ásvaláyana-Snána Sútra. The Yáská Gaitiká-Kathás are mentioned in the Káthaka which again is quoted by Paṅgi; see I. St., iii. 475. A direct reference to Yáska is made in the Rik-Prát, and in the Bráhaddevátá; see also I. St., viii. 96, 245, 246.

* The circumstance that commentaries on almost all branches of the Vedas, and on various other important and extensive works as well, are ascribed to Sáyána and his brother Mádhaba, is to be explained by the practice prevailing in India by which works composed by order of some distinguished person bear his name as the author. So in the present day the Pañjáta work for the person who pays them, and leave
centuries* between Yáska and Sáyāna but scanty remains of an exegetical literature connected with the Rik-Samhitā are left to us, or, at any rate, have as yet been discovered Śaṅkara and the Vedántic school turned their attention chiefly to the Upanishads. Nevertheless, a gloss upon a portion at least of the Rik-Samhitā was drawn up by Anandatīrtha, a pupil of Śaṅkara, of which there is an exposition by Jayatīrtha, comprising the second and third adhyāyas of the first asktaka, in the Library of the India House in London.” Sáyāna himself, in addition to Durga’s commentary on the Nirukti, only quotes Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara Miśra and Bharatavāmin as expositors of the Vedas.31 The former wrote a commentary upon the Taitt. Yajus, not the Rik-Samhitā, in which he refers to Kāśakṛitiṣṇa, Ekachūrṇi, and Yāska as his predecessors in the work. For Bharatavāmin we have no further data than that his name is also cited by Devarāja (on the Nighaṇṭus), who further mentions Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara Miśra, Mādhavaśeṣa, Bhavasvāmin, Guhadeva, Śrīnivāsa, and Uvatā. The latter, otherwise called Uṣā, wrote a commentary on the

the fruit of their labour to him as his property. Mādhava, and probably also Sāyāna, were ministers at the court of King Buhka at Vijayanāgar, and took advantage of their position to give a fresh impulse to the study of the Veda. The writings attributed to them, point, by the very difference of their contents and style, to a variety of authorship. [According to A. O. Burnell, in the preface to his edition of the Vādās-Bṛh-māṇa, p. viii., ff. (1873), the two names denote one person only. Sāyāna, he says, is “the Bhoga-māṇa, or mortal body, of Mādhava, the soul identified with Vīṣṇu.” Burnell is further of opinion that the twenty-nine writings current under the name of Mādhava all proceed from Mādhava himself, unassisted to any large extent by others, and that they were composed by him during a period of about thirty of the fifty-five years between 1337-1356 A.D., which he spent as abbot of the monastery at Śrīnι, under the name Vidyāranyakavāmin. See my remarks to the contrary in Literaturwissenschaftliches Centralblatt (1873), p. 1421. Burnell prefers the form Vidyānāgara to Vijayanāgar. Cowell, in his note on Celeb., Misc. Ess., i. 235, has Vidyā3 and Vijaya3 side by side.] 31 To these have to be added Skandavāmin (see p. 41) and Ka- pardin (see below); and as anterior to Sāyāna we must probably regard the works of Atmānanda, Rāvana, and Kauśika (or is the latter identical with Bhaṭṭa Kauśika Bhāskara Miśra?) cf. Burnell, Catalogue of Vedic MSS., p. 12, and the Gū- dhārtharatnasamādī, Burnell, Vaisakha., p. xxvi., ff.; Müller, in the preface to his large edition of the Rik- Samhitā, vol. vi. p. xxvii., ff. Some extracts from Rāvana’s commentary have been published by Fitz-Edward Hall in Journal As. Soc. Beng., 1862, pp. 129-134.
RIGVEDA-SAMHITA.

Samhitā of the White Yajus, not the Rik-Samhitā, as well as commentaries on the two Prātiśākyas of the Rik and the White Yajus. As regards European researches, the Rik-Samhitā, as well as the other Vedas, first became known to us through Colebrooke’s excellent paper “On the Vedas,” in the As. Res. vol. viii. (Calc. 1805). To Rosen we are indebted for the first text, as given partly in his Rīgvedae Specimen (London, 1830), partly in the edition of the first ashtaṅga, with Latin translation, which only appeared, after the early death of the lamented author (ibid. 1838). Since then, some other smaller portions of the text of the Rik-Samhitā have here and there been communicated to us in text or translation, especially in Roth’s already often quoted and excellent Abhandlungen zur Literatur und Geschichte des Weda (Stuttgart, 1846). The entire Samhitā, together with the commentary of Śāyana, is now being published, edited by Dr. M. Müller of Oxford, at the expense of the East India Company; the first ashtaṅga appeared in 1849. At the same time an edition of the text, with extracts from the commentary, is in course of publication in India. From Dr. M. Müller, too, we may expect detailed prolegomena to his edition, which are to treat in particular of the position held by the songs of the Rik in the history of civilisation. A French translation by Langlois comprises the entire Samhitā (1848–1851); it is, of course, in many respects highly useful, although in using it great caution is necessary. An English translation by Wilson is also begun, of which the first ashtaṅga only has as yet appeared.  

Müller’s edition of the text, together with the commentary of Śāyana, a complete index of words, and list of pratīkās, is now complete in six vols., 1849–1875. He has also published separately the text of the first mandala, in samhitā- and pada-pāsha (Leipsig, 1856–65), as also the whole 10 mandalas, likewise in double form (London, 1873). The first complete edition of the text was published, in Roman transliteration, by Aufrecht, in vols. vii. and viii. of the Indische Studien (1861–65). Roer’s edition of text and commentary, in the Bibliotheca Indica, Nos. 1–4 (Calc. 1849), only reaches to the end of the second aṣṭāṅga. A fragment of the text, edited by Stevenson so long ago as 1833, extends but a little farther (l. 1-35). Of Wilson’s translation, five volumes have appeared; the last, in 1866, under the editorship of Cowell, brings it up to mānd cor viii. 20. Benfey published in his Orient und Occident (1860–68) a critical translation of mānd cor vii. 118. Twelve hymns in the Marūs are translated and furnished with a detailed commentary in vol. 1 of Max. Müller’s Rīgveda Samhita, trans-
We now turn to the Brāhmaṇas of the Rīk.

Of these, we have two, the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa and the Śāṅkhāyaṇa- (or Kaushitaki-) Brāhmaṇa. They are closely connected with one another, treat essentially of the same matter, not unfrequently, however, taking opposite views of the same question. It is in the distribution of their matter that they chiefly differ. In the Śāṅkhāyaṇa-Brāhmaṇa we have a perfectly arranged work, embracing on a definite plan the entire sacrificial procedure; but this does not seem to be the case in an equal degree in the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa. The latter, moreover, appears to treat exclusively of the Soma sacrifice; whereas in the former it merely occupies the principal place. In the Śāṅkhāyaṇa-Brāhmaṇa we meet with nothing at all corresponding to the last ten adhyāyas of the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa, a gap which is only filled up by the Śāṅkhāyaṇa-Sūtra; and for this reason, as well as from internal evidence, it may perhaps be assumed that the adhyāyas in question are but a later addition to the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa. In the extant text, the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa contains 40 adhyāyas (divided into eight pāñčikās, or pen-

jated and explained (London, 1869). But the scholar who has done most by far for the right understanding of the Rīk is Roth; both in the commentary added to his edition of Yāsaka’s Nirukta (Göttingen, 1848-52) and in the great St. Petersburg Sanskrit Dictionary (seven vols., 1853-75), edited by Böhltingk and him. Here we may also mention the following works:—Grassmann, Wörterbuch zum Rīveda (1873, ff.); Delbrück, Das altindische Verbum (1874); Banfey, Einleitung in die Grammatik der vedischen Sprache (1874), and Die Quantitätsverschiedenheiten in den Sanskrit- und Padārthahn Texten der Vedas; Böllensken, Die Lieder des Panṭhara, in Z. D. M. G. xxii. (1868); Siebenzig Lieder des Rīveda, überarbeitet von Karl Geldner und Adolf Kneitz, mit Beiträgen von R. Roth (Tübingen, 1875)—reviewed by Abel Bergsagni in the Revue Ὀρτύπικα, Dec. 11 and 12, 1875; Alfred Ludwig, Die Nachrichten des Rī- und Atharva-veda über Geographie, Geschichte und Verfassung des alten Indiens (the identification here mentioned, p. 13, of the Vedic Sarasvatī with the Indus, was first made by myself; cf. Vidyāpaścanda, ii. 30 ff., 1847), and Die philosophischen und religiösen Anschauungen des Veda (Prag, 1875); Alfred Hillebrandt, Über die Göttin Aditi (Breis- ten, 1876); H. Zimmer, Parjanya Piθrgya Vītes Wodan in Zeitschrift für Deutsches Alterthum, New Series, vii. 164, ff. Lastly, we have to draw attention specially to Muir’s Original Sanskrit Texts (5 vols., second edit., London, 1868, ff.), in which the antiquarian information contained in the Rīk-Saṃhitā on the different stages and phases of Indian life at that early period is clearly and comprehensively grouped: translations of numerous Vedic passages and pieces are given.

* See on this I. St., ii. 289, [and ix. 377].
BRAHMANAS OF THE RIK.

...tada), while the Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa contains 30; and it is perhaps allowable to refer to them the rule in Pāṇini v 1. 62, which states how the name of a Brāhmaṇa is to be formed if it contain 30 or 40 adhyāyas,—a view which would afford external warrant also of the fact of their existence in this form in Pāṇini’s time, at all events. Geographical or similar data, from which a conclusion might be drawn as to the time of their composition, are of very rare occurrence. Most of these, together with really historical statements, are to be found in the last books of the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa (see I. St., i. 199, ff.), from which it at any rate specially follows that their scene is the country of the Kuru-Pañchālas and Vaśa-Uśniras (see viii. 14). In the Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa mention is made of a great sacrifice in the Naimisha forest; but this can hardly be identified with the one at which, according to the accounts of the Mahā-Bhārata, the second recitation of this epic took place. Another passage implies a very special prominence, amongst the other gods of the deity who is afterwards known to us exclusively by the name of Śiva. He here receives, among other titles, those of Iśāna and Mahādeva, and we might perhaps venture to conclude from this that he was already the object of a very special worship. We are at any rate justified in inferring, unless the passage is an interpolation, that the Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa ranks chronologically with the last books of the Samhitā of the White Yajus, and with those portions of its Brāhmaṇa and of the Atharva-Samhitā in which this nomenclature is likewise found. Lastly, a third passage of the Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa implies, as already hinted, a special cultivation of the field of language in the northern parts of India. People resorted thither in order to become acquainted with the language, and on their return enjoyed a special authority on questions connected with it. [I. St., ii. 309.]

Both Brāhmaṇas presuppose literary compositions of some extent as having preceded them. Thus mention is made of the ṛkhyānavidas, i.e., “those versed in tradition;” and gāthās, abhiyajna-gāthās, a sort of memorial verses (kārikās), are also frequently referred to and quoted. The names Rīgveda, Sāmaveda, and Yajurveda, as well as travya vulyā, a term used to express them collectively, repeatedly
occur. In the Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa, however, special regard is had to the Paṅgya and Kaushītaka, whose views are very frequently quoted side by side, that of the Kaushītaka being always recognised as final. The question now arises what we are to understand by these expressions, whether works of the Brāhmaṇa order already extant in a written form, or still handed down orally only—or merely the inherited tradition of individual doctrines. Mention of the Kaushītaka and the Paṅgya occurs in the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa only in a single passage—and that perhaps an interpolated one—in the latter part of the work. This at all events proves, what already seemed probable from its more methodical arrangement, that the Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa is to be considered a later production than the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa, since it appears to be a recast of two sets of views of similar tenor already extant under distinct names, while the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa presents itself as a more independent effort. The name Paṅgya belongs to one of the sages mentioned in the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus and elsewhere, from whose family Yāska Paṅgi* was descended, and probably also Paṅgala, the author of a treatise on metre. The Paṅgi Kalpaḥ is expressly included by the commentator of Pāṇini, probably following the Mahābhāshya, among the ancient Kalpa-Sūtras, in contradistinction to the Āśmara-thādha Kalpaḥ, with which we shall presently become acquainted as an authority of the Āśvalāyana-Sūtra. The Paṅgins are, besides, frequently mentioned in early writings, and a Paṅgi-Brāhmaṇa must still have been in existence even in Śāyaṇa's time, for he repeatedly refers to it. The case stands similarly as regards the name Kaushītaka, which, is, moreover, used directly in the majority of passages where it is quoted for the Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa itself—a fact easy of explanation, as in the latter the view represented by the Kaushītaka is invariably upheld as the authoritative one, and we have in this Brāhmaṇa but a remoulding by Śāṅkhāyana of the stock of dogma peculiarly the property of the Kaushītakins. Further, in its commentary, which, it may be remarked,

* The quotations from Brāhmaṇas Paṅgi Kalpaḥ in the Mahābhāshya, in Yāska, therefore, belong in part perhaps to the Paṅgya (?). [On the
interprets the work under the sole title of the "Kaushitaki-Brāhmaṇa," passages are frequently quoted from a Maha-Kaushitaki-Brāhmaṇa, so that we have to infer the existence of a still larger work of similar contents,—probably a later handling of the same subject (?). This commentary further connects the Kaushitaki-Brāhmaṇa with the school of the Kauthumasa—a school which otherwise belongs only to the Śāmaveda: this, however, is a relation which has not as yet been cleared up.—The name Sānkhyāyana-Brāhmaṇa interchanges occasionally with the form Sānkhyāyana-Brāhmaṇa, but the former would seem to deserve the preference; its earliest occurrence is probably in the Prātiśākhya-Sūtra of the Black Yajus.

The great number of myths and legends contained in both these Brāhmaṇas of the Rik invests them with a peculiar interest. These are not indeed introduced for their own sake, but merely with a view to explain the origin of some hymn; but this, of course, does not detract from their value. One of them, the legend of Śunahṣepa, which is found in the second part of the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa, is translated by Roth in the Indische Studien, i. 458–464, and discussed in detail, ibid., ii. 112–123. According to him, it follows a more ancient metrical version. We must indeed assume generally, with regard to many of these legends, that they had already gained a rounded, independent shape in tradition before they were incorporated into the Brāhmaṇa, and of this we have frequent evidence in the distinctly archaic character of their language, compared with that of the rest of the text. Now these legends possess great value for us from two points of view: first, because they contain, to some extent at least, directly or indirectly, historical data, often stated in a plain and artless manner, but at other times disguised and only perceptible to the eye of criticism; and, secondly, because they present connecting links with the legends of later times, the origin of which would otherwise have remained almost entirely obscure.

On the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa we have a commentary by Śāyana, and on the Kaushitaki-Brāhmaṇa one by Viśnavāya, a son of Mādāhava.33

33 The Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa has been edited, text with translation, 1863, see / St., ix. 177–380 (1865).
To each of these Brāhmaṇas is also annexed an Aranyaka, or 'forest-portion,' that is, the portion to be studied in the forest by the sages known to us through Megasthenes as ἅλοςις, and also by their disciples. This forest-life is evidently only a later stage of development in Brahmanical contemplation, and it is to it that we must chiefly ascribe the depth of speculation, the complete absorption in mystic devotion by which the Hindūs are so eminently distinguished. Accordingly, the writings directly designated as Aranyakas bear this character impressed upon them in a very marked degree; they consist in great part of Upanishads only, in which, generally speaking, a bold and vigorous faculty of thought cannot fail to be recognised, however much of the bizarre they may at the same time contain.

The Aitareya-Aranyaka consists of five books, each of which again is called Aranyaka. The second and third books form a separate Upanishad; and a still further subdivision here takes place, inasmuch as the four last sections of the second book, which are particularly consonant with the doctrines of the Vedānta system, pass κατ' ἐξοχήν as the Aitareyopanishad. Of these two books Mahidāsa Aitareya is the reputed author; he is supposed to be the son of Vīśāla and Itarā, and from the latter his name Aitareya is derived. This name is indeed several times quoted in the course of the work itself as a final authority, a circumstance which conclusively proves the correctness of tracing to him the views therein propounded. For we must divest ourselves of the notion that a teacher of this period ever put his ideas into writing; oral delivery was his only method of imparting them to his pupils; the knowledge of them was transmitted by tradition, until it became fixed in

The legend of Śunahṣeṇa (vii. 13-18), had been discussed by Roth; see also M. Müller, Hist. of A. S. L., p. 573, f. Another section of it (viii. 5-20), treating of royal inaugurations, had previously been edited by Schöntborn (Berlin, 1862).

The first fasciculus of an edition, together with Śiṣyaṇa's commentary, of the Aitareya-Aranyaka, by Rajendra Līla Mitra, has just come to hand (Nov. 30, 1875), see Bibliotheca Indica, New Series, No. 325; the text reaches as far as i. 4. 1.

* See J. S., i. 388, f.

This Aitareyopanishad, amongst others, has been edited (with Sāṅkhara's commentary) and translated by Roer, Bibl. Ind., vii. 143, f. (Calc. 1850), xv. 28, ff. (1853).
some definite form or other, always however retaining his name. It is in this way that we have to account for the fact of our finding the authors of works that have been handed down to us, mentioned in these works themselves. For the rest, the doctrines of Aitareya must have found especial favour, and his pupils have been especially numerous; for we find his name attached to the Brāhmaṇa as well as the Aranyaka. With respect to the former, however, no reasons can for the present be assigned, while for the fourth book of the Aranyaka we have the direct information that it belongs to Ásvaláyana, the pupil of Saunaka; nay, this Saunaka himself appears to have passed for the author of the fifth book, according to Colebrooke’s statements on the subject, Misc. Ess., i. 47, n. The name of Aitareya is not traceable anywhere in the Brāhmaṇas; he is first mentioned in the Chhandogyopanishad. The earliest allusion to the school of the Aitareyins is in the Sāma-Sūtras.—To judge from the repeated mention of them in the third book, the family of the Māndūkas, or Māndūkeyas, must also have been particularly active in the development of the views there represented. Indeed, we find them specified later as one of the five schools of the Rīgveda; yet nothing bearing their name has been preserved except an extremely abstruse Upanishad, and the Māndūki-Siksha, a grammatical treatise. The former, however, apparently only belongs to the Atharvan, and exhibits completely the standpoint of a rigid system. The latter might possibly be traced back to the Māndūkeya who is named here as well as in the Rīk-Prātiśākhya.

The contents of the Aitareya-Aranyaka, as we now have it, supply no direct clue to the time of its composi-

* I find an Ásvaláyana-Brāhmaṇa also quoted, but am unable to give any particulars regarding it. [In a MS. of the Ait. Ar., India Office Library, 986, the entire work is described at the end as Ásvaláyana-brāhmaṇam Áranyaka.]

** See I. St., i. 387–392. I am now in possession of the complete text, but have nothing material to add to the above remarks. Great stress is laid upon keeping the particular doctrines secret, and upon the high importance of these familiar with them. Among the names mentioned in the course of the work, Águlvésyáyana is of significance on account of its formation. The interesting passages on the three pātha of the Veda, nírájaṇa = sāma-kūḍāpātha, prātiprājaṇa = pāṣadāpātha, and nábbayum aitareya = kramapātha, are discussed by M. Müller on Rīk-Prākt., i. 2–4 (see also ibid., Nachträge, p. 41).
tion, other than the one already noticed, namely, that in the second chapter of the second book the extant arrange-
ment of the Rik-Samhitā is given. Again, the number of
teachers individually mentioned is very great, particu-
larly in the third book—among them are two Śākalyas, a
Krishṇa Hārīta, a Paṇḍālāchāṇḍa—and this may be con-
sidered as an additional proof of its more recent origin, a
conclusion already implied by the spirit and form of the
opinions enunciated.26

The Kaushitakāranyaka, in its present form, consists of
three books; but it is uncertain whether it is complete.27
It was only recently that I lighted upon the two first
books.* These deal rather with ritual than with specula-
tion. The third book is the so-called Kaushitaky-Upani-
shad,† a work of the highest interest and importance. Its
first adhātā gives us an extremely important account of
the ideas held with regard to the path to, and arrival in,
the world of the blessed, the significance of which in
relation to similar ideas of other races is not yet quite
apparent, but it promises to prove very rich in information.
The second adhātā gives us in the ceremonies which it
describes, amongst other things, a very pleasing picture of
the warmth and tenderness of family ties at that period.
The third adhātā is of inestimable value in connection
with the history and development of the epic myth, inasmuch
as it represents Indra battling with the same powers
of nature that Arjuna in the epic subdues as evil demons.
Lastly, the fourth adhātā contains the second recension
of a legend which also appears, under a somewhat different

---

26 The circumstance here empha-
sised may be used to support the
very opposite view; indeed I have
so represented it in the similar case
of the Lātīyāna-Sūtra (see below).
This latter view now appears to me
to have more in its favour.

27 A manuscript sent to Berlin
by Bühler (MS. Or. fol. 630) of the
Śākalyāna-Aranyaka (as it is
there called) presents it in 15 adhā-
tyas; the first two correspond to
Ait. Ar. i., v.; adhy. 3–6 are made
up of the Kaush. Up.; adhy. 7, 8
correspond to Ait. Ar. iii.; adhy.
9 gives the rivalry of the senses

* See Catalogue of the Berlin
Skr. MSS., p. 19, n. 82.

† See J. St., i. 392–420. It would
be very desirable to know on what
Poley's assertion is founded, "that
the Kaushitaki-Brahmāṇa consists
of nine adhātyas, the first, seventh,
eighth, and ninth of which form the
Kaushitaki-Brahmāṇa-Upanishad." I
have not succeeded in finding any
statement to this effect elsewhere.
[See now Cowell's Preface, p. vii.,
to his edition of the Kaush. Up. in
the Bibl. Ind.]
form, in the Aranyaka of the White Yajus, the legend, namely, of the instruction of a Brahman, who is very wise in his own esteem, by a warrior called Ajátaśatru, king of Kúśi. This Upanishad is also peculiarly rich in geographical data, throwing light upon its origin. Thus the name of Chitra Gánghyáni, the wise king in the first adhánya who instructs Arúni, clearly points to the Gángá. According to ii. 10, the northern and southern mountains, i.e., Himavant and Vindhya, enclose in the eyes of the author the whole of the known world, and the list of the neighbouring tribes in iv. 1 perfectly accords with this. That, moreover, this Upanishad is exactly contemporaneous with the Vrihád-Aranyaka of the White Yajus is proved by the position of the names Arúni, Svétaketu, Ajátaśatru, Gánghya Báláki, and by the identity of the legends about the latter. [See I. St., i. 392–420.]

We have an interpretation of both Aranyakas, that is to say, of the second and third books of the Aitareya-Aranyaka, and of the third book of the Kaushitaki-Aranyaka in the commentary of Saḿkaraásárya, a teacher who lived about the eighth century A.D., and who was of the highest importance for the Vedánta school. For not only did he interpret all the Vedic texts, that is, all the Upanishads, upon which that school is founded, he also commented on the Vedánta-Sútra itself, besides composing a number of smaller works with a view to elucidate and establish the Vedánta doctrine. His explanations, it is true, are often forced, from the fact of their having to accommodate themselves to the Vedánta system; still they are of high importance for us. Pupils of his, Anandajána, Anandagiri, Anandatírtha, and others, in their turn composed glosses on his commentaries. Of most of these commentaries and glosses we are now in possession, as they have been recently edited, together with their Upanishads, by Dr. Roer, Secretary to the Asiatic Society of Bengal, in the Bibliotheca Indica; a periodical appearing under the auspices of that Society, and devoted exclusively

---

28 Saḿkara's date has not, unfortunately, been more accurately determined as yet. He passes at the same time for a zealous adversary of the Buddhists, and is therefore called a Śaiva, or follower of Śiva. In his works, however, he appears as a worshipper of Vándeva, whom he puts forward as the real incarnation or representative of brahman.
to the publication of texts. Unfortunately the Kaushitaki-Upanishad is not yet among the number, neither is the Maitraiyani-Upanishad, of which we have to speak in the sequel. It is, however, to be hoped that we shall yet receive both. — And may yet a third, the Vashkala-Upanishad, be recovered and added to the list of these Upanishads of the Rik! It is at present only known to us through Anquetil Duperron’s *Ouspeshat*, ii. 366–371; the original must therefore have been extant at the time of the Persian translation (rendered into Latin by Anquetil) of the principal Upanishads (1656). The Vashkala-Sruti is repeatedly mentioned by Sāyana. We have seen above that a particular recension of the Rik-Samhitā, which has likewise been lost, is attributed to the Vashkalas. This Upanishad is therefore the one sorry relic left to us of an extensive cycle of literature. It rests upon a legend repeatedly mentioned in the Brāhmaṇas, which in substance, and one might almost say in name also, corresponds to the Greek legend of Gany-Medes. Medhātithi, the son of Kanva, is carried up to heaven by Indra, who has assumed the form of a ram, and during their flight he inquires of Indra who he is. Indra, in reply, smilingly declares himself to be the All-god, identifying himself with the universe. As to the cause of the abduction, he goes on to say that, delighted with Medhātithi’s penance, he desired to conduct him into the right path leading to truth; he must therefore have no further misgiving. With regard to the date of this Upanishad, nothing more definite can of course at present be said than that its general tenor points to a tolerably high antiquity.

We now descend to the last stage in the literature of the Rgveda, viz., to its Sūtras.

First, of the Śrauta-Sūtras, or text-books of the sacrificial rite. Of these we possess two, the Sūtra of Āśvalāyana in 12 adhyayás, and that of Śāṅkhāyana in 18

---

25 Both have now been published and translated by Cowell in the *Bibliotheca Indica*. The Kauśā.-Up. (Cal. 1861) is accompanied with the comment of Śaṅkhārāmāda, the Maitri-Up. with that of Rāmatīrtha (1863–69).
26 See now my special paper on the subject in *J. St.*, ix. 38–42; the original text has not yet been met with.
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adhyayas. The former connects itself with the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa, the latter with the Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa, and from these two works frequent literal quotations are respectively borrowed. From this circumstance alone, as well as from the general handling of the subject, we might infer that these Sūtras are of comparatively recent origin; and direct testimony is not wanting to establish the fact. Thus the name Āśvalāyana is probably to be traced back to Āśvala, whom we find mentioned in the Aranyakā of the White Yajus as the Hotar of Janaka, king of Videha (see I. St., i. 441). Again, the formation of the word by the affix āyana, *probably leads us to the time of established schools (ayana)?* However this may be, names formed in this way occur but seldom in the Brāhmaṇas themselves, and only in their latest portions; in general, therefore, they always betoken a late period. We find corroboration of this in the data supplied by the contents of the Āśvalāyana-Sūtra. Among the teachers there quoted is an Āśmarathya, whose *kalpa* (doctrine) is considered by the scholiast on Pāṇini, iv. 3. 105., *probably following the Mahābhārata,* as belonging to the new *kalpas* implied in this rule, in contradistinction to the old *kalpas.* If, then, the authorities quoted by Āśvalāyana were regarded as recent, Āśvalāyana himself must of course have been still more modern; and therefore we conclude, assuming this statement to originate from the Mahābhārata, *that Āśvalāyana was nearly contemporaneous with Pāṇini.* Another teacher quoted by Āśvalāyana, Taulvali, is expressly mentioned by Pāṇini (ii. 4. 61) as belonging to the *prāṇīchās,* or “dwellers in the east.”—At the end there is a specially interesting enumeration of the various Brāhmaṇa-families, and their distribution among the family stems of Bhṛgu, Aṅgiras, Atri, Viśvāmitra, Kaśyapa, Vasishṭha, and Agastya.—The sacrifices on the Sarasvatī, of which I shall treat in the sequel, are here only briefly touched upon, and this with some differences in the

---

* As in the case of Āgniṣṭhāyana, Ālambara, Aitiśayana, Audumbara, Kāṇḍamāyana, Kātyāyana, Kāṭāyana, Drāpyāyana, Piṅkalāyana, Šāundra, Manuputra, Kriṣṇāyana, Lātkrīṣṇāyana, Lābhādhyaya, Lāmbādhyaya, Vāstuvādhyaya, Bātyāyana, Śāntiyāna, Śāṅkhyāyana, Śāntiyāna, Śāṅkhaśāntiyāna, Śāṁkhyāyana, Sañjñāyana, Sañjñāyana, &c. * The name is not known in the Mahābhārata, see I. St., xiii. 455.
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names, which may well be considered as later corruptions. We have also already seen that Áśvaláyana is the author of the fourth book of the Aitareya-Áranyaka, as also that he was the pupil of Saunaka, who is stated to have destroyed his own Sútra in favour of his pupil's work.

The Sútra of Sámkhayana wears in general a somewhat more ancient aspect, particularly in the fifteenth and sixteenth books, where it assumes the appearance of a Bráhmaṇa. The seventeenth and eighteenth books are a later addition, and are also ranked independently, and separately commented upon. They correspond to the first two books of the Kaushitaki-Áranyaka.

From my but superficial acquaintance with them, I am not at present in a position to give more detailed information as to the contents and mutual relation of these two Sútras. My conjecture would be that their differences may rest upon local grounds also, and that the Sútra of Áśvaláyana, as well as the Aitareya-Bráhmaṇa, may belong to the eastern part of Hindustán; the Sútra of Sámkhayana, on the contrary, like his Bráhmaṇa, rather to the western. The order of the ceremonial is pretty much the same in both, though the great sacrifices of the kings, &c., viz., vájápeya (sacrifice for the prospering of the means of subsistence), vágasthāya (consecration of the king), aśve-medha (horse sacrifice), purushamedha (human sacrifice), sarvamedha (universal sacrifice), are handled by Sámkhayana with far more minuteness.

For Áśvaláyana I find mention made of a commentary by Náráyaṇa,43 the son of Krishnajit, a grandson of Srípati. A namesake of his, but son of Paśupatísarman,

---

43 The Áśvaláyana-Sútra has since been printed, Bibli. Ind. (Calcutta 1864–74), accompanied with the comm. of Náráyaṇa Gárgya, edited by Báiśa-Náráyaṇa and Anandachandra. A special comparison of it with the Sámkhayana-Sútra is still wanting. Bühl, Catalogue of MSS. from Gujratí, l. 154 (1871), cites a commentary by Devaláksha on the Áśv. Sr. S., likewise a partial one by Vidyáraṇya.4

4 Perhaps to the Naimisha forest (?). See below, p. 59.

4 This is a confusion. The above-named Náráyaṇa wrote a commentary upon the Sámkhayana-Grihya; but the one who commented the Áśvaláyana-Srauti-Sútra calls himself in the introduction a son of Narsíśáha, just as Náráyaṇa, the commentator of the Utára-Naišadhíya, does, who, according to tradition (Boer, Pref., p. viii., 1855), lived some five hundred years ago. Are these two to be regarded as one and the same person? See I. Sír., 3, 298 (1869).
composed a padhān (‘outlines’) to Śāṅkhāyana, after the example of one Brahmadatta. When he lived is uncertain, but we may with some probability assign him to the sixteenth century. According to his own statements he was a native of Malayadesa. Further, for the Sūtra of Śāṅkhāyana we have the commentary of Varadattasuta Anarṭīya. Three of its adhyāyas were lost, and have been supplied by Dāsaśarman Muñjasūnu, viz., the ninth, tenth, and eleventh. On the last two adhyāyas, xvii., xviii., there is a commentary by Govinda. That these commentaries were preceded by others, which, however, have since been lost, is obvious, and is besides expressly stated by Ānartiṭya.

Of the Grihya Sūtras of the Rigveda we likewise only possess two, those of Āśvalāyana (in four adhyāyas) and of Śāṅkhāyana (in six adhyāyas). That of Saunaka is indeed repeatedly mentioned, but it does not seem to be any longer in existence.

However widely they may differ as to details, the contents of the two works are essentially identical, especially as regards the order and distribution of the matter. They treat mainly, as I have already stated (p. 17), of the ceremonies to be performed in the various stages of conjugal and family life, before and after a birth, at marriage, at the time of and after a death. Besides these, however, manners and customs of the most diverse character are depicted, and “in particular, the sayings and formulas to be uttered on different occasions bear the impress of a very high antiquity, and frequently carry us back into the time when Brahmanism had not yet been developed” (see Stenzler in I. St., ii. 159). It is principally popular and superstitious notions that are found in them; thus, we are pointed to star-worship, to astrology, portents, and witchcraft, and more especially to the adoration and propitiation of the evil powers in nature, the averting of their malign influence, &c. It is especially in the pitiśarpana, or oblation to the Manes, that we find a decisive proof of

---

44 Sections 3-5 of the fourth book have been published by Donner in his Pīndāpīṭāgāna (Berlin, 1870), and the portion relating to the legend of Saunahēsa (xv. 17-27) by Streiter (1861); the variants presented therein to the parallel passage in the Ait. Brhamn. had already been given by M. Müller, A. S. L. p. 573, ff.
the modern composition of these works, as the forefathers are there enumerated individually by name—a custom which, although in itself it may be very ancient (as we find a perfect analogy to it in the Yeshts and Nerengs of the Parsis), yet in this particular application belongs to a very recent period, as is apparent from the names themselves. For not only are the Rishis of the Rik-Samhitâ cited in their extant order, but all those names are likewise mentioned which we encounter as particularly significant in the formation of the different schools of the Rik, as well as in connection with its Brâhmaṇas and Sûtras; for example, Vâshkala, Sâkalya, Mânḍûkâya, Aitareya, Paîngya, Kaushitaka, Saunaka, Âsvalâyana, and Sânkhyâyaṇa themselves, &c. Joined to these, we find other names with which we are not yet otherwise acquainted, as also the names of three female sages, one of whom, Gârgî Vâchaknavi, meets us repeatedly in the Vrîhad-Araṇyaka of the White Yajus, as residing at the court of Janaka. The second is unknown; but the name of the third, Sulabhâ Maitreyi, is both connected with this very Janaka in the legends of the Mahâ-Bhârata,* and also points us to the Saupadhâni Brâhmaṇâdâni, quoted by the scholiast on Pânini, iv. 3. 105, probably on the authority of the Mahâbhâshya,† as an instance of the ‘modern Brâhmaṇas implied by this rule. Immediately after the Rishis of the Rik-Samhitâ, we find mention of other names and works which have not yet been met with in any other part of Vedic literature. In the Sânkhyâya-Grihya we have these: Sumantu-Jaimini-Vâsilampâyana-Pâlita-sûtra-bhâshya [Gârgya-Badhrâ] . . . ; and in the Âsvalâyana-Grihya these: Sumantu-Jaimini-Vâsilampâyana-Pâlita-sûtra-bhârata-mahâbhârata-dharmâchâryâya.‡ The latter

45 Her name is Vadavâ Pratistheyi; a teacher called Pratisthi is mentioned in the Vadhâ-Brâhmaṇa of the Sâmanava.

* [Cf. Sâmkara’s statements as to this in Ved. Sûtrabh. to iii. 3. 32, p. 915, ed. Râma Nârâyana.] Buddha’s uncle is called by the Buddhist Sûtra; see Schérzer, Leben des Sâkyamuni, p. 6.

46 See on this I. St., xiii. 429.

47 They are there cited a second time also, to Pâp., iv. 2. 68, and are explained by Kaitya as Sulabha prâkāram.

48 The word bhâshya is to be inserted above between sûtra and bhârata; though wanting in the MS. used by me at the time when I wrote, it is found in all the other MSS.
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passage is evidently the more modern, and although we must not suppose that the Mahā-Bhārata in its present form is here referred to, still, in the expression "Vaiṣampāṇyāno mahābhāratadāharyah," apparently indicated by this passage, there must at all events be implied a work of some compass, treating of the same legend, and therefore forming the basis of our extant text. The passage seems also to indicate that the same material had already been handled a second time by Jaimini, whose work, however, can have borne but a distant resemblance to the Jaimini-Bhārata of the present day. We shall find in the sequel frequent confirmation of the fact that the origin of the epic and the systematic development of Vedic literature in its different schools belong to the same period. Of a Sūtra by Sumantu, and a Dharma by Paila, we have no knowledge whatever. It is only in more modern times, in the Purāṇas and in the legal literature proper, that I find a work attributed to Sumantu, namely, a Smṛiti-Sāstra; while to Paila (whose name appears from Pān. iv. 1. 118) is ascribed the revelation of the Rigveda—a circumstance which at least justifies the inference that he played a special part in the definitive completion of its school development.—It is, however, possible to give a wholly different interpretation of the passage from Āśvalāyana; and in my opinion it would be preferable to do so. We may divest the four proper names of any special relation to the names of the four works, and regard the two groups as independent, as we must evidently assume them to be in the Śāṅkhāyana-Gṛihya. If this be done, then what most readily suggests itself in connection with the passage is the manner in which the Purāṇas apportion

* This interpretation becomes imperative after the rectification of the text (see the previous note), according to which no longer four, but five names of works are in question.

* What is meant in the latter (and of. note 47 in the Āśv. Gṛih. tāp) by the word āśvalīya, appears from the Prātiśākhya of the White Yajus, where (1. 1. 19, 20) redēkan and āśvalīyayati are found in contradistinction to one another, just as in the Prātiśākhya of the Black Yajus (ii. 12) we find ṣṭhāndas and ṣṭhānd, and in Yāsaka āsuvāṣṭya and ṣṭhānd. We must, therefore, understand by it ‘works in āśvalīya,’ though the meaning of the word is here more developed than in the works just mentioned, and approaches the sense in which Vāgini uses it. I shall return to the subject farther on.
the revelation of the several Vedas; inasmuch as they assign the Atharvaveda to Sumantu, the Sānāveda to Jaimini, the Yajurveda to Vaiśampāyana, and the Rigveda to Paila. But in either case we must assume with Roth, who first pointed out the passage in Āśvālāyana (op. c., p. 27), that this passage, as well as the one in Śāṅkhāyana, has been touched up by later interpolation; otherwise the dates of these two Grihya-Sūtras would be brought down too far! For although, from the whole tenor of both passages, that in the Āśvālāyana-Grihya, as well as that in the Śāṅkhāyana-Grihya—which for the rest present other material discrepancies of detail—it is sufficiently clear that they presuppose the literature of the Rigveda as entirely closed, still the general attitude of both works shows their comparatively ancient origin.—The question whether any connection exists between the Smṛiti-Sūtra of Śāṅkha and the Grihya-Sūtra of Śāṅkhāyana, remains still unanswered.

For both Grihya-Sūtras there are commentaries by the same Nārāyaṇa who commented the Śrauta-Sūtra of Āśvālāyana. They probably belong to the fifteenth century.* There are, besides, as in the case of the Śrauta-Sūtras,

---

40 We find the Sumantu-Jaimini-Vaiśampāyana-Pālīrāyavā口岸 quoted a second time in the Śāṅkh. O. in its last section (vi. 5), which is probably of later origin; and here, without any doubt, the reference is to the same distribution of the four Vedas among the above-named personalities which occurs in the Vīṣṇu-Purāṇa, iii. 4. 8, 9. Both times the representative of the Atharvāna comes first, that of the Rāik last, which in a Rāik text serves as a clear proof that we have here to do with later appendages. A similar precedence is given to the Atharvaveda in the Mahābhārata; cf. I. St., xiii. 437.

41 This is a mistake, see note 43; all three Nārāyaṇas must be kept distinct. The commentator of the Āśval. St. 3. calls himself a Ṣāṅgīya, and son of Narasihha; the comm. of the Āśval. Grihya, a Nāidrava, and son of Divākara; the comm. of the Śāṅkh. Grihya, son of Kṛishṇa-n, and grandson of Śripati. (This third Nār. lived A.D. 1538; see Catalogue of the Berlin MSS., p. 354, sub No. 1282.)—The text of the Āśval. Grihya has been edited by Stenzler, with a translation (Indische Hausregeln, 1864-65); the text, with Nārāyaṇa’s comm., by Rāmanārāyaṇa and Anandachandra, in Bibl. Ind. (1866-69). The sections relating to marriage ceremonies have been edited by Haas, I. St., v. 283, ff.; those relating to funeral rites, by Müller, Z. D. M. G., ix.

* Two glosses on Śāṅkara’s commentary on the Prāṇaparishad and the Munḍakopanishad bear the same name, so that possibly the author of them is identical with the above-named Nārāyaṇa. Acc. to what has just been remarked in note 50, this must appear a priori very doubtful, since a considerable number of other
many small treatises in connection with the Grihya-Sutras, some of them being summaries, in which the larger works are reduced to system. Among them is a Paddhati to the Saunháyana-Grihya by Rámaocanda, who lived in the Naimisha forest in the middle of the fifteenth century; and I am inclined to think that this Naimisha forest was the birthplace of the Sutra itself. It is perhaps for this reason that the tradition connected with it was so well preserved in that district.

The extant Práti-sákhya-Sutra of the Rik-Samhitá is ascribed to Saunaka, who has been repeatedly mentioned already, and who was the teacher of Áśvaláyana. This extensive work is a metrical composition, divided into three kandas, of six pātalas each, and containing 103 kandikas in all. The first information regarding it was given by Roth, op. c., p. 53, ff. — According to tradition, it is of more ancient origin than the Sutras of Áśvaláyana just mentioned, which only purport to be written by the pupil of this Saunaka; but whether it really was composed by the latter, or whether it is not much more probably merely the work of his school, must for the present remain undecided. The names quoted in it are in part identical with those met with in Yáska’s Nirukti and in the Sutra of Páñini. The contents of the work itself are, however, as yet but little known in their details. Of special interest are those passages which treat of the correct and incorrect pronunciation of words in general. There is an excellent commentary on it by Úța, which professes in the introduction to be a remodelling of an earlier commentary by Vishṇuputra.—The Upaleśha is to be con-

authors bear the same name. But in this particular case we are able to bring forward definite reasons against this identification. The glossarist of the Práśnop, was called Nārāyanacandra according to J. St., i. 470; according to the note, ibid., i. 439, Nārāyaṇa Saravati; according to Aufrecht, Catalogue of the Oxford MSS., p. 366 (1859-64), rather Nārāyanendra Saravati (!). The glossarist of the Mundákop., on the other hand, was, according to J. St., i. 470, called Nārāyaṇabhūja; and he is probably identical with the author of the dipika on the small Atharvapanishada published in the Böll. Ind. in 1872, who (ibid., p. 393) is called Bhāṣṭra Nārāyaṇa, and son of Bhāṣṭra Rāmākara.] at We are now in possession of two editions of this most important work, texts and translation, with elucidatory notes, by Ad. Regnier (Paris, 1857-58), and M. Müller (Leipzig, 1856-69); see J. St., ii. 94, ff., 127, ff., 159, ff.; Lit. Centralblatt, 1870, p. 530.
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considered as an epitome of the Prátiśákhyā-Sūtra, and to some extent as a supplement to it [specially to chapters x. xi.]. It is a short treatise, numbered among the Pariśishṭas (supplements); and it has in its turn been repeatedly commented upon.52

A few other treatises have still to be noticed here, which, although they bear the high-sounding name of Vedāṅgas, or "members of the Veda," are yet, as above stated (p. 25), only to be looked upon as later supplements to the literature of the Rigveda: the Sūkhā, the Chhandas, and the Jyotisha. All three exist in a double recension according as they profess to belong to the Rigveda or to the Yajurveda. The Chhandas is essentially alike in both recensions, and we have to recognise in it the Sūtra on prosody ascribed to Pingala.53 It is, moreover, like both the other treatises, of very recent origin. We have a proof of this, for instance, in the fact that, in the manner peculiar to the Indians, it expresses numbers by words,54 and feet by letters, and that it treats of the highly elaborated metres, which are only found in modern poetry.55 The part dealing with Vedic metres may perhaps be more ancient. The teachers quoted in it bear in part comparatively ancient

52 Edited by W. Perlsch (Berlin, 1854); this tract treat of the brahma-prajñā, an extended form of the padopādaḥ, which at the same time gives the text in the saṃhāda form, namely, each word twice, first joined with the preceding, and then with the following word (thus: ab, ba, ca, ca . . .). There are also other still more complicated modes of reciting the Veda, as to which cf. Thibaut in his edition of the Jaṭāpaṭāka (1870), p. 36, ff. The next step, called śārāḥ, exhibits the text in the following manner: ab de ab, de de, and MSS. of this kind have actually been preserved, e.g., in the case of the Vājas Samh. The following step, called ghanā, is said to be still in use; cf. Bhādākara, Indian Antiquary, iii. 133; Haug, Ueber das Wissen der vedischen Sprache, p. 58; it runs: ab de abe obe abc, de de be bed deb abcd.

53 Edited and commented by myself in J. St., viii. (1853); the text, together with the commentary of Halāyudha, edited by Viśvanātha-pāṭalā in Bijō Indica (1871-74).

54 See Albrun's account in Woepcke's Mémoire sur la propagation des chiffres indiens, p. 102, ff. (1863).

55 Burnell, Blem. of S. I. Palæogr., p. 58.

56 On the other hand, there are metres-taught in this work which but rarely occur in modern literature, and which must be looked upon as obsolete and out of fashion. Therefore, in spite of what has been said above, we must carry back the date of its composition to a period about simultaneous with the close of the Vedic Sūtra literature, or the commencement of the astronomical and algebraical literatures; see J. St., vii. 173, 178.
names. These are: Krauṣṭūki, Tāṇḍin, Yāska, Saitava, Rāta, and Māṇḍavya. The recensions most at variance with each other are those of the Śikṣā and Jyotisha respectively. The former work is in both recensions directly traced to Paṇini, the latter to Lagadha, or Lagata an otherwise unknown name in Indian literature.—Besides the Paṇiniya Śikṣā, there is another bearing the name of the Māṇḍūkas, which therefore may more directly follow the Rik, and which is at any rate a more important work than the former. As a proof of the antiquity of the name Śikṣā for phonetic investigations, we may adduce the circumstance that in the Teitt. Arany., vii. 1, we find a section beginning thus: "we will explain the Śikṣā;" whereupon it gives the titles of the topics of the oral exposition which we may suppose to have been connected therewith (I. St., ii. 211), and which, to judge by these titles, must have embraced letters, accents, quantity, articulation, and the rules of euphony, that is to say, the same subjects discussed in the two existing Śikṣās.

Of the writings called Anukramanī, in which the metre, the deity, and the author of each song are given in their proper order, several have come down to us for the Rik-Samhita, including an Anuvādkānu-kramanī by Sauna, and a Sarvānu-kramanī by Kātyāyana. For both of these we have an excellent commentary by Shādguru.

*Reinaud in his Mémoire sur l'Inde, pp. 331, 332, adduces from Albfrutii a Lāta, who passed for the author of the old Sārya-Siddhānta; might he not be identical with this Lagadha, Lagata? According to Celebr., 1st, ii. 409, Brahmagupta quotes a Lāḍhūchārya; this name also could be traced to Lagadha. [By Saṅyādeva, a scholiast of Aryabhaṭa, the author of the Jyotisha is cited under the name of Lagadāchārya; see Kert, Preface to the Aryabhaṭiya, p. ix., 1874. An edition of the text of the Jyotisha, together with extracts from Somākara's commentary and explanatory notes, was published by me in 1862 under the title: Ueber den Vedakalender. Namens Jyotisham.]

85 The Paṇiniya Śikṣā has been printed with a translation in I. St., iv. 345-371 (1853); on the numerous other treatises bearing the same name, see Rājendra Lāla Mitra, Notices of Sanskrit MSS., i. 71, ff. (1870), Burholl, Catalogue of Vedic MSS., pp. 8, 42 (1870), my essay on the Pratijñārita (1872), pp. 70-74: specially on the Māṇḍūki Śikṣā, pp. 106-112; Haug, Ueber das Wesen des vedischen Accents, p. 53, ff. (1873), on the Nārada-Śikṣā, ibid., 57, ff., and lastly Kiellhorn, I. St., xiv. 160.

86 In substance published by Müller in the sixth volume of his large edition of the Rik, pp. 621-671.
śishya, whose time is unknown, as also his real name. The names of the six teachers from whom he took this surname are enumerated by himself; they are Vináyaka, Tríśúlánka, Govinda, Sárya, Vyása, and Śivayogin, and he connects their names with those of the corresponding deities.—Another work belonging to this place, the Brihaddevatá, has been already mentioned (p. 24), as attributed to Śaunaka, and as being of great importance, containing as it does a rich store of mythical fables and legends. From Kuhn's communications on the subject (I. St., i. 101–120), it appears that this work is of tolerably late origin, as it chiefly follows Yáska's Nirukta, and probably therefore only belongs to Śaunaka in the sense of having proceeded from his school. It mentions a few more teachers in addition to those quoted by Yáska, as Bháguri and Áśvaláyana; and it also presupposes, by frequently quoting them, the existence of the Aitareyaka, Bhállaví-Bráhma, and Nidána-Sútra. As the author strictly adheres to the order of the hymns observed in the Samhitá, it results that in the recension of the text used by him there were a few deviations from that of the Śákalas which has been handed down to us. In fact, he here and there makes direct reference to the text of the Váshkalas, to which, consequently, he must also have had access.—Lastly, we have to mention the writings called Rigvidhána, &c., which, although some of them bear the name of Śaunaka, probably belong only to the time of the Purápas. They treat of the mystic and magic efficacy of the recitation of the hymns of the Rik, or even of single verses of it, and the like. There are, likewise, a number of other similar Parásishtas (supplements) under various names; for instance, a Bahvriča-Parásishta, Sáňkháyana-P., Áśvaláyana-Grihyá-P., &c.

68 His work was composed towards about 1187 A.D.; cf. I. St., vili. 160. the close of the twelfth century, d. (1863).
I now turn to the Sāma\textsuperscript{a}veda.*

The Sāmhitā of the Sāma\textsuperscript{a}veda is an anthology taken from the Rīk-Sāmhitā, comprising those of its verses which were intended to be chanted at the ceremonies of the Soma sacrifice. Its arrangement would seem to be guided by the order of the Rīk-Sāmhitā; but here, as in the case of the two Sāmhitās of the Yajus, we must not think to find any continuous connection. Properly speaking, each verse is to be considered as standing by itself: it only receives its real sense when taken in connection with the particular ceremony to which it belongs. So stands the case at least in the first part of the Sāma-Sāmhitā. This is divided into six prapāṭhakas, each of which consists of ten daśats or decades, of ten verses each, a division which existed as early as the time of the second part of the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, and within which the separate verses are distributed according to the deities to whom they are addressed. The first twelve decades contain invocations of Agni, the last eleven of Soma, while the thirty-six intermediate ones are for the most part addressed to Indra. The second part of the Sāma-Sāmhitā, on the contrary, which is divided into nine prapāṭhakas, each of which again is subdivided into two or occasionally three sections, invariably presents several, usually three, verses closely connected with one another, and forming an independent group, the first of them having generally appeared already in the first part. The principle of distribution here is as yet obscure.\textsuperscript{50} In the Sāmhitā these verses are still exhibited in their rīch-form, although with the sāman-accenta; but in addition to this we have four gānas, or song-books, in which they appear in their sāman-form. For, in singing they were consider-

\* See I. St., i. 28–66.

\dagger Except the last, which contains only nine decades.

\textsuperscript{50} The first part of the Sāmhitā is referred to under the names śrīdīka, chāndas, chāndāśikā, the second as uttarārdhā or uttard; the designation of the latter as stāmeantha (see I. St., i. 29, 30, 66), into the use of which my example has misled Müller also, History of A. S. L., p. 473, n., is wrong, see Monatsberichte der Berl. Acad., 1868, p. 238. According to Düring, the author of the padapāthā of the Sāma-Sāmhitā was a Gārgya; see Roth, Comm., p. 39 (respecting this family, see I. St., xiii. 411).
ably altered by the prolongation and repetition of the syllables, by the insertion of additional syllables, serving as a rest for the chanting, and so forth; and only thus were they transformed into sámanas. Two of these song-books, the Grámagvya-góma (erroneously called Veya-
góma), in seventeen prapáthakas, and the Áranya-góma, in six prapáthakas, follow the order of the ríchas contained in the first part of the Sáhítá; the former being intended for chanting in the grámas, or inhabited places, the latter for chanting in the forest. Their order is fixed in a comparatively very ancient Anukramaṇi, which even bears the name of Bráhmaṇa, viz., Rishi-Bráhmaṇa. The other two gónas, the Uha-góma, in twenty-three prapáthakas, and the Únya-góma, in six prapáthakas, follow the order of the ríchas contained in the second part of the Sáhítá. Their mutual relation here still requires closer investigation. Each such sáman evolved out of a rícha has a special technical name, which probably in most cases originated from the first inventor of the form in question, is often, however, borrowed from other considerations, and is usually placed in the manuscripts before the text itself. As each rícha can be chanted in a great variety of ways, in each of which it bears a particular name, the number of sámanas, strictly speaking, is quite unlimited, and is of course far greater than that of the ríchas contained in the Sáhítá. Of these latter there are 1549,* of which all but seventy-eight have been traced in the Rik-Sáhítá. Most of them are taken from its eighth and ninth maṇḍalas.

I have already remarked (p. 9) upon the antiquity of the readings of the Sáma-Sáhítá as compared with those of the Rik-Sáhítá. It follows from this almost with

---

* Benfey [Einleitung, p. xix.] erroneously states the number as 1472, which I copied from him, I. St., I. 29, 30. The above number is borrowed from a paper by Whitney, which will probably find a place in the Indische Studien. The total number of the ríchas contained in the Sáma-Sáhítá is 1810 (585 in the first, 1225 in the second part), from which, however, 261 are to be deducted as mere repetitions, i.e., much as 249 of those occurring in the first part are repeated in the second, three of them twice, while nine of the ríchas which occur in the second part only, appear twice. [See on this Whitney's detailed table at the end of his Tabellarische Darstellung der gegenseitigen Verhältnisse der Sáma-Sáhítas des Rik, Sámen, Weisen Yajus, und Atharvan, I. St., ii. 321, ff., 363 (1853)].
certainty that the *richas* constituting the former were borrowed from the songs of the latter at a remote period, before their formation into a Rik-Samhitā had as yet taken place; so that in the interval they suffered a good deal of wearing down in the mouth of the people, which was avoided in the case of the *richas* applied as sāmans, and so protected by being used in worship. The fact has also already been stated that no verses have been received into the Sāma-Samhitā from those songs of the Rik-Samhitā which must be considered as the most modern. Thus we find no sāmans borrowed from the Purusha-Sūkta, in the ordinary recensions at least, for the school of the Naigeyas has, in fact, incorporated the first five verses of it into the seventh *prapāṭhaka* of the first part—a section which is peculiar to this school. The Sāma-Samhitā, being a purely derivative production, gives us no clue towards the determination of its date. It has come down to us in two recensions, on the whole differing but little from each other, one of which belongs to the school of the Rāṇāyanyas, the other to that of the Kauthumās. Of this latter the school of the Negas, or Naigeyas, alluded to above, is a subdivision, of which two Anukramanis at least, one of the deities and one of the Rishis of the several verses, have been preserved to us. Not one of these three names has as yet been traced in Vedic literature; it is only in the Sūtras of the Sāmaveda itself that the first and second at least are mentioned, but even here the name of the Negas does not appear.—The text of the Rāṇāyanyas was edited and translated, with strict reference to Sāyyana’s commentary, by the missionary Stevenson in 1842; since 1848 we have been in possession of another edition, furnished with a complete glossary and much

---

60 The seventh *prapāṭhaka*, which is peculiar to it, has since been discovered. It bears the title *Āraṇya-Samhitā*, and has been edited by Siegfried Goldschmidt in *Monatsberichte der Berl. Acad.* 1868, pp. 228–248. The editor points out that the Āraṇya-gānas are based upon the *dṛṣṭikā* of the Naigeya text (l. c., p. 238), and that MSS. have probably been preserved of its *uttarādṛṣṭikā* also (p. 241). — A London MS. of Bharatāvāmin’s Sāmavedavivaraṇa specially refers to the Arāṇyaka-Samhitā, see Burnell, *Catalogue of Vedic MSS.* (1870), p. 39. — Of the Arāṇyaka-gāna as well as of the Grāmaṇeya-gāna we find, ibid., p. 49, a text in the Jaimini-Śākhā also. According to Rājendra Lāla Mitra (Preface to Translation of Cuhād. Up., p. 4), ‘the Kauthumā (Śākhā) is current in Guzerat, the Jaiminiya in Kāraṇḍa, and the Rāṇāyanyiya in Mahārāṣṭra.’
additional material, together with translation, which we owe to Professor Benfey, of Göttingen.\textsuperscript{61}

Although, from its very nature, the Samhitá of the Sámaveda is poor in data throwing light upon the time of its origin, yet its remaining literature contains an abundance of these; and first of all, the Bráhmaṇas.

The first and most important of these is the Tánḍya Bráhmaṇa, also called Pañcaviniśa, from its containing twenty-five books. Its contents, it is true, are in the main of a very dry and unprofitable character; for in mystic trifling it often exceeds all bounds, as indeed it was the adherents of the Sámaveda generally who carried matters furthest in this direction. Nevertheless, from its great extent, this work contains a mass of highly interesting legends, as well as of information generally. It refers solely to the celebration of the Soma sacrifices, and to the chanting of the adhams accompanying it, which are quoted by their technical names. These sacrifices were celebrated in a great variety of ways; there is one special classification of them according as they extended over one day or several, or finally over more than twelve days.\textsuperscript{62} The latter, called sattras, or sessions, could only be performed by Bráhmans, and that in considerable numbers, and might last 100 days, or even several years. In consequence of the great variety of ceremonies thus involved, each bears its own name, which is borrowed either from the object of its celebration, or the sage who was the first to celebrate it, or from other considerations. How far the order of the Samhitá is here observed has not yet been investigated.

\textsuperscript{61} Recently a new edition, likewise very meritorious, of the first two books, the dghasvat and the sīndraks pānca, of the dhrúka (up to I. g. 2. 3. 10), has been published by Saiyavatra Sámakramin, in the Bāla-kāraka índica (1871-74), accompanied by the corresponding portions (grāndhaśa 1-12) of the Geyagáda, and the complete commentary of Saiyapa, and other illustrative matter.—The division of the adhams into persons is first mentioned by Pársakara, ii. 10 (svaś gas yuddhā prabhūgad, prāśādikādhi-bhūp

\textsuperscript{62} To each Soma sacrifice belong several (four at least) preparatory days; these are not here taken into account. The above division refers only to these days when Soma juice is expressed, that is, to the sātuḍa days. Some sacrifices having only one such day are called chõka; those with from two to twelve, adhams. Satras lasting a whole year, or even longer, are called ayama. For the sātuḍa festival there are seven fundamental forms, called saqatshá; I. St., x. 352-355.
but in any case it would be a mistake to suppose that for all the different sacrifices enumerated in the Brāhmaṇa corresponding prayers exist in the Samhitā. On the contrary, the latter probably only exhibits the verses to be chanted generally at all the Soma sacrifices; and the Brāhmaṇa must be regarded as the supplement in which the modifications for the separate sacrifices are given, and also for those which arose later. While, as we saw above (p. 14), a combination of verses of the Rik for the purpose of recitation bears the name śastra, a similar selection of different sāmans united into a whole is usually called uktā (vач, to speak), stoma (स्तु, to praise), or prishṭha (प्रच्छ, to ask); and these in their turn, like the śastras, receive different appellations. ⁴³

Of special significance for the time of the composition of the Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa are, on the one hand, the very minute descriptions of the sacrifices on the Sarasvati and Drishadvatī; and, on the other, the Vṛatyaśostomas, or sacrifices by which Indians of Aryan origin, but not living according to the Brahmanical system, obtained admission to the Brahman community. The accounts of these latter sacrifices are preceded by a description of the dress and mode of life of those who are to offer them. "They drive in open chariots of war, carry bows and lances, wear turbans, robes bordered with red and having fluttering ends, shoes, and sheepskins folded double; their leaders are distinguished by brown robes and silver neck-ornaments; they pursue neither agriculture nor commerce; their laws are in a constant state of confusion; they speak the same language as those who have received Brahmanical consecration, but nevertheless call what is easily spoken hard to pronounce." This last statement probably refers to

⁴³ The term directly opposed to śastra is, rather, stotra. Prishṭha specially designates several stotras belonging to the mid-day sacrifice, and forming, as it is expressed, its "back;" uktā is originally employed as a synonym of śastra, and only at a later period in the meaning of sāman (I. St., xiii. 447); stoma, lastly, is the name for the six, seven, or more ground-forms of the stotras, after which latter are formed for the purposes of chanting. The simple recitation of the śastras by the Hotar and his companions always comes after the chanting recitation of the same verses by the Udātar and his assistants (ग्रह्त्या ग्रह्यान्यम् स्तुता भा दासिनी, Sat. viii, r. 3–3). The differences of the seven saṃkhyās, or fundamental types of the Soma sacrifice, rest mainly upon the varying number of the śastras and stotras belonging to their suṣṭit days. See I. St., r. 353, ff., ix. 229.
prakritic, dialectic differences, to the assimilation of groups of consonants, and similar changes peculiar to the Prakrit-vernaculars. The great sacrifice of the Naimishiya-Rishis is also mentioned, and the river Sudam. Although we have to conclude from these statements that communication with the west, particularly with the non-Brahmanic Aryans there, was still very active, and that therefore the locality of the composition must be laid more towards the west, still data are not wanting which point us to the east. Thus, there is mention of Para Atnara, king of the Kosala; of Trasadasyu Purukutsa, who is also named in the Rik-Samhitâ; further of Namin Sâpya, king of the Videhas (the Nimi of the epic); of Kurukshetra, Yamunâ, &c. The absence, however, of any allusion in the Tandy-Brahmana either to the Kuru-Paciâlas or to the names of their princes, as well as of any mention of Janaka, is best accounted for by supposing a difference of locality. Another possible, though less likely, explanation of the fact would be to assume that this work was contemporary with, or even anterior to, the flourishing epoch of the kingdom of the Kuru-Paciâlas. The other names quoted therein seem also to belong to an earlier age than those of the other Brâhmañas, and to be associated, rather; with the Rishi period. It is, moreover, a very significant fact that scarcely any differences of opinion are stated to exist amongst the various teachers. It is only against the Kaushitakis that the field is taken with some acrimony; they are denoted as vrtyas (apostates) and as yajndavatrya (unfit to sacrifice). Lastly, the name attached to this Brâhmaña,* viz., Tandy, is mentioned in the Brâhmaña of the White Yajus as that of a teacher; so that, combining all this, we may at least safely infer its priority to the latter work.65

64 The fact that the name of Chitraratha (etena vai Chitrarathas Kapeya apojyan ...) is found in the Kharatrapatir jyotes 'nulambha iti dityayah, xx. 12, 5) occurs in the gana 'Adhadanta' to Pâñ., li. 2, 31, joined with the name Bhrashtaks a compound (Chitraratha-Bhrashtaka) is perhaps also to be taken in this connection.

65 The Tandy-Brâhmaña has been edited, together with Sâya's commentary, in the Bâl. Ind. (1869-74); by Anandaachandra Vedântavâtiga. At the time of the Bhrashtaka-Sûtra (see Kielbom, J. St., x. 421) it must still have been accentuated, and that in the same manner as the Sapattha; in Kumârâbhâtta's time, on the contrary (the last half of the
The *Shādviniṣa-Brāhmaṇa* by its very name proclaims itself a supplement to the Pañchaviṇīsa-Brāhmaṇa. It forms, as it were, its twenty-sixth book, although itself consisting of several books. Sāyaṇa, when giving a summary of its contents at the commencement of his here excellent commentary, says that it both treats of such ceremonies as are not contained in the Pañchaviṇīsa-Brāhmaṇa, and also gives points of divergence from the latter. It is chiefly expiatory sacrifices and ceremonies of imprecation that we find in it, as also short, comprehensive general rules. The fifth book (or sixth *adhyāya*) has quite a peculiar character of its own, and is also found as a separate Brāhmaṇa under the name of *Adbhuta-Brāhmaṇa*; in the latter form, however, with some additions at the end. It enumerates untoward occurrences of daily life, omens and portents, along with the rites to be performed to avert their evil consequences. These afford us a deep insight into the condition of civilisation of the period, which, as might have been expected, exhibits a very advanced phase. The ceremonies first given are those to be observed on the occurrence of vexatious events generally; then come those for cases of sickness among men and cattle, of damaged crops, losses of precious things, &c.; those to be performed in the event of earthquakes, of phenomena in the air and in the heavens, &c., of marvellous appearances on altars and on the images of the gods, of electric phenomena and the like, and of miscarriages. This sort of superstition is elsewhere only treated of in the Grihya-Sūtras, or in the Pārissārtas (supplements); and this imparts to the last *adhyāya* of the *Shādviniṣa-Brāhmaṇa*—as the remaining contents do to the work generally—the appearance of belonging to a very modern period. And, in accordance with this, we find mention here made of Uddālaka Aruni, and other teachers, whose names are altogether unknown to the Pañchaviṇīsa-Brāhmaṇa.—A śloka is cited in the course of

---

seventh century, according to Burnell), it was already being handed down without accents, as in the present day. See Müller, *A. S. L.*, p. 348; Burnell, *Śādviniṣa-Brāhmaṇa*, Preface, p. vi.

---

The *Adbhuta-Brāhmaṇa* has been published by myself, text with translation, and explanatory notes, in *Zwei vedische Texte über Oṁika und Pontia* (1859).
the work, in which the four yugas are still designated by their more ancient names, and are connected with the four lunar phases, to which they evidently owe their origin, although all recollection of the fact had in later times died out. This sloka itself we are perhaps justified in assigning to an earlier time than that of Megasthenes, who informs us of a fabulous division of the mundane ages analogous to that given in the epic. But it does not by any means follow that the Shaivism-Brahmana, in which the sloka is quoted, itself dates earlier than the time of Megasthenes.

The third Brahmana of the Samaveda bears the special title of Chhandogya-Brahmana, although Chhandogya is the common name for all Saman theologians. We, however, also find it quoted, by Sambhara, in his commentary on the Brahma-Sutra, as "Tandinâm bruti," that is to say, under the same name that is given to the Panchavimsa-Brahmana. The two first adhyayas of this Brahmana are still missing, and the last eight only are preserved, which also bear the special title of Chhandogypanshad. This Brahmana is particularly distinguished by its rich store of legends regarding the gradual development of Brahmanical theology, and stands on much the same level as the Vrihad-Aranyaka of the White Yajus with respect to opinions, as well as date, place, and the individuals mentioned. The absence in the Vrihad-Aranyaka, as in the Brahmana of the White Yajus generally, of any reference to the Naimisirya-Rishis, might lead us to argue the priority of the Chhandogypanshad to the Vrihad-Aranyaka. Still, the mention in the Chhandogypanshad of these, as well as of the Mahavishas and the Gandharas—the latter, it is true, are set down as distant—ought perhaps only to be taken as proof of a somewhat more western origin; whereas the Vrihad-Aranyaka belongs, as we shall hereafter see, to quite the eastern part of Hindustan. The numerous animal fables, on the contrary, and the mention of Mahidaa Aitareya, would sooner incline me to suppose that the Chhandogypanshad is more modern than the Vrihad-Aranyaka. With regard to another allusion, in

---

67 Differently Roth in his essay Die Lehre von den vier Weltalteln (Tubingen, 1860).
itself of the greatest significance, it is more hazardous to venture a conjecture: I mean the mention of Krishna Devakiputra, who is instructed by Ghora Angrisasa. The latter, and besides him (though not in connection with him) Krishna Angrisasa, are also mentioned in the Kaushtaki-Brahmana; and supposing this Krishna Angrisasa to be identical with Krishna Devakiputra, the allusion to him might perhaps rather be considered as a sign of priority to the Vrihad-Aranyaka. Still, assuming this identification to be correct, due weight must be given to the fact that the name has been altered here: instead of Angrisasa, he is called Devakiputra, a form of name for which we find no analogy in any other Vedic writing excepting the Vanasas (genealogical tables) of the Vrihad-Aranyaka, and which therefore belongs, at all events, to a tolerably late period.* The significance of this allusion for the understanding of the position of Krishna at a later period is obvious. Here he is yet but a scholar, eager in the pursuit of knowledge, belonging perhaps to the military caste. He certainly must have distinguished himself in some way or other, however little we know of it, otherwise his elevation to the rank of deity, brought about by external circumstances, would be inexplicable.**

The fact of the Ohandogtyapanishad and the Vrihad-Aranyaka having in common the names Pravāhāṇa Jaimvali, Ushaati Chākrayana, Śāndilya, Satyakama Jābala, Uddālaka Aruni, Śvetaketu, and Āsāpati, makes it clear that they were as nearly as possible contemporary works; and this appears also from the generally complete identity of the seventh book of the former with the corresponding passages of the Vrihad-Aranyaka. What, however, is of most significance, as tending to establish a late date for

* Compare also Pāṇ., iv. i. 159, and the names Sambuputra, Mahāyaniputra, in the Sāma-Sūtras; also Kātyāyaniputra, Maitrāyaniputra, Vatsiputra, etc., among the Buddhists. [On these metronymic names in prāṇa see F. St., iii. 157, 485, 486; iv. 380, 435; v. 63, 64.]

** By what circumstances the elevation of Krishna to the rank of deity was brought about is as yet obscure; though unquestionably mythical relations to Indra, &c., are at the root of it; see F. St., xiii. 349, ff. The whole question, however, is altogether vague. Krishna worship proper, i.e., the sectarian worship of Krishna as the one God, probably attained its perfection through the influence of Christianity. See my paper, Krishna's Geburtstag, p. 316, ff. (where also are further particulars as to the name Devaki).
the Chhândogyopanishad, is the voluminous literature, the existence of which is presupposed by the enumeration at the beginning of the ninth book. Even supposing this ninth book to be a sort of supplement (the names of Sanatkumára and Skanda are not found elsewhere in Vedic literature; Nárada also is otherwise only mentioned in the second part of the Aitareya-Bráhmaṇa⁰), there still remains the mention of the ‘Athravángirases,’ as well as of the Itihásas and Puráṇas in the fifth book. Though we are not at liberty here, any more than in the corresponding passages of the Vrīhad-Āranyaka, to understand by these last the Itihásas and Puráṇas which have actually come down to us, still we must look upon them as the forerunners of these works, which, originating in the legends and traditions connected with the songs of the Rik, and with the forms of worship, gradually extended their range, and embraced other subjects also, whether drawn from real life, or of a mythical and legendary character. Originally they found a place in the Bráhmaṇas, as well as in the other expository literature of the Vedas; but at the time of this passage of the Chhán-
dogyopanishad they had possibly already in part attained an independent form, although the commentaries,* as a rule, only refer such expressions to passages in the Bráhmaṇas themselves. The Mahá-Bhárata contains, especially in the first book, a few such Itihásas, still in a prose form; nevertheless, even these fragments so preserved to us belong, in respect both of style and of the conceptions they embody, to a much later period than the similar passages of the Bráhmaṇas. They however suffice, together with the ślokas, gāthás, &c., quoted in the Bráhmaṇas themselves, and with such works as the Bárhaddaivata, to bridge over for us the period of transition from legend to epic poetry.

We meet, moreover, in the Chhánḍogyopanishad with one of those legal cases which are so seldom mentioned in Vedic literature, viz., the infliction of capital punishment for (denied) theft, exactly corresponding to the severe

---

⁰ And a few times in the Atharva-
Saṃhitā, as also in the Vaṣa of the
Śámacand簸na-Bráhmaṇa.

* Not Śámkara, it is true, in this
case, but Śáyaṇa, Harévádmā, and
Drivedasaṅga in similar passages of
the Śácapatha-Bráhmaṇa and Tait-
ttriya-Āraṇyaka.
enactments regarding it in Manu’s code. Guilt or innocence is determined by an ordeal, the carrying of a red-hot axe; this also is analogous to the decrees in Manu. We find yet another connecting link with the state of culture in Manu’s time in a passage occurring also in the Vrīhad-Aranyaka, viz., the doctrine of the transmigration of souls. We here meet with this doctrine for the first time, and that in a tolerably complete form; in itself, however, it must certainly be regarded as much more ancient. The circumstance that the myth of the creation in the fifth book is on the whole identical with that found at the beginning of Manu, is perhaps to be explained by regarding the latter as simply a direct imitation of the former. The tenth book, the subject of which is the soul, its seat in the body and its condition on leaving it, i.e., its migration to the realm of Brahman, contains much that is of interest in this respect in connection with the above-mentioned parallel passage of the Kaushitaky-Upanishad, from which it differs in some particulars. Here also for the first time in the field of Vedic literature occurs the name Rāhu, which we may reckon among the proofs of the comparatively recent date of the Chhāndogyopanishad.

Of expressions for philosophical doctrines we find only Upanishad, Ādēśa, Guhīya Ādēśa (the keeping secret of doctrine is repeatedly and urgently inculcated), Upākhyāna (explanation). The teacher is called dehārya [as he is also in the Śat. Br.]; for “inhabited place,” ardha is used; single ślokas and gāthās are very often quoted.

The Chhāndogyopanishad has been edited by Dr. Roer in the Bibliotheca Indica, vol. iii., along with Śāṃkara’s commentary and a gloss on it. Fr. Windischmann had previously given us several passages of it in the original, and several in translation; see also I. St., i. 254–273.

The Kenopanishad has come down to us as the remnant of a fourth Brāhmaṇa’ of the Śāmaveda, supposed to be its ninth book. In the colophons and in the quotations found in the commentaries, it also bears the other-

---

70 In this series (1854–62) a translation also has been published by Rājendra Lal Mitra.

* Regarding the contents of the first eight books, Śāṃkara furnishes us with information in the beginning of his commentary.
wise unknown name of the Tālauvākāras.* It is divided into two parts: the first, composed in ślokas, treats of the being of the supreme Brahman, appealing in the fourth verse to the tradition of the "earlier sages who have taught us this" as its authority. The second part contains a legend in support of the supremacy of Brahman, and here we find Umā Haimavati, later the spouse of Śiva, acting as mediatrix between Brahman and the other gods, probably because she is imagined to be identical with Sarasvatī, or Vāch, the goddess of speech, of the creative word.† These are the extant Brāhmaṇas of the Sāmaveda. Sāyāna, indeed, in his commentary on the Sāmavidhāna enumerates eight (see Müller, Rīk i. Pref. p. xxvii): the Pṛavāṇa- or Mahā-Brāhmaṇa (i.e., the Pāñchavāni), the Śadvāṇa, the Sāmavidhā, the Arshēya, the Devatādhyāya, the Upanishad, the Sāmphitopanishad, and the Vanā. The claims, however, of four of these works to the name of Brāhmaṇa, have no solid foundation. The Arshēya is, as already stated, merely an Anukramani, and the Devatādhyāya can hardly be said to be anything else; the Vanā elsewhere always constitutes a part of the Brāhmaṇas themselves: the two latter works, moreover, can scarcely be supposed to be still in existence, which, as far as the Vanā is concerned, is certainly very much to be regretted. The Sāmavidhāna also, which probably treats, like the portion of the Lātāyana-Sūtra bearing the same name, of the conversion of the pīchas into ādāman, can hardly pass for a Brāhmaṇa.†† As to the Sāmphitopanishad, it appears

* Might not this name be traceable to the same root ṭad, ṛad, from which ṭundya is derived?
† On the literature, &c., of the Kepampanishad, see J. St., ii. 181, ff. [We have to add Roer's edition with Sāphāra's commentary, in Bibliotheca Indica, vol. viii., and his translation, ibid., vol. xv.]
†† The above statements require to be corrected and supplemented in several particulars. The Vanā-Brāhmaṇa was first edited by myself in J. St., iv. 371, ff., afterwards by Burnell with Sāyāna's commentary (1873). The Devatādhyāya is not an Anukramani, but only contains some information as to the deities of the different ādāman, to which a few other short fragments are added. Finally, the Sāmavidhāna-Brāhmaṇa does not treat of the conversion of pīchas into ādāman; on the contrary, it is a work similar to the Rigvidhāna, and relates to the employment of the ādāman for all sorts of superstitious purposes. Both texts have likewise been edited by Burnell, with Sāyāna's commentaries (1873). By Kumērīla, too, the number of the Brāhmaṇas of the Sāmaveda is given as eight (Müller,
to me doubtful whether Sāyaṇa meant by it the Kenopanishad; for though the samhitā (universality) of the Supreme Being certainly is discussed in the latter, the subject is not handled under this name, as would seem to be demanded by the analogy of the title of the Samhitopanishad of the Aitareya-Aranyaka as well as of the Taittirīya-Aranyaka. My conjecture would be that he is far more likely to have intended a work of the same title, of which there is a MS. in the British Museum (see I. St., i. 42); and if so, all mention of the Kenopanishad has been omitted by him; possibly for the reason that it appears at the same time in an Atharvan-recension (differing but little, it is true), and may have been regarded by him as belonging to the Atharvan?

There is a far greater number of Sūtras to the Sāma-veda than to any of the other Vedas. We have here three Śrauta-Sūtras; a Sūtra which forms a running commentary upon the Pañchaviniśa-Brahmāṇa; five Sūtras on Metres and on the conversion of rīchas into sāmāṇa; and a Grihyā-Sūtra. To these must further be added other similar works of which the titles only are known to us, as well as a great mass of different Pariśiṣṭas.

Of the Śrauta-Sūtras, or Sūtras treating of the sacrificial ritual, the first is that of Maśaka, which is cited in the other Sāma-Sūtras, and even by the teachers mentioned in these, sometimes as Ārṣeya-Kalpa, sometimes as Kalpa, and once also by Lātyāyana directly under the name of Maśaka. In the colophons it bears the name of Kalpa-Sūtra. This Sūtra is but a tabular enumeration of the prayers belonging to the several ceremonies of the Soma sacrifice; and these are quoted partly by their technical Sāman names, partly by their opening words. The

A.S. L., p. 345; in his time all of them were already without accents. One fact deserves to be specially noticed here, namely, that several of the teachers mentioned in the Vāsā-Brahmāṇa, by their very names, point us directly to the northwest of India, e.g., Kāmboja Au- pāmanyava, Madragrā Śauṭigāyana, Sāti Aushṭrākahi, Śāṃkāyana, and Kauhala; see I. St., iv. 378-380.

72 This is unquestionably correct, since this text appears there, as well as elsewhere, in connection with the Vāsā-Brahmāṇa, &c. It is not much larger than the Devatādhyāya, but has not yet been published; see I. St., iv. 375.

73 Lātyāyana designates Maśaka as Gārgya. Is this name connected with the Mārgya of the Greeks? Lassen, I. A. K., i. 150; I. St., iv 78.
order is exactly that of the Pañchaviniśa-Brāhmaṇa; yet a few other ceremonies are inserted, including those added in the Shadviṇaśa-Brāhmaṇa, as well as others. Among the latter the Janakasaptarātra deserves special notice,—a ceremony owing its origin to King Janaka,\(^74\) of whom, as we saw above, no mention is yet made in the Pañchaviniśa-Brāhmaṇa. His life and notoriety therefore evidently fall in the interval between the latter work and the Sūtra of Maṣaka.—The eleven prapāṭhakas of this Sūtra are so distributed that the ekāhas (sacrifices of one day) are dealt with in the first five chapters; the aṅkhas (those lasting several days) in the following four; and the sattras (sacrifices lasting more than twelve days) in the last two. There is a commentary on it, composed by Varadarāja, whom we shall meet with again as the commentator of another Śāna-Sūtra.

The second Śrauta-Sūtra is that of Lātyāyana, which belongs to the school of the Kauthumas. This name appears to me to point to Lāṭa, the Λανθή of Ptolemy,\(^75\) to a country therefore lying quite in the west, directly south of Surāšṭra (Σουραστρη). This would agree perfectly with the conjecture above stated, that the Pañchaviniśa-Brāhmaṇa belongs more to the west of India; and is borne out by the data contained in the body of the Sūtra itself, as we shall see presently.

This Sūtra, like that of Maṣaka, connects itself closely with the Pañchaviniśa-Brāhmaṇa, and indeed often quotes passages of some length from it, generally introducing them by “tad uktam brāhmaṇena;” or, “iti brāhmaṇam bhavati;” once also by “tathā purāṇam Tāṅḍam.” It usually gives at the same time the different interpretations which these passages received from various teachers. Śāndilya, Dhānamjayya, and Śāndilyāyana are most frequently mentioned in this manner, often together, or one after the other, as expounders of the Pañchaviniśa-Brāhmaṇa. The first-named is already known to us through the Chhāndo-gyopanishad, and he, as well as Śāndilyāyana, is repeatedly

---

\(^{74}\) Śāyaṇa, it is true, to Pañch.
\(^{75}\) Lāṭika as early as the edicts of xxii. 9. 1, takes janaka as an appellative in the sense of prajāpāti, which is the reading of the Pañchaviniśa-Brāhmaṇa.
mentioned also in another Sūtra, the Nidāna-Sūtra; the same is the case with Dhānamjāyya. Besides these, however, Lātyāyana mentions a number of other teachers and schools, as, for example, his own āchāryas, with especial frequency; the Arsheya-Kalpa, two different Gautamas, one being distinguished by the surname Sthavira (a technical title, especially with the Buddhists); further Sauchivrikshi (a teacher known to Pāṇini), Kshairakalambhi, Kautsa, Vārshaganyā, Bhāṇḍitāyana, Lāmakāyana, Rāpāyaniputra, &c.; and in particular, the Śātyāyanins, and their work, the Śātyāyananaka, together with the Śālaṅkāyanins, the latter of whom are well known to belong to the western part of India. Such allusions occur in the Sūtra of Lātyāyana, as in the other, Sūtras of the Śaeva-veda, much more frequently than in the Sūtras of the other Vedas, and are in my opinion evidence of their priority to the latter. At the time of the former there still existed manifold differences of opinion, while in that of the latter a greater unity and fixedness of exegesis, of dogma, and of worship had been attained. The remaining data appear also to point to such a priority, unless we have to explain them merely from the difference of locality. The condition of the Śādras, as well as of the Nishādas, i.e., the Indian aborigines, does not here appear to be one of such oppression and wretchedness as it afterwards became. It was permitted to sojourn with them (Śāṇḍilya, it is true, restricts this permission to “in the neighbourhood of their grāmas”), and they themselves were allowed to attend in person at the ceremonies, although outside of the sacrificial ground. They are, moreover, now and then represented, though for the most part in a mean capacity, as taking an actual part on such occasions, which is not to be thought of in later times. Toleration was still a matter of necessity, for, as we likewise see, the strict Brahmanical principle was not yet recognised even among the neighbouring Aryan tribes. These, equally with the Brahmanical Indians, held in high esteem the songs and customs of their ancestors, and devoted to them quite as much study as the Brahmanical Indians did; nay, the latter now and then directly resorted to the former, and borrowed distinct ceremonies from them. This is sufficiently clear from the particulars of one ceremony of the
kind, which is embodied, not indeed in the Pañchaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa, but in the Sañjviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa, and which is described at full length by Lātyāyana. It is an imprecatory ceremony (called śyenā, falcon); and this naturally suggests the idea that the ceremonial of the Atharvan, which is essentially based upon imprecations and magical expedients,—as well as the songs of the Atharvan itself,—may perhaps chiefly owe its cultivation to these western, non-Brahmanical, Aryan tribes. The general name given to these tribes by Lātyāyana (and with this Pāṇini v. 2. 21 agrees) is Vrāṭinas, and he further draws a distinction between their yaudhās, warriors, and their arhants, teachers. Their anūchānas, i.e., those versed in Scripture, are to be chosen priests for the above-mentioned sacrifice. Sāndilya limits this to the arhants alone, which latter word—subsequently, as is well known, employed exclusively as a Buddhist title—is also used in the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus, and in the Aranyaka of the Black Yajus, to express a teacher in general. The turban and garments of these priests should be red (lohitā) according to Sañjviṃśa and Lātyāyana; and we find the same colour assigned to the sacrificial robes of the priests of the Rākshasas in Laṅkā, in the Rāmāyana, vi. 19. 110, 51. 21; with which may be compared the light red, yellowish red (kṣaṇḍāya) garments of the Buddhists (see for instance Mṛichhakat, pp. 112, 114, ed. Stenzler; M.-Bhār., xii. 566, 11898; Yājnav., i. 272), and the red (raktā) dress of the Śaṁkhyabhikshu * in the Leghujātaka of Varāha-Mihira. Now, that these western non-Brahmanical Vṛattyas, Vṛāṭinas, were put precisely upon a par with the eastern non-Brahmanical, i.e., Buddhist, teachers, appears from an addition which is given by Lātyāyana to the description of the Vṛatyastomas as found in the Pañchaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa. We are there told that the converted Vṛattyas, i.e., those who have entered into the Brahman community, must, in order to cut off all connection with their past, hand over their wealth to those of their companions who still abide by the old mode of life—thereby transferring to these their own former impurity—or else, to a “Brahma-

* According to the commentary; or should this be Śākyabhikṣu? See I. St., ii. 287.
bandhu Mágadhadesáya." This latter expression is only explicable if we assume that Buddhism, with its anti-
Brahmanical tendencies, was at the time flourishing in Magadha; and the absence of any such allusion in the
Pañchavánsa-Bráhmaṇa is significant as to the time which elapsed between this work and the Sútra of Látýáyana.*

The first seven prapákhas of the Látýáyana-Sútra comprise the rules common to all Soma sacrifices; the
eighth and part of the ninth book treat, on the contrary, of the separate ekáhas; the remainder of the ninth book,
of the akáhas; and the tenth, of the sattras. We have an excellent commentary on it by Agnisvámin,76 who be-
longs probably to the same period as the other commentators whose names terminate in svámin, as Bhavasvámin,
Bharatasvámin, Dhúrtasvámin, Harisvámin, Khárásvámin, Meghasvámin, Skandásvámin, Khairásvámin, &c.;
their time, however, is as yet undetermined.77

The third Sáma-Sútra, that of Dráhyáyana, differs but slightly from the Látýáyana-Sútra. It belongs to the
school of the Ráisyanyásas. We meet with the name of these latter in the Ráisyanyiputra of Látýáyana; his
family is descended from Vasishtha, for which reason this Sutra is also directly called Vásishtha-Sútra. For the
name Dráhyáyána nothing analogous can be adduced.78 The difference between this Sutra and that of Látýáyana

* In the Rik-Sáṃhitás, where the
Kklástas—the ancient name of the
people of Magadha—and their king
Prámagandá are mentioned as hosti-
ble, we have probably to think of the
aborigines of the country, and not of hostile Aryas (?). It seems not
impossible that the native inhabi-
tants, being particularly vigorous,
retained more influence in Magadha
than elsewhere, even after the coun-
try had been brahmanized;—a pro-
cess which perhaps was never com-
pletely effected;—that they joined
the community of the Brahmanas as
K前所未有, as happened elsewhere
also; and that this is how we have
to account for the special sympathy
and success which Buddhism met
with in Magadha, these native inha-

76 We now possess in the Bill.
Indica (1870-72) an edition of the
Látýáyana-Sútra, with Agnisvámin's
commentary, by Anandachandra
Vadántavágíśa.

77 We find quite a cluster of Brah-
man names in -svámin in an inscrip-
tion dated Sáka 527 in Journal Bomb-
day Branch R. A. S., iii. 208 (1851),
and in an undated inscription in

78 It first occurs in the Vásá-
Brahmanas, whose first list of teach-
ers probably refers to this very
school; see J. St. iv. 379: draka
is said to be a Prákrt corruption of
drôda; see Heim. Prákr., ii. 80, 120.
is mainly confined to the different distribution of the matter, which is on the whole identical, and even expressed in the same words. I have not yet met with a complete codex of the whole work, but only with its beginning and its end, in two different commentaries, the date of which it is not yet possible to determine—the beginning, namely, in Maghasvāmin’s commentary, remodelled by Rudraskanda; the end in the excellent commentary of Dhanvin.

The only knowledge I have of a Śrauta-Sūtra by Gobhila is derived from a notice of Roth’s (op. c., pp. 55, 56), according to which Krītyachintāmaṇī is said to have composed a commentary upon it.79

In a far more important degree than he differs from Drāhyāyaṇa does Lātyāyana differ, on the one hand, from Kātyāyana, who in his Śrauta-Sūtra, belonging to the White Yajus, treats in books 22–24 of the ekāhas, aṅganas, and sattras; and on the other, from the Rik-Sūtras of Āśvalāyana and Śāṅkhāyana, which likewise deal with these subjects in their proper place. In these there is no longer any question of differences of opinion; the stricter view represented by Śāndilya in the Lātyāyana-Sūtra has everywhere triumphed. The ceremonies on the Sarasvatī and the Vrātyastomas have also become, in a local sense too, further removed from actual life, as appears both from the slight consideration with which they are treated, and from modifications of names, &c., which show a forgetting of the original form. Many of the ceremonies discussed in the Sāma-Sūtras are, moreover, entirely wanting in the Sūtras of the other Vedas; and those which are found in the latter are enumerated in tabular fashion rather than fully discussed—a difference which naturally originated in the diversity of purpose, the subject of the Sūtra of the Yajus being the duties of the Adhvaryu, and that of the Sūtras of the Rik the duties of the Hotar.

A fourth Sāma-Sūtra is the Anupada-Sūtra, in ten prapāthakas, the work of an unknown author. It explains

---

79 The name ‘Krītyachintāmaṇī’ probably belongs to the work itself; compare I. St., i. 60, ii. 395; Aufrecht, Catalogus, p. 365; but whether it really was a commentary on a Śrauta-Sūtra of Gobhila remains doubtful in the meantime, since such a work is not mentioned elsewhere.
the obscure passages of the Pañchaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa; and, it would appear, of the Śaṭṭviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa also, accompanying the text step by step. It has not as yet been closely examined; but it promises to prove a rich mine of material for the history of Brahmanical theology, as it makes mention of, and appeals to, an extremely large number of different works. For example, of schools of the Rīk, it cites the Aitareyins, the Paingins, the Kaushitaka; of schools of the Yajus, the Adhvaryus in general; further, the Śātyāyanins, Khāḍāyanins, the Taittirīyas, the Kāthaka, the Kālabavins, Bhāllavins, Śāmbuvis, Vājasaneyins; and frequently also śruti, smṛiti, āchāryas, &c. It is a work which deserves to be very thoroughly studied.

While the above-named four Sūtras of the Sāmaveda specially attach themselves to the Pañchaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa, the Sūtras now to be mentioned stand out more independently beside the latter, although of course, in part at least, often referring to it. In the first place, we have to mention the Nidāna-Sūtra, which contains in ten prāṇāṅgikas metrical and other similar investigations on the different ukthas, stomas, and gānas. The name of the author is not given. The word nidāna, ‘root,’ is used with reference to metre in the Brāhmaṇa, of the White Yajus; and though in the two instances where the Naidānas are mentioned by Yāsaka, their activity appears to have been directed less to the study of metre than to that of roots, etymology, still the Nidānasamjñaka Grantha is found cited in the Brihaddevatā, 5, 5, either directly as the Śruti of the Chhandogas, or at least as containing their Śruti. This Sūtra is especially remarkable for the great number of Vedic schools and teachers whose various opinions it adduces; and in this respect it stands on pretty much the same level as the Anupada-Sūtra. It differs from it, however, by its particularly frequent quotation

---

80 Unfortunately we do not even now know of more than one MS.; see J. St., i. 43.
81 This is wrong; on the contrary, the word has quite a general meaning in the passages in question (e.g., in gṛyatri ud caḥ nidāna, or yo va atid ‘yaṁ gṛyati ca nidāna)
also of the views of the Sāman theologians named by Lātyā-yana and Drāhyāyana, viz., Dhānamjaya, Śāndilya, Sauchhivrikiṣi, &c.—a thing which seldom or never occurs in the former. The animosity to the Kaushitakis, with which we have already become acquainted in the Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa, is here again exhibited most vividly in some words attributed to Dhānamjaya. With regard to the Rigveda, the daśatayā division into ten maṇḍalas is mentioned, as in Yāska. The allusion to the Atharvaṇikas, as well as to the Anubrahmaṇins, is particularly to be remarked; the latter peculiar name is not met with elsewhere, except in Pāṇini. A special study of this Sūtra is also much to be desired, as it likewise promises to open up a wealth of information regarding the condition of literature at that period.²²

Not much information of this sort is to be expected from the Puṣpā-Sūtra of Gobhila,* which has to be named along with the Nidāna-Sūtra. The understanding of this Sūtra is, moreover, obstructed by many difficulties. For not only does it cite the technical names of the saṁs, as well as other words, in a very curtailed form, it also makes use of a number of grammatical and other technical terms, which, although often agreeing with the corresponding ones in the Prātisākhya-Sūtras, are yet also often formed in quite a peculiar fashion, here and there, indeed, quite after the algebraic type so favoured by Pāṇini. This is particularly the case in the first four prapāṭhakas; and it is precisely for these that, up to the present time at least, no commentary has been found; whereas for the remaining six we possess a very good commentary by Upādhyāya Ajātaśatru.† The work treats of the modes in which the separate riches, by various insertions, &c., are transformed into saṁs, or “made to blossom,” as it were, which is evidently the origin of the name Pushpa-Sūtra, or “Flower-Sūtra.” In addition to

---

²² See I. St., I. 44, 27; the first two pafalas, which have special reference to metre, have been edited and translated by me in I. St., viii. 85–724. For Anubrahmaṇin, sq., see also Aśv. Sr., ii. 8, 11, and Schol. on T. S., i. 8. 1. 1.

* So, at least, the author is called in the colophons of two chapters in MS. Chambers 220 (Catalogue of the Berlin MSS., p. 76).

† Composed for his pupil, Vīhāryuṣas.
the Pravachana, i.e. (according to the commentary), Brahma, of the Kala-bavins and that of the Sattyayannis, I found, on a cursory inspection, mention also of the Kauthumas. This is the first time that their name appears in a work connected with Vedic literature. Some portions of the work, particularly in the last books, are composed in slokas, and we have, doubtless, to regard it as a compilation of pieces belonging to different periods. In close connection with it stands the Sama-Tantra, composed in the same manner, and equally unintelligible without a commentary. It treats, in thirteen prapdyakhas, of accent and the accentuation of the separate verses. A commentary on it is indeed extant, but at present only in a fragmentary form. At its close the work is denoted as the vyanvarya, grammar, of the Sama theologians.

Several other Sutras also treat of the conversion of richas into sams, &c. One of these, the Panchavidhi-Sutra (Panchavidhya, Panchavidhya), is only known to me from quotations, according to which, as well as from its name, it treats of the five different vidhis (modes) by which this process is effected. Upon a second, the Pratihara-Sutra, which is ascribed to Katyayana, a commentary called DaSatayi was composed by Varadaraja, the above-mentioned commentator of Maaska. It treats of the aforesaid five vidhis, with particular regard to the one called pratihara. The Tandilakshana-Sutra is only known to me by name, as also the Upagrantha-Sutra, both of which, with the two other works just named, are, according to the catalogue, found in the Fort-William

---

43 In Dekhan MSS, the work is called Phulla-Sutra, and is ascribed to Vararuchi, not to Gobhila; see Burnell, Catalogue, pp. 45, 46. On this and other points of difference, see my paper, "Uber das Sastrapatakam des Haoa" (1870), pp. 258, 259. I now possess a copy of the text and commentary, but have nothing of consequence to add to the above remarks.

44 See also Burnell, Catalogue, pp. 40, 41. -- ibid., p. 44, we find a 'Svaraparibhash, or Samaksha, specified. Katyata also mentions a 'Samaksha-iin pradhyakshya iva-

---

45 Szudguruadhya, in the introduction to his commentary on the Anukrama of the Rik, describes Katyayana as 'upagranthya kara,
collection of MSS. By the anonymous transcriber of the Berlin MS. of the Maṣaka-Sūtra, who is of course a very weak authority, ten Śrauta-Sūtras for the Sāmaveda are enumerated at the close of the MS., viz., besides Lātyāyana, Anupada, Nidāna, Kalpa, Taṇḍālakṣaṇa, Pañchavidheya, and the Upagranthas, also the Kalpaṇupada, Anustotra, and the Kāśyapras. What is to be understood by the three last names must for the present remain undecided.86

The Grihya-Sūtra of the Sāmaveda belongs to Gobhila, the same to whom we also found a Śrauta-Sūtra and the Pūṣpa-Sūtra ascribed.85 His name has a very unvedic ring, and nothing in any way corresponding to it appears in the rest of Vedic literature.87 In what relation this work, drawn up in four prāṇḍhakas, stands to the Grihya-Sūtras of the remaining Vedas has not yet been investigated.88 A supplement (parīkṣheṣa) to it is the Karmaprādīpa of Kātyāyana. In its introductory words it expressly acknowledges itself to be such a supplement to Gobhila; but it has also been regarded both as a second Grihya-Sūtra and as a Smṛiti-Sūtra. According to the statement of Āśārka, the commentator of this Karmaprādīpa, the Grihya-Sūtra of Gobhila is authoritative for both the schools of the Sāmaveda, the Kauthasas as well as the Rāṇāyanis.89—Is the Khaddra-Grihya, which is now and then mentioned, also to be classed with the Sāmaveda?89

86 On the Pañchavidheya-Sūtra and the Kalpaṇupada, each in two-praṇḍhakas, and the Kāśyapa in three prāṇḍhakas, see Müller, A. S. Lit. p. 230; Aufrecht, Catalogus, p. 377. The Upagranthas-Sūtras treat of expiations, prāṇḍhakas, see Ed. Jendran L. M., Notices of Sanskrit MSS., ii. 182.
87 To him is also ascribed a Naṅgaya-Sūtra, “a description of the Metres of the Sāmaveda,” see Colin Browning, Catalogue of Śrīnīvra MSS., existing in Oudh (1873), p. 4.
88 A list of teachers belonging to the Gobhila school is contained in the Veda-Bṛhadāraṇyaka.
89 An edition of the Gobhila-Grihya-Sūtra, with a very diffuse commentary by the editor, Chandrakirta Tarkalankāra, has been commenced in the BML. Indica (1871); the fourth fasciculus (1873) reaches to ff. 8, 12. See the sections relating to nuptial ceremonies in Hase’s paper, J. St., v. 283, ff.
90 Among the authors of the Smṛiti-Sūtras a Kauṭumika is also mentioned.
91 Certainly. In Burnell’s Catalogue, p. 56, the Dṛṣṭānta-Grihya-Sūtra (in four prāṇḍhakas) is attributed to Khaddra. Rādrakandāsvāmin composed a write on this work also (see p. 56); and Vāmana is named as the author of “Khaddra to the Grihya-Sūtra of Khaddra,” Burnell, p. 57. To the Grihya-Sūtras of the Sāmaveda probably belong also Gautama’s Piṭṭīvṛkṣa-Sūtra
As representative of the last stage of the literature of the Sāmaveda, we may specify, on the one hand, the various Paddhatis (outlines) and commentaries, &c., which connect themselves with the Sūtras, and serve as an explanation and further development of them; and, on the other, that peculiar class of short treatises bearing the name of Pariśisketas, which are of a somewhat more independent character than the former, and are to be looked upon more as supplements to the Sūtras. * Among these, the already mentioned Arśka and Daivata enumerations of the Rishis and deities—of the Samhitā in the Naigeya-Sākhā deserve prominent notice. Both of these treatises refer throughout to a comparatively ancient tradition; for example, to the Nairuktas, headed by Yāśka and Śākapūpi, to the Naigandikas, to Śaunaka (i.e., probably to his Anukramaṇī of the Rik), to their own Brāhmaṇa, to Aitareya and the Aitareyins, to the Śatapathikas, to the Pravachana Kāṭhaka, and to Āśvalāyana. The Dālkhya-Pariśisketa ought probably also to be mentioned here; it bears the name of an individual who appears several times in the Chhāndogypishanśad, but particularly often in the Purāṇas, as one of the sages who conduct the dialogue.

The Yajurveda, to which we now turn, is distinguished above the other Vedas by the great number of different schools which belong to it. This is at once a consequence and a proof of the fact that it became pre-eminently the subject of study, inasmuch as it contains the formulas for the entire sacrificial ceremonial, and indeed forms its

\*(cf. Burnell, p. 57; the commentator Anantatreya identifies the author with Akṣapāda, the author of the Nyāya Sūtra, and the Gaudamāñjūna-Dharma-Sūtra; see the section treating of the legal literature.

* Rāmabhadrāṇa, in his commentaries on the Grhyasūtra of the White Yajus, several times ascribes their authorship to a Kātyāyana (India Office Library, No. 440, fol. 50*; 56*; 58*, &c.), or do these quotations only refer to the above-named Karmapṛśāpa?\)
proper foundation; whilst the Rigveda prominently, and the Samaveda exclusively, devote themselves to a part of it only, viz., to the Soma sacrifice. The Yajurveda divides itself, in the first place, into two parts, the Black and the White Yajus. These, upon the whole, indeed, have their matters in common; but they differ fundamentally from each other as regards its arrangement. In the Samhitā of the Black Yajus the sacrificial formulas are for the most part immediately followed by their dogmatic explanation, &c., and by an account of the ceremonial belonging to them; the portion bearing the name of Brāhmaṇa differing only in point of time from this Samhitā, to which it must be viewed as a supplement. In the White Yajus, on the contrary, the sacrificial formulas, and their explanation and ritual, are entirely separated from one another, the first being assigned to the Samhitā, and their explanation and ritual to the Brāhmaṇa, as is also the case in the Rigveda and the Samaveda. A further difference apparently consists in the fact that in the Black Yajus very great attention is paid to the Hotar and his duties, which in the White Yajus is of rare occurrence. By the nature of the case in such matters, what is undigested is to be regarded as the commencement, as the earlier stage, and what exhibits method as the later stage; and this view will be found to be correct in the present instance. As each Yajus possesses an entirely independent literature, we must deal with each separately.

First, of the Black Yajus. The data thus far known to us concerning it open up such extensive literary perspectives, but withal in such a meagre way, that investigation has, up to the present time, been less able to attain to approximately satisfactory results* than in any other field. In the first place, the name "Black Yajus" belongs only to a later period, and probably arose in contradistinction to that of the White Yajus. While the theologians of the Rik are called Babyrichas, and those of the Sāman Chhandogas, the old name for the theologians of the Yajus is Adhvaryus; and, indeed, these three names are already so

---

* See I. St., i. 68, ff. [All the been published; see the ensuing texts, with the exception of the notes.] Sūtras relating to ritual, have now
employed in the Samhita of the Black Yajus and the Brhma of the White Yajus. In the latter work the designation Adityavrus is applied to its own adherents, and the Charakdvrus are denoted and censured as their adversaries—an enmity which is also apparent in a passage of the Samhita of the White Yajus, where the Charakdvraya, as one of the persons to be dedicated at the Purushamedha, is devoted to Dushkrita, or "ill deed." This is all the more strange, as the term Charaka is otherwise always used in a good sense, for "travelling scholar;" as is also the root Char, "to wander about for instruction."

The explanation probably consists simply in the fact that the name Charakas is also, on the other hand, applied to one of the principal schools of the Black Yajus, whence we have to assume that there was a direct enmity between these and the adherents of the White Yajus who arose in opposition to them—a hostility similarly manifested in other cases of the kind. A second name for the Black Yajus is "Taittirya," of which no earlier appearance can be traced than that in its own Pratisakhya-Sutra, and in the Sama-Sutras. Pnini connects this name with a Rishi called Tittiri, and so does the Anukramani to the Atreyya school, which we shall have frequent occasion to mention in the sequel. Later legends, on the contrary, refer it to the transformation of the pupils of Vaisampayana into partridges (tittiri), in order to pick up the yajus-verses disgorge by one of their companions who was wroth with his teacher. However absurd this legend may be, a certain amount of sense yet lurks beneath its surface. The Black Yajus is, in fact, a motley, undigested jumble of different pieces; and I am myself more inclined to derive the name Taittirya from the variegated partridge (tittiri) than from the Rishi Tittiri; just as another name of one of the principal schools of the Black Yajus, that of the Khndikya, probably owes its formation to

---

* The rule referred to (iv. 3:102) is, according to the statement of the Calcutta scholiast, not explained in Patanjali's Bhasya; possibly, therefore, it may not be Pdnini's at all, but may be later than Patanjali. (The name Taittirya itself, however, is several times mentioned in the Bhasya, see I. St., xiii. 442, which is also acquainted with Tittiriprobhokh describing, not belonging to the Chhandas, see I. St., v. 41; Goldstucker, Pdnini, p. 243.)
this very fact of the Black Yajus being made up of khandas, fragments, although Pāṇini,* as in the case of Taittiriya, traces it to a Rishi of the name of Khandika, and although we do really meet with a Khandika (Adbhāri) in the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus (xi. 8. 4. i).

Of the many schools which are allotted to the Black Yajus, all probably did not extend to Śamhitā and Brāhmaṇa; some probably embraced the Śūtras only.† Thus far, at least, only three different recensions of the Śamhitā are directly known to us, two of them in the text itself, the third merely from an Anukramaṇī of the text. The two first are the Taittiriya-Śamhitā, κατ' ζωγράφυ so called, which is ascribed to the school of Āpastamba, a subdivision of the Khandikīya; and the Kāṭhaka, which belongs to the school of the Charakes, and that particular subdivision of it which bears the name of Chārāyānīya.‡ The Śamhitā, &c., of the Ātreya school, a subdivision of the Au-khiya, is only known to us by its Anukramaṇī; it agrees in essentials with that of Āpastamba. This is not the case with the Kāṭhaka, which stands on a more independent footing, and occupies a kind of intermediate position between the Black and the White Yajus, agreeing frequently with the latter as to the readings, and with the former in the arrangement of the matter. The Kāṭhaka, together with the Hāridravīka—a lost work, which, however, likewise certainly belonged to the Black Yajus, viz., to the school of the Hāridravīya, a subdivision of the Maitrāyānīya—is the only work of the Brāhmaṇa order mentioned by name in Yāska’s Nirukta. Pāṇini, too, makes direct reference to it in a rule, and it is further alluded to in the Anupada-Śūtra and Brhaddevatā. The name of the Kāṭhas does not appear in other Vedic writings, nor does that of Āpastamba.§

---

* The rule is the same as that for Taittiri. The remark in the previous note, therefore, applies here also.
† As is likewise the case with the other Vedas.
‡ Besides the text, we have also a Rishyasaṅkramaṇī for it.
§ In later writings several Kāṭhas are distinguished, the Kāṭhas, the Prāchya-Kāṭhas, and the Kapāh-thala-Kāṭhas; the epithet of these last is found in Pāṇini (viii. 3. 91), and Megasthenes mentions the Kapāh-thala as a people in the Pan-jab—In the Fort-William Catalogue a Kapāh-thala-Śamhitā is mentioned [see I. 52, xili. 375, 439.—At the time of the Mahābhārata the position of the Kāṭhas must have been one of great consideration, since
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The Samhitá of the Ápastamba school consists of seven books (called aśṭakas!); these again are divided into 44 praśnas, 651 anuvākas, and 2198 kandikás, the latter being separated from one another on the principle of an equal number of syllables to each. Nothing definite can be ascertained as to the extent of the Átreya recension; it is likewise divided into kandaśas, praśnas, and anuvākas, the first words of which coincide mostly with those of the corresponding sections of the Ápastamba school. The Kāthaka is quite differently divided, and consists of five parts, of which the three first are in their turn divided into forty sohánakas, and a multitude of small sections (also probably separated according to the number of words); while the fourth merely specifies the ročas to be sung by the Hotar, and the fifth contains the formulas belonging to the horse-sacrifice. In the colophons to the three first parts, the Charaka-Śākhā is called Iṭhimikā, Madhyamikā, and Orimikā, respectively: the first and last of these three appellations are still unexplained. The Brāhmaṇa portion in these works is extremely meagre as regards the ritual; and gives but an imperfect picture of it; it is, however, peculiarly rich in legends of a mythological character. The sacrificial formulas themselves are on the whole the same as those contained in the Samhitá of the White Yajus; but the order is different, although the

they—and their text, the Kāthaka—are repeatedly mentioned; see I. St., xiii. 437. ff. The founder of their school, Kātha, appears in the Mahābhāṣya as Valāṃpāyana’s pupil, and the Kāthas themselves appear in close connection with the Kālāpas and Kauthumās, both schools of the Bāman. In the Rāmdyāya, too, the Kātha-Kālāpas are mentioned as being much esteemed in Ayodhyā (ii. 32. 18, Schlegel). Haradatta’s statement, “Bassyotdnam apyasti Kāṭakākhā” (Bhāṭṭojī’s Śiddh. Kaum. ed. Tārānātha (1865), vol. ii. p. 524, on Pāp., vii. 4. 38), probably rests upon some misunderstanding; see I. St., xiii. 438.]

It is not the number of syllables, but the number of words, that constitutes the norm; fifty words, as a rule, form a kandika; see I. St., xi. 13, xii. 90, xiii. 97–99. Instead of aśṭaka, we find also the more correct name kandika, and instead of praśna, which is peculiar to the Taittirīya texts, the generally employed term, āraṇākha; see I. St., xi. 13, 124.—The Taitt. Brāhm. and the Tāttv. Āra., are also subdivided into kandikās, and these again into very small sections; but the principle of these divisions has not yet been clearly ascertained.

Iṭhimikā is to be derived from heṣṭhina (from heṣṭh, i.e., adhāntē), and Orimikā from uravima (from upari); see my paper, über die Bhāgavati der Jaina, i. 404, n.
order of the ceremonial to which they belong is pretty much the same. There are also many discrepancies with regard to the words; we may instance, in particular, the expansion of the semi-vowels e and y after a consonant into uw and iy, which is peculiar to the Aparastamba school. As to data, geographical or historical, &c. (here, of course, I can only speak of the Aparastamba school—and the Kathaka), which are not known in the former—the purushamedha, for instance.) Now these data—to which we must add some other scattered allusions in the portions bearing the character of a Brāhmaṇa—carry us back, as we shall see, to the flourishing epoch of the kingdom of the Kuru-Paṇchala in which district we must therefore recognise the place of origin of both works. Whether this also holds good of their final redaction is another question, the answer to which, as far as the Aparastamba-Samhitā is concerned, naturally depends upon the amount of influence in its arrangement to be ascribed to Aparastamba, whose name it bears. The Kathaka, according to what has been stated above, appears to have existed as an entirely finished work even in Yāśka’s time, since he quotes it; the Anukramaṇī of the Ātreya school, on the contrary, makes Yāśka Pāṇgī (as the pupil of Vaiṣampayana) the teacher of Tittiri, the latter again the in-
SAMHITAS OF THE BLACK YAJUS.

structure of Ukha, and Ukha the preceptor of Átreyas. This at least clearly exhibits its author’s view of the priority of Yáśka to the schools and rejections of the Black Yajus bearing the names of Tittiri and Átreyas; although the data necessary to prove the correctness of this view are wanting. That, however, some sort of influence in the arrangement of the Samhitá of the Black Yajus is certainly to be attributed to Yáśka, is evident further from the fact that Bhāṭṭa Bhāskara, Miśra, in an extant fragment of his commentary on the Apatamba-Samhitá, quotes, side by side with the views of Káṣákṛitana and Ėkāchūrṇī regarding a division of the text, the opinion of Yáśka also.

Along with the Káthaka, the Mánava and the Maitra are very frequently quoted in the commentaries on the Kátyāyana-Sútra of the White Yajus. We do not, it is true, find these names in the Sútras or similar works; but at all events they are meant for works resembling the Káthaka, as is shown by the quotations themselves, which are often of considerable length. Indeed, we also find, although only in later writings, the Maitrāyaṇīyas, and, as a subdivision of these, the Mánavas, mentioned as schools of the Black Yajus. Possibly these works may still be in existence in India.

* Átreyas was the padowkára of his school; Kúpála, on the contrary, the vṛttikára. The meaning of vṛttita is here obscure, as it is also in the Schol. to Yaj. iv. 3. 108 (maddhúri vṛttita) [see I. St., xiii. 381].

† We have, besides, a commentary by Sáyaṇa, though it is only fragmentary; another is ascribed to Bālakriṣṇa. [In Burnell’s Collection of MSS., see his Catalogue, pp. 12–14, is found the greater portion of Bhāṭṭa Kaśvika Bhāskara Miśra’s commentary, under the name Jñāna-yajñā; the author is said to have lived 400 years before Sáyaṇa; he quotes amongst others Bhavaváman, and seems to stand in special connection with the Átreyas school. A Peśódhikshákya on the Black Yajus is also mentioned; see I. St., ix. 176.—An edition of the Taśṭirirya-Samhitá in the Bōt. Indica, with Sáyaṇa’s complete commentary, was commenced by Roer (1854), continued by Cowell and Báma Náraṇya, and is now in the hands of Maháchandra Nyáyaratna (the last part, No. 23, 1874, reaches to iv. 3. 11); the complete text, in Roman transcript, has been published by myself in I. St., xi., xii. (1871–72). On the Káthaka, see I. St., iil. 451–479.]

† According to the Fort-William Catalogue, the ‘Maitryaṇī-Śāhka’ is in existence there. [Other MSS. have since been found; see Hung in I. St., ix. 175, and his essay Brahman and the Brahmanas, pp. 31–34 (1871), and Bühler’s detailed survey of the works composing this Śāhka in I. St., xill. 103, 117–128. According to this, the Maitr. Samhitá consists at present of five śūtras, two of which, however, are but later ad.
Besides the Samhitā so called, there is a Brāhmaṇa recognised by the school of Apastamba, and also by that of Atreya,* which, however, as I have already remarked, differs from the Samhitā, not as to the nature of its contents, but only in point of time; it is, in fact, to be regarded merely as a supplement to it. It either reproduces the formulae contained in the Samhitā, and connects them with their proper ritual, or it develops further the liturgical rules already given there; or again, it adds to these entirely new rules, as, for instance, those concerning the purushākamedha, which is altogether wanting in the Samhitā, and those referring to the sacrifices to the lunar asterisms. Only the third and last book, in twelve propāṭhakas, together with Sāyana’s commentary, is at present known. The three last propāṭhakas, which contain four different sections, relating to the manner of preparing certain peculiarly sacred sacrificial fires, are ascribed in the Anukramaṇī of the Atreya school (and this is also confirmed by Sāyana in another place) to the sage Katha. Two other sections also belong to it, which, it seems, are only found in the Atreya school, and not in that of Apastamba; and also, lastly, the two first books of the Taittirīya-Āranyaka, to be mentioned presently. Together these eight sections evidently form a supplement to the Kāṭhaka above discussed; they do not, however, appear to exist as an independent work, but only in connection with the Brāhmaṇa and Āranyaka of the Apastamba- (and Atreya-) schools, from which, for the rest they can be externally distinguished easily enough by the absence of the expansion of ṇ and ṣ into ūṇ and śị. The legend quoted towards the end of the second of these sections (prop. xi. 8), as to the visit of Nachiketas, to the lower

---

* At least as regards the fact, for the designation Samhitā or Brāhmaṇa does not occur in its Anukramaṇi. On the contrary, it passes without any break from the portions which belong in the Apastamba school to the Samhitā, to those there belonging to the Brāhmaṇa.

* All three books have been edited, with Sāyana’s commentary, in the Būt. Ind. (1855-70), by Rājendra Lala Mitra. The Hiraṇyakasi-kāliṣṭha-Brāhmaṇa quoted by Bühler, Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. from Gujarāt, i. 38, is not likely to depart much from the ordinary Apastamba text; the respective Śrṣanta-Sūtras at least agree almost literally with each other; see Bühler, Apastamba-śāstra, Preface, p. 6 (1863).
world, gave rise to an Upanishad of the Atharvan which bears the name of Kāṭhakopanishad. Now, between this supplement to the Kāṭhaka and the Kāṭhaka itself a considerable space of time must have elapsed, as follows from the allusions made in the last sections to Mahā-Meru, Krauṇḥa, Maimāga; to Vaiśampāyana, Vyāsa Pārāśarya, &c.; as well as from the literature therein presupposed as existing, the ‘Aṭharvāṅgirass,’ Brāhmaṇas, Itihāsas, Purāṇas, Kalpas, Gāthās, and Nārāyaṇīs being enumerated as subjects of study (svādhyāya). Further, the last but one of these sections is ascribed to another author, viz., to the Aruṇa, or to Aruṇa, whom the scholiast on Pāṇini speaks of as a pupil of Vaiśampāyana, a statement with which its mention of the latter as an authority tallies excellently; this section is perhaps therefore only erroneously assigned to the school of the Kāṭhas.—The Taittirīya-Aranyaka, at the head of which that section stands (as already remarked), and which belongs both to the Apastamba and Ātreya schools, must at all events be regarded as only a later supplement to their Brāhmaṇa, and belongs, like most of the Aranyakas, to the extreme end of the Vedic period. It consists of ten books, the first six of which are of a liturgical character: the first and third books relate to the manner of preparing certain sacred sacrificial fires; the second to preparatives to the study of Scripture; and the fourth, fifth, and sixth to purificatory sacrifices and those to the Manes, corresponding to the last books of the Śamhitā of the White Yājus. The last four books of the Aranyaka, on the contrary, contain two Upanishads; viz., the seventh, eighth, and ninth books, the Taittirīyopanishad, kārt dēṣyāṁ so called, and the tenth, the Yajñikī- or Nārāyaṇīyā-Upanishad. The former, or Taittirīyopanishad, is in three parts. The first is the Śamhitopanishad, or Śikshāvalī, which begins with a short grammatical disquisition, and then turns to

64 Kaiyā on Pūj., iv. 2. 104 (Mahābhāṣāya, fol. 73a, ed. Benares); he calls him, however, Aruṇī instead of Aruṇa, and derives from him the school of the Arupika (cited in the Itihāsa, i, 25); the Arupiks are cited in the Kāṭhaka itself; see I. St., iii. 475.

65 Vati means ‘a creeper;’ it is perhaps meant to describe these Upanishads as ‘creepers, which have attached themselves to the Veda-Sūkha.

66 See above, p. 61; Müller, A. S. L., p. 113, n. 16; Haug, Über das Wesen des vorderen Accents, p. 54.
the question of the unity of the world-spirit. The second
and third are the Ananda-avatih and Brih-avatih, which
together also go by the name of Varuni-Upashad, and
treat of the bliss of entire absorption in meditation upon
the Supreme Spirit, and its identity with the individual
soul. If in these we have already a thoroughly systematised
form of speculation, we are carried even further in one
portion of the Yajnik-Upanishad, where we have to do
with a kind of sectarian worship of Narayana; the remain-
ing part contains ritual supplements. Now, interesting as
this whole Aranyakas is from its motley contents and evi-
dent piecing together of collected fragments of all sorts,
it is from another point of view also of special importance
for us, from the fact that its tenth book is actually extant
in a double recension, viz., in a text which, according to
Saysan's statements, belongs to the Dravidas, and in an-
other, bearing the name of the Andiras, both names of
peoples in the south-west of India. Besides these two
texts, Saysan also mentions a recension belonging to the
Karnatas, and another whose name he does not give.
Lastly, this tenth book† exists also as an Atharvopan-
ished, and here again with many variations; so that there
is here opened up to criticism an ample field for researches
and conjectures. Such, certainly, have not been wanting
in Indian literary history; it is seldom, however, that the
facts lie so ready to hand as we have them in this case,
and this we owe to Saysan's commentary, which is here
really excellent.

When we look about us for the other Brhammapas of the
Black Yajus, we find, in the first place, among the schools
sited in the Sāma-Sūtras two which must probably be considered as belonging to the Black Yajus, viz., the Bhāllavins and the Śātyāyānis. The Brāhmaṇa of the Bhāllavins is quoted by the scholiast on Pāṇini, probably following the Mahābhāṣya, as one of the ‘old’ Brāhmaṇas; we find it mentioned in the Brihaddevatā; Sureśvarāchārya also, and even Sāyaṇa himself, quote passages from the Bhāllavīruti. A passage supposed to be borrowed from the Bhāllavi-Upanishad is adduced by the sect of the Mādhavas in support of the correctness of their (Dvaita) belief (As. Res., xvi. 104). That the Bhāllavins belong to the Black Yajus is, however, still uncertain; I only conclude so at present from the fact that Bhāllaveya is the name of a teacher specially attacked and censured in the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus. As to the Śātyāyānis, whose Brāhmaṇa is also reckoned among the ‘old’ ones by the scholiast on Pāṇini, and is frequently quoted, especially by Sāyaṇa, it is pretty certain that they belong to the Black Yajus, as it is so stated in the Charanavyūha, a modern index of the different schools of the Vedas, and, moreover, a teacher named Śātyāyani is twice mentioned in the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus. The special regard paid to them in the Sāma-Sūtras, and which, to judge from the quotations, they themselves paid to the Sāman, is probably to be explained by the peculiar connection (itself still obscure) which we find elsewhere also between the schools of the Black Yajus and those of the Sāman. Thus, the Kaṭhas are mentioned along with the Sāman schools

---

93 This is not so, for in the Bhāṣya to the particular sūtra of Pāṇ. (iv. 3. 103), the Bhāllavins are not mentioned. They are, however, mentioned elsewhere in the work, at iv. 2. 104 (here Kātyāṇa derives them from ‘a teacher Bhallu; Bhalland proktasa nādiḥyaḥ’) as a Bhāllaveya Mataiya vajaputraḥ is cited in the Anugāda, vi. 5; their home may have been in the country of the Matayas; see I. St., xii. 441, 442. At the time of the Bhāṣīka-Sūtra their Brāhmaṇa text was still accentuated, in the same way as the Śatapatha; see Kielhorn, I. St., x. 421.

94 The Mahābhāṣya is not his authority in this case either, for it does not mention the Śātyāyānis in its comment on the sūtra in question (iv. 3. 105). But Kātyāṇa cites the Brāhmaṇa proclaimed by Śātyāyana, &c., as contemporaneous with the Yajnavalkaṇḍa Brāhmaṇḍini and Satkālaṅkāra Dr., which are mentioned in the Mahābhāṣya (see, however, I. St., v. 67, 68) and the Mahābhāṣya itself cites the Śātyāyānis along with the Bhāllavins (on iv. 2. 104); they belonged, it would seem, to the north; see I. St., xii. 442.

100 See on this I. St., iii. 473; xiii. 439.
of the Kālāpas and Kauthumās; and along with the latter the Lankākshas also. As to the Śākāyanins, Sāyakāyanins, Kālābavins, and Śālankāyanins, with whom, as with the Śātyāyanins, we are only acquainted through quotations, it is altogether uncertain whether they belong to the Black Yajus or not. The Chhagalins, whose name seems to be borne by a tolerably ancient Upanishad in Anquetil's Ouvres, are stated in the Charanavyūha to form a school of the Black Yajus (according to Pāṇini, iv. 3. 109, they are called Chhiāgaleyins): the same is there said of the Śvetāsvatara. The latter gave their name to an Upanishad—composed in a metrical form, and called at its close the work of a Śvetāsvatara: in which the Sāmkhya doctrine of the two primeval principles is mixed up with the Yoga doctrine of one Lord, a strange misuse being here made of wholly irrelevant passages of the Saṃhitā, &c., of the Yajus; and upon this rests its sole claim to be connected with the latter. Kapila, the originator of the Sāmkhya system, appears in it raised to divine dignity itself, and it evidently belongs to a very late period; for though several passages from it are quoted in the Brahma-Sūtra of Bādarāyaṇa—from which its priority to the latter at least would appear to follow), they may just as well have been borrowed from the common source, the Yajus. It is, at all events, a good deal older than Śaṅkara, since he regarded it as Sruti, and commented upon it. It has recently been published, together with this commentary, by Dr. Roer, in the Bibliotheca Indica, vol. vii.; see also Ind. Stud., i. 420, ff.—The Maitrāyaṇa Upanishad at least bears a more ancient name, and might perhaps be connected.

* They are mentioned in the tenth book of the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus [see also Kāthaka 22. 7, i. St., iii. 472]; as is also Sāyakāyana.

101 The Śālankāyanas are ranked as Brāhmaṇas among the Vāikuṇṭhas in the Calcutta scholiast to Pāṇ. v. 3. 114 (Bhāṣya na vyākhyātām). Vyāsa's mother, Sātyāvatā, is called Śālankāyanā, and Pāṇini himself Śālanki; see i. St., xii. 375, 395, 428, 429.

102 This statement needs correction to this extent, that the Charanavyūha does not know the name Chhagalins at all (which is mentioned by Pāṇini alone), but speaks only of Chhageyas or Chhiāgaleyas; see i. St., iii. 258; Müller, A. S. L., p. 370. On Anquetil's 'Tshiakli' Upanishad see now i. St., ix. 42-46.

* Distinguished by a great number of sometimes tolerably long quotations from the Purāṇas, &c. [Roer's translation was published in the Bibl. Ind., vol. xvi.]
with the above-mentioned Maitra (Brāhmaṇa). Its text, however, both in language and contents, shows that, compared with the latter, it is of a very modern date. At present, unfortunately, I have at my command only the four first prapṭiḥaksas, and these in a very incorrect form,—whereas in Anquetil’s translation, the Upanishad consists of twenty chapters,—yet even these are sufficient clearly to determine the character of the work. King Brihadraśy, who, penetrated by the nothingness of earthly things, resigned the sovereignty into the hands of his son, and devoted himself to contemplation, is there instructed by Śākāyanya (see gana ‘Kuṇja’) upon the relation of the atman (soul) to the world; Śākāyanya communicates to him what Maitreyā had said upon this subject, who in his turn had only repeated the instruction given to the Bālakhiyas by Prajāpati himself. The doctrine in question is thus derived at third hand only, and we have to recognise in this tradition a consciousness of the late origin of this form of it. This late origin manifests itself externally also in the fact that corresponding passages from other sources are quoted with exceeding frequency in support of the doctrine, introduced by “atha ‘nyatvā ‘py uktam,” “etad āpy uktam,” “atra ‘me śloka bhavanti,” “atha yathe ‘yam Kauṭśayaṇaṃastuḥ.” The ideas themselves are quite upon a level with those of the fully developed Sāmkhya doctrine, and the language is completely marked off from the

* I obtained them quite recently, in transcripts, through the kindness of Baron d’Eckstein, of Paris, together with the tenth adhāyya of a metrical paraphrase, called Anākaśa-śāstra, of this Upanishad, extending, in 150 slokas, over these four prapṭiḥaksas. The latter is copied from E. I. H., 693, and is probably identical with the work of Vidyāraṇya often mentioned by Colebrooke. [It is really so; and this portion has since been published, together with the Upanishad in full, by Cowell, in his edition of the Mait, Upanishad, in seven prapṭiḥaksas, with, Rāmatitterha’s commentary and an English translation, in the Bibli. Ind., (1862-70). According to the commentary, on the one hand, the two last books are to be considered as khitas, and on the other, the whole Upanishad belongs to a pārvakaṇḍa, in four books, of ritual purport, by which most likely is meant the Maitreyānta-Samhitā discussed by Bühler (see. L. St., xiii, 119, &c.), in which the Upanishad is quoted as the second (2) kāṇḍa; see L. c. p. 121. The transcript sent me by Eckstein shows manifold deviations from the other text; its original has unfortunately not been discovered yet.]

† Brahman, Rudra, and Viṣṇu represent respectively the Sattva, the Tamas, and the Rūpas elements of Prajāpati.
prose of the Brāhmaṇas, both by extremely long compounds, and by words entirely foreign to these, and only belonging to the epic period (such as suṣra; yaksha, uraga, bhūtakaṇa, &c.). The mention also of the grāhas, planets, and of the motion of the polar star (dhrusvasya pračalanaṁ), supposes a period considerably posterior to the Brāhmaṇa. The zodiacal signs are even mentioned in Anquetil’s translation; the text to which I have access does not unfortunately extend so far. That among the princes enumerated in the introduction as having met their downfall, notwithstanding all their greatness, not one name occurs belonging to the narrower legend of the Mahā-Bhārata or Rāmāyaṇa, is no doubt simply owing to the circumstance that Bṛhadṛathaḥ is regarded as the predecessor of the Pāṇḍus. For we have probably to identify him with the Bṛhadṛatha, king of Magadha, who according to the Mahā-Bhārata (ii. 756) gave up the sovereignty to his son Jardasamtha, afterwards slain by the Pāṇḍus, and retired to the wood of penance. I cannot forbear connecting with the instruction here stated to have been given to a king of Magadha by a Śākyaśrīya the fact that it was precisely in Magadha that Buddhism, the doctrine of Śākyamuni, found a welcome. I would even go so far as directly to conjecture that we have here a Brahmanical legend about Śākyamuni; whereas otherwise legends of this kind reach us only through the adherents of the Buddhist doctrine. Maitreyā, it is well known, is, with the Buddhists, the name of the future Buddha, yet in their legends the name is also often directly connected with their Śākyamuni; a Pūrṇa Maitrayāṇiputra, too, is given to the latter as a pupil. Indeed, as far as we can judge at

---

128 According to Cowell (p. 244), by grāha we have here to understand, once at least (i. 4), not the planets but dhālogrāhas (children’s diseases); "Dhrusvasya pračalanaṁ probably only refers to a grāseya; then even ‘the never-ranging pole star’ is forced to move.” In a second passage, however (vi. 16, p. 124), the grāhas appear along with the moon and the rīkṣhas. Very peculiar, too, is the statement as to the stellar limits of the sun’s two journeys (vi. 14; Cowell, pp. 119, 266); see on this J. St., ix. 353.

129 The text has nothing of this (vii. 1, p. 198); but special mention is here made of Saturn, śani (p. 201), and where śakra occurs (p. 200), we might perhaps think of Venus. This last adhāsya throughout clearly betrays its later origin; of special interest is the bitter polemic against heretics and unbelievers (p. 206).
present, the doctrine of this Upanishad stands in close connection with the opinions of the Buddhists, although from its Brahmanical origin it is naturally altogether free from the dogma and mythology peculiar to Buddhism. We may here also notice, especially, the contempt for writing (grantha) exhibited in one of the slokas quoted in corroboration.

Neither the Chhagalins, nor the Vedásavatara, nor the Maitráyaníyas are mentioned in the Sútras of the other Vedas, or in similar works, as schools of the Black Yajus; still, we must certainly ascribe to the last mentioned a very active share in its development, and the names Maitreya and Maitreyí at least are not unfrequently quoted in the Bráhmañás.

In the case of the Sútras, too, belonging to the Black Yajus, the large number of different schools is very striking. Although, as in the case of the Bráhmañás, we only know the greater part of them through quotations, there is reason to expect, not only that the remarkably rich collection of the India House (with which I am only very superficially acquainted) will be found to contain many treasures in this department, but also that many of them will yet be recovered in India itself. The Berlin collection does not contain a single one. In the first place, as to the Srauta-Sútras, my only knowledge of the Katha-Sútra, the Manu-Sútra, the Maitra-Sútra, and the Laugáshi-Sútra is derived from the commentaries on the Kátiya-Sútra of the White Yajus; the second, however, stands in the catalogue of the Fort-William col-

---

162 Bīsa’s Harshaśihaśtra informs us of a Maitrāyaṇīya Divākara who embraced the Buddhist creed; and Bhaű Dáji (Journal Bombay Branch R. A. S., x. 40) adds that even now Maitr. Bráhmans live near Bhágdãgon at the foot of the Vindhya, with whom other Bráhmans do not eat in common;‘the reason may have been the early Buddhist tendencies of many of them.’

* Which, by the way, recurs together with some others in precisely the same form in the Ampitavindu- (or Brahmapindu-) Upanishad. [Though it may be very doubtful whether the word grantha ought really a priori and for the earlier period to be understood of written texts (cf. J. St., xiii. 476), yet in this verse, at any rate, a different interpretation is hardly possible; see below.]

† Laugáshi and the ‘Lomaktyapramdah Bráhmaṇam’ are said to be quoted therein.

163 On this, as well as on the contents and the division of the work, see my remarks in J. St., v. 13-16, in accordance with communications received from Professor Cowell; cf. also Haug, Íd., i. 175. A Mánava
lection, and of the last, whose author is cited in the Kaṭha-Sūtra, as well as in the Kātiya-Sūtra, there is, it appears, a copy in Vienna. Mahādeva, a commentator of the Kalpa-Sūtra of Satyāśādiḥa Hiranyakeśi, when enumerating the Taittirīya-Sūtras in successive order in his introduction, leaves out these four altogether, and names at the head of his list the Sūtra of Baudhāyana as the oldest; then that of Bhāradvāja, next that of Apastamba, next that of Hiranyakeśi himself, and finally two names not otherwise mentioned in this connection, Vādākāna and Vaiśākhāna, the former of which is perhaps a corrupted form. Of these names, Bhāradvāja is the only one to be found in Vedic works; it appears in the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus, especially in the supplements to the Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka (where several persons of this name are mentioned), in the Kātiya-Sūtra of the same Yajus, in the Prātiśākhya-Sūtra of the Black Yajus, and in Pāṇini. Though the name is a patronymic, yet it is possible that these last citations refer to one and the same person, in which case he must at the same time be regarded as the founder of a grammatical school, that of the Bhāradvājayas. As yet, I have seen nothing of his Sūtra, and am acquainted with it only through quotations. According to a statement by the Mahādeva just mentioned, it treats of the oblātion to the Mānes, in two praśnas, and therefore shares with the rest of the Sūtras this designation of the sections, which is peculiar to the Black Yajus. The Sūtra of Apastamba* is found in the Library of the India House, and a part of it in Paris also. Commentaries on it by

Śrauta-Sūtra is also cited in Bühler’s Catalogue of MSS. from Gujarāt, i. 186 (1871); it is in 322 fol. The manuscript edited in facsimile by Goldstücker under the title, ‘Mānasa Kalpa-Sūtra, being a portion of this ancient work on Vaidik rites, together with the Commentary of Kumārājasaṃvid,’ (1861), gives but little of the text, the commentary quoting only the first words of the passages commented upon; whether the concluding words, ‘Kumḍraśabadsatrñaṃ sasmāpyaṃ,’ really indicate that Kumārājasaṃvid was the author of the commentary seems still doubtful.

* The Bhāradvājya-Sūtra has now been discovered by Bühler; see his Catal. of MSS. from Gujar., i. 186 (212 foll.); the Vaiśākhāna-Sūtra is also quoted, ib. i. 190 (292 foll.); see also Haus in I. St., ix. 175.

According to the quotations, the Vājasaneyaka, Bhaveśa-Bṛhmaṇa, and Śatyāyanaka are frequently mentioned therein.
SUTRAS OF THE BLACK YAJUS.

Dhūrtasvāmin and Tālavrintanivāsin are mentioned, also one on the Sūtra of Baudhāyana by Kapardisvāmin. The work of Satyādhārṣa contains, according to Mahādeva’s statement, twenty-seven prañānas, whose contents agree pretty closely with the order followed in the Kāṭhya-Sūtra; only the last nine form an exception, and are quite peculiar to it. The nineteenth and twentieth prañānas refer to domestic ceremonies, which usually find a place in the Grihya- and Śmṛta-Sūtras. In the twenty-first, genealogical accounts and lists are contained; as also in a prañāna of the Baudhāyana-Sūtra.

Still scantier is the information we possess upon the Grihya-Sūtras of the Black Yajus. The Kāṭhya Grihya-Sūtra is known to me only through quotations, as are also the Sūtras of Baudhāyana (extant in the Fort-William

---

168. On the Āpastamba-Śrauta-Sūtra and the commentaries belonging to it, by Dhūrtasvār, Kapardisvāmin, Rudrātta, Gurudevasvāmin, Kārvanidhasvāmin, Tālav, Aḥobalasūri (Aḍābilā in Bühler, l. c., p. 150, who also mentions a-Śrīśāhā, p. 152), and others, see Burnell in his Catalogue, pp. 18–24, and in the Indian Antiquity, i. 5. 6. According to this the work consists of thirty prañānas; the first twenty-three treat of the sacrificial rites in essentially the same order (from dārśapṝṣṇām to udārgaṇam) as in Hiraṇyakesī, whose Sūtra generally is almost identical with that of Āpastamba; see Bühler’s preface to the Ap. Dharma-Sūtra, p. 6; the 24th prañāna contains the general rules, paribādeśa, edited by M. Müller in Z. D. M. G., ix. (1855), a pravara-khaṇḍa and a khaṇḍa; prañānas 25–27 contain the Grihya-Sūtra; prañānas 28–29, the Dharma-Sūtra, edited by Bühler (1868); and finally, prañāna 30, the Śulva-Sūtra (śulva, measuring cord).

169. On the Baudhāyana-Sūtra compare likewise Burnell’s Catalogue, pp. 24–30. Bhavasvāmin, who amongst others commented it, is mentioned by Bhāṭṭa Bhadākara, and is consequently placed by Burnell (p. 26) in the eighth century. According to Kielhorn, Catalogue of S. MSS. in the South Division of the Bombay Pres., p. 8, there exists a commentary on it by Śrīṭapa also, for whom, indeed, it constituted the special text-book of the Yajus school to which he belonged; see Burnell; Vasāṭa-Bṛhadārṣa, pp. ix.–xix. In Bühler’s Catalogue of MSS. from Guj., i. 183, 184, Anautada, Navabasta, and Sesa are also quoted as scholiasts. The exact compass of the entire work is not yet ascertained; the Baudhāyanas-Dharma-Sūtra, which, according to Bühler, Digest of Hindu Law, i. p. xxi. (1867), forms part of the Śrauta-Sūtra, as in the case of Āpastamba and Hiraṇyakesī, was commented by Govindaśvāmin; see Burnell, p. 35. 170. Mātyāḷadeva and Vānabheṣaṇa (? are also mentioned as commentators; see Kielhorn, l. c., p. 10.

* Such lists are also found in Āvalyana’s work, at the end, though only in brief; for the Kāṭhya-Sūtra, a Pariśālāḥa comes in. [Prañānas 26, 27, of Hiraṇyakesī treat of dharmas, so, that here also, as in the case of Āpast. and Baudh., the Dharma-Sūtra forms part of the Śrauta-Sūtra.]
collection), of Bhāravadāja, and of Satyāśādha, or Hiranyakeśi, unless in this latter case only the corresponding praśnas of the Kalpa-Sūtra are intended. 111 I have myself only glanced through a Paddhati of the Grihya-Sūtra of the Maitrāyanīya school, which treats of the usual subject (the sixteen samśkāras, or sacraments). I conclude that there must also have been a Grihya-Sūtra 112 of the Māṇava school, from the existence of the Code bearing that name, 113 just as the Codes ascribed to Atri, Āpastamba, Cchāgaleya, Baudhāyana, Laugakshi, and Sātyāyana are probably to be traced to the schools of the same name belonging to the Black Yajus, that is to say, to their Grihya-Sūtras. 114

Lastly, the Prātiśākhya-Sūtra has still to be mentioned as a Sūtra of the Black Yajus. The only manuscript with which I am acquainted unfortunately only begins at the fourth section of the first of the two praśnas. This work is of special significance from the number of very peculiar names of teachers 115 mentioned in it: as Ātreya, Kuṇḍinya (once by the title of Sthavira), and Bhāravadāja, whom we know already; also Vālmiki, a name which in this connection is especially surprising; and further Āgnivesyā, Āgnivesyāyana, Paushkarasādi, and others. The two last names, as well as that of Kuṇḍinya, 116 are mentioned in Buddhist writings as the names either of pupils or of contemporaries of Buddha, and Paushkarasādi is also cited in the vṛttikas to Pāṇini by Kātyāyana, their author. Again, the allusion occurring here for the first time to the Māṁsakas and Taittirīyakas deserves to be remarked;

111 This is really so. On Āpastamba- and Bhāravadāja-Grihya, see Burnell, Catalogus, pp. 30–33. The sections of two “proopog,” of both texts, relating to birth ceremonial, have been edited by Sperber in his book De Ceremonia apud Indos quae vocatur jātakarma (Leiden, 1872).
112 It is actually extant; see Bühler, Catalogus, i. 188 (80 foll.), and Kielhorn, l. c., p. 10 (fragment).
113 Johkentgen in his valuable tract Ueber das Geschub des Manu (1865), p. 109, ff., has, from the geographical data in Manu, ii. 17, ff., fixed the territory between the Driśadvati and Sarasvatī as the proper home of the Māṇavas. This appears somewhat too strict. At any rate, the statements as to the Madhyadeśa which are found in the Pratijñā-Parishātha of the White Yajus point us for the latter more to the east; see my essay Ueber das Pratijñā-Sūtra (1872), pp. 107, 105.
115 Their number is twenty; see Roth, Zur Lit. und Gesch., pp. 65, 66.
116 See I, St., i. 441 not. [xiii. 387, ff., 418].
also the contradistinction, found at the close of the work, of \textit{Chhandas} and \textit{Bhāshā}, i.e., of Vedic and ordinary language.\footnote{In the passage in question (xxiv. 5), ‘
\textit{chhandobhāshā}’ means rather ‘the Veda language,’ see Whitney, p. 417.} The work appears also to extend to a portion of the Aranyaka of the Black Yajus; whether to the whole cannot yet be ascertained, and is scarcely probable.\footnote{We have now an excellent edition of the work by Whitney, \textit{Journal Am. Or. Soc.}, ix. (1871), text, translation, and notes, together with a commentary called \textit{Trīṃḍakṣaraṇa}, by an anonymous author (or is his name \textit{Kārttikeya}?), a compilation from three older commentaries by \textit{Atreyā, Māthibaya, and Vāraruci}.—No reference to the \textit{Taitt.} Ār. or \textit{Taitt. Brahm.} is made in the text itself; on the contrary, it confines itself exclusively to the \textit{Taitt.} S. The commentary, however, in some few instances goes beyond the T. S.; see Whitney’s special discussion of the points here involved, pp. 422-426; cf. also \textit{J. St.}, iv. 76-79.} 

In conclusion, I have to notice the two Anukramanīs already mentioned, the one belonging to the \textit{Ātreya} school, the other to the \textit{Chārāyanya} school of the Kāṭhaka. The former\footnote{See \textit{J. St.}, iii. 373-401, xii. 350-357, and the similar statements from \textit{Bhaṭṭa Bāskara Miśra} in Burnett’s \textit{Catalogue}, p. 14.} deals almost exclusively with the contents of the several sections, which it gives in their order. It consists of two parts. The first, which is in prose, is a mere nomenclature; the second, in thirty-four \textit{ślokas}, is little more. It, however, gives a few particulars besides as to the transmission of the text. To it is annexed a commentary upon both parts, which names each section, together with its opening words and extent. The Anukramaṇī of the Kāṭhaka enters but little into the contents; it limits itself, on the contrary, to giving the Rishis of the various sections as well as of the separate verses; and here, in the case of the pieces taken from the Rik, it not unfrequently exhibits considerable divergence from the statements given in the Anukramaṇī of the latter, citing, in particular, a number of entirely new names. According to the concluding statement, it is the work of \textit{Ātri}, who imparted it to \textit{Laugāksha}. 

We now turn to the White Yajus.

With regard, in the first place, to the name itself, it probably refers, as has been already remarked, to the fact that the sacrificial formulas are here separated from their
ritual basis and dogmatical explanation, and that we have here a systematic and orderly distribution of the matter so confusedly mixed up in the Black Yajus. This is the way in which the expression सुक्लादि यज्ञुः is explained by the commentator Dviveda Gaṅga, in the only passage where up till now it has been found in this sense, namely, in the last supplement added to the व्रिहाद-आरण्याक of the White Yajus. I say in the only passage, for though it appears once under the form सुक्रयायायुः, in the आरण्याक of the Black Yajus (5. 10), it has hardly the same general meaning there, but probably refers, on the contrary, to the fourth and fifth books of that आरण्याक itself. For in the आनुक्रामिन of the आत्रेय school these books bear the name सुक्रियाकंद, because referring to expiatory ceremonies; and this name सुक्रिया, 'expiating' [probably rather 'illuminating'?] belongs also to the corresponding parts of the साम्हितादि of the White Yajus, and even to the अद्वमि employed at these particular sacrifices.

Another name of the White Yajus is derived from the surname वाजसनेय, which is given to वाजनवल्क्य, the teacher who is recognised as its author, in the supplement to the व्रिहाद-आरण्याक, just mentioned. Mahādhara, at the commencement of his commentary on the साम्हितादि of the White Yajus, explains वाजसनेय as a patronymic, "the son of वाजसनि." Whether this be correct, or whether the word वाजसनि is to be taken as an appellative, it at any rate signifies "the giver of food," and refers to the chief object lying at the root of all sacrificial ceremonies, the obtaining of the necessary food from the gods whom the sacrifices are to propitiate. To this is also to be traced the name वाजिन, "having food," by which the theologians of the White Yajus are occasionally distinguished. Now, from वाजसनेय are derived two forms of words by which the साम्हितादि and ब्राह्मान्दि of the White Yajus are found

* In Mahā-Bhārata, xii. 1507, the word is an epithet of कृष्ण. [Here also it is explained as above; for the Bīk, however, according to the St. Petersburg Dictionary, we have to assign to it the meaning of 'prosuring courage or strength, victorious, gaining booty or prize. The explanation of the word वाजिन by 'food' (सोम) is probably purely a scholastic one.]

328 According to another explanation, this is because the Sun as Horse revealed to यज्ञवल्क्य the यज्ञयायायुः to आदि आदिप्रसाम्य अनुवर्तित वाजिन. See Vishnu-Purāṇa, iii. 5. 25; 'swift, courageous, horse,' are the fundamental meanings of the word.
cited, namely, \textit{Vājasaneyaka}, first used in the Taittirīya-Sūtra of Āpastamba and the Kātyāya-Sūtra of the White Yajus itself, and \textit{Vājasaneyinas},* i.e., those who study the two works in question, first used in the Anupada-Sūtra of the Sāmaveda.

In the White Yajus we find, what does not occur in the case of any other Veda, that Samhitā and Brāhmaṇa have been handed down in their entirety in two distinct recensions; and thus we obtain a measure for the mutual relations of such schools generally. These two recensions agree almost entirely in their contents, as also in the distribution of them; in the latter respect, however, there are many, although slight, discrepancies. The chief difference consists partly in actual variants in the sacrificial formulas, as in the Brāhmaṇa, and partly in orthographic or orthoepic peculiarities. One of these recensions bears the name of the Kāṇva, the other that of the Mādhyaṁdaṁinas, names which have not yet been found in the Sūtras or similar writings. The only exception is the Prātiśākhya-Sūtra of the White Yajus itself, where there is mention both of a Kāṇva and of the Mādhyaṁdaṁinas. In the supplement to the Vṛihad-Āranyaka again, in the lists of teachers, a Kāṇvīputra (vi. 5 1) and a Mādhyamāṁdāyana (iv. 6. 2) at least are mentioned, although only in the Kāṇva recension, not in the other; the former being cited among the latest, the latter among the more recent members of the respective lists. The question now arises whether the two recensions are to be regarded as contemporary, or if one is older than the other. It is possible to adopt the latter view, and to consider the Kāṇva school as the older one. For not only is Kāṇva the name of one of the ancient Rishi families of the Rgveda—and with the Rgveda this recension agrees in the peculiar notation of the cerebral ṣ by ṭ—but the remaining literature of the White Yajus appears to connect itself rather with the school of the Mādhyamāṁdinas. However this may be,** we cannot, at

---

* Occurs in the gāna 'Śaunaka.' [The Vājasaneyaka is also quoted by Lātreyana.]

** The Mādhyamāṁdinas are not mentioned in Patanjali’s Mahābhāṣāhāvyā, but the Kāṇvas, the Kāṇvakā, a yellow (rāgole) Kāṇva, and a Kāṇvīyāna, and also their pupils, are mentioned; see I. St., xili. 417, 444. The school of the Kāṇvas Śauvāvāscons is mentioned in the Kāṭhaka, see on this I. St., iii. 475,**
any rate, assume anything like a long interval between the two recensions; they resemble each other too closely for this, and we should perhaps do better to regard their distinction as a geographical one, orthoepic divergencies generally being best explained by geographical reasons. As to the exact date to be ascribed to these recensions, it may be, as has already been stated in our general survey, (p. 10), that we have here historical ground to go upon—a thing which so seldom happens in this field. Arrian, quoting from Megasthenes, mentions a people called Madrasevot, "through whose country flows the river Andhoma." I have ventured to suggest that we should understand by these the Madhyandinas, after whom one of these schools is named, and that therefore this school was either then already in existence, or else grew up at that time or soon afterwards.* The matter cannot indeed be looked upon as certain, for this reason, that Madhyandina, 'southern,' might apply in general to any southern people or any southern school; and, as a matter of fact, we find mention of Madhyandina-Kauthumk, 'southern Kauthumas.'† In the main, however, this date suits so perfectly that the conjecture is at least not to be rejected offhand. From this, of course, the question of the time of origin of the White Yajus must be strictly separated; it can only be solved from the evidence contained in the

and in the Ápastamba-Dharma-Sátra, also, reference is sometimes made to a teacher Kapya or Kápya. Kapya and Kápya appear further in the pressa section of Ásrilayana, and in Pañini himself (iv. 2. 111), &c.

120 The country of the Madrasevot is situatc precisely in the middle of that Madhyadéa, the limits of which are given in the Pratiyog-Pariśipta; see my paper Ueber das Pratiyog-Sátra, pp. 101-105.

* Whether, in that case, we may assume that all the works now comprised in the Madhyandina school had already a place in this recension is a distinct question. [An interesting remark of Müller's, Hist. A. S. L., p. 438, points out that the Gopathi-Brahmana, in citing the first words of the different Védas (l. 29), quotes in the case of the Yajurveda the beginning of the Vajas, S., and not that of the Taitt. S. (or Káth.).]

† [Vinayaka designates his Kau-
shitaki-Brahmana-Bháhya as Mad-
hyandina-Kauthumk; but he does not here mean the two schools so called (Madhy. and Kauth.)! They appear, in like manner, side by side in an inscription published by Hall, Journal As. Or. Soc., vi. 539.] In the Káliká (to Pápi. vii. l. 94) a grammarian, Madhyandina, is mentioned as a pupil of Vyaghrapal (Vyaghrapalas evi-
sháho); see Bühling’s, Pañini, Introd., p. l. On this it is to be re-
marked, that in the Brahmana two Vaiyághrapadyas and one Vaiyágh-
rapadiputra are mentioned.
work itself. Here our special task consists in separating the different portions of it, which in its present form are bound up in one whole. Fortunately we have still data enough here to enable us to determine the priority or posteriority of the several portions.

In the first place, as regards the Šamhitā of the White Yajus, the Vājasaneyi-Samhitā, it is extant in both recensions in 40 adhyāyas. In the Mādhyamādina recension these are divided into 303 anuvākas and 1975 kandikās. The first 25 adhyāyas contain the formulas for the general sacrificial ceremonial;121 first (i., ii.) for the new and full-moon sacrifice; then (iii.) for the morning and evening fire sacrifice, as well as for the sacrifices to be offered every four months at the commencement of the three seasons; next (iv.–viii.) for the Soma sacrifice in general, and (ix., x.) for two modifications of it; next (xi.–xviii.) for the construction of altars for sacred fires; next (xix.–xxi.) for the saukṛāmati, a ceremony originally appointed to expiate the evil effects of too free indulgence in the Soma drink; and lastly (xxii.–xxv.) for the horse sacrifice. The last seven of these adhyāyas may possibly be regarded as a later addition to the first eighteen. At any rate it is certain that the last fifteen adhyāyas which follow them are of later, and possibly of considerably later, origin. In the Anukramaṇī of the White Yajus, which bears the name of Kātyāyana, as well as in a Pariśāhṭa122 to it, and subsequently also in Mahīdhara’s commentary on the Samhitā, xxvi.–xxxv. are expressly called a Khila, or supplement, and xxxvi.–xl, Sukriya, a name above explained. This statement the commentary on the Code of Yājnavalkya (called Mitakṣarā) modifies to this effect, that the Sukriya begins at xxx. 3, and that xxxvi. 1 forms the beginning of an Āranyaka.* The first four of these later added adhyāyas (xxvi.–xxix.) contain sacrificial formulas which belong to the ceremonies treated of in the earlier adhyāyas, and

---

121 A comprehensive but condensed exposition of it has been commenced in my paper, Zur Kenntnis des vedischen Opferrituals, in I. St., x. 321–396, xii. 217–292.


* That a portion of these last books is to be considered as an Āranyaka seems to be beyond doubt; for xxvii.–xxxix., in particular, this is certain, as they are explained in the Āranyaka part of the Brahmana.
must be supplied thereto in the proper place. The ten following adhyāyas (xxx.-xxxix.) contain the formulas for entirely new sacrificial ceremonies, viz., the puruṣa-medha (human sacrifice), the sarva-medha (universal sacrifice), the puri-medha (oblation to the Manes), and the pravargya (purificatory sacrifice). The last adhyāya, finally, has no sort of direct reference to the sacrificial ceremonial. It is also regarded as an Upanishad, and is professedly designed to fix the proper mean between those exclusively engaged in sacrificial acts and those entirely neglecting them. It belongs, at all events, to a very advanced stage of speculation, as it assumes a Lord (Īś) of the universe. Independently of the above-mentioned external testimony to the later origin of these fifteen adhyāyas, their posteriority is sufficiently proved by the relation in which they stand both to the Black Yajus and to their own Brāhmaṇa, as well as by the data they themselves contain. In the Taittirīya-Samhitā only those formulas appear which are found in the first eighteen adhyāyas, together with a few of the mantras belonging to the horse sacrifice; the remainder of the latter, together with the mantras belonging to the sautrāmaṇḍ and the human sacrifice, are only treated of in the Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa; and those for the universal and the purificatory sacrifices, as well as those for oblations to the Manes, only in the Taittirīya-Āranyaka. In like manner, the first eighteen adhyāyas are cited in full, and explained word by word in the first nine books of the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus; but only a few of the formulas for the sautrāmaṇḍ, the horse sacrifice, human sacrifice, universal

---

122 See my Essay, Über Menschenopfer bei den Indern der vedischen Zeit, in J. Str., i. 54, ff.

124 This translation of the word pravargya is not a literal one (for this see the St. Petersburg Dict.), under root varj with prep. pra, but is borrowed from the sense and purpose of the ceremony in question; the latter is, according to Hau gen Alt. Brāhm., i. 18, p. 42, “a preparatory rite intended for providing the sacrificer with a heavenly body, with which alone he is permitted to enter the residence of the gods.”

* Other parts, too, of the Vājas. S. have in later times been looked upon as Upanishads; for example, the sixteenth book (Sata-rudrīga), the thirty-first (Puruṣa-sūkta), thirty-second (Taderv), and the beginning of the thirty-fourth book (Śivasaṃkhyya).

† According to Mahābhārata’s commentary, its polemic is directed partially against the Buddhists, that is, probably, against the doctrines which afterwards were called Sāṃkhya.
sacrifice, and oblation to the Manes (xix.–xxxv.) are cited in the twelfth and thirteenth books, and that for the most part only by their initial words, or even merely by the initial words of the anuvādas, without any sort of explanation; and it is only the three last adhyāyas but one (xxxvii.–xxxix.) which are again explained word by word, in the beginning of the fourteenth book. In the case of the mantras, but slightly referred to by their initial words, explanation seems to have been considered unnecessary, probably because they were still generally understood; we have, therefore, of course, no guarantee that the writer of the Brāhmaṇa had them before him in the form which they bear at present. As to those mantras, on the contrary, which are not mentioned at all, the idea suggests itself that they may not yet have been incorporated into the Samhitā text extant when the Brāhmaṇa was composed. They are, roughly speaking, of two kinds. First, there are strophes borrowed from the Rik, and to be recited by the Hotar, which therefore, strictly speaking, ought not to be contained in the Yajus at all, and of which it is possible that the Brāhmaṇa may have taken no notice, for the reason that it has nothing to do with the special duties of the Hotar; e.g., in the twentieth, thirty-third, and thirty-fourth adhyāyas especially. Secondly, there are passages of a Brāhmaṇa type, which are not, however, intended, as in the Black Yajus, to serve as an explanation of mantras preceding them, but stand independently by themselves; e.g., in particular, several passages in the nineteenth adhyāya, and the enumeration, in the form of a list, of the animals to be dedicated at the horse sacrifice, in the twenty-fourth adhyāya. In the first eighteen adhyāyas also, there occur a few sacrificial formulas which the Brāhmaṇa either fails to mention (and which, therefore, at the time when it was composed, did not form part of the Samhitā), or else cites only by their initial words, or even merely by the initial words of the anuvādas. But this only happens in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth adhyāyas, though here with tolerable frequency, evidently because these adhyāyas themselves bear more or less the character of a Brāhmaṇa.—With regard, lastly, to the data contained in the last adhyāyas, and testifying to their posteriority, these
are to be sought more especially in the thirtieth and thirty-ninth adhyāyas, as compared with the sixteenth. It is, of course, only the Yajus portions proper which can here be adduced, and not the verses borrowed from the Rik-Sāmhitā, which naturally prove nothing in this connection. At most they can only yield a sort of measure for the time of their incorporation into the Yajus, in so far as they may be taken from the latest portions of the Rik, in which case the existence of these at that period would necessarily be presupposed. The data referred to consist in two facts. First, whereas in the sixteenth book Rudra, as the god of the blazing fire, is endowed with a large number of the epithets subsequently applied to Śiva, two very significant epithets are here wanting which are applied to him in the thirty-ninth book, viz., īśāna and mahādeva, names probably, indicating some kind of sectarian worship (see above, p. 45). Secondly, the number of the mixed castes given in the thirtieth is much higher than that given in the sixteenth book. Those mentioned in the former can hardly all have been in existence at the time of the latter, or we should surely have found others specified besides those that are actually mentioned.

Of the forty books of the Sāmhitā, the sixteenth and thirtieth are those which bear most distinctly the stamp of the time to which they belong. The sixteenth book, on which, in its Taittiriya form, the honour was afterwards bestowed of being regarded as an Upanishad, and as the principal book of the Śiva sects, treats of the propitiation of Rudra; and (see I. St., ii. 22, 24–26) by its enumeration and distinction of the many different kinds of thieves, robbers, murderers, night-brawlers, and highwaymen, his supposed servants, reveals to us a time of insecurity and violence: its mention, too, of various mixed castes indicates that the Indian caste system and polity were already fully developed. Now as, in the nature of things, these were not established without vigorous opposition from those who were thrust down into the lower castes, and as this opposition must have manifested itself chiefly in feuds, open or secret, with their oppressors, I am inclined to suppose that this Rudra book dates from the time of these secret feuds on the part of the conquered aborigines, as well as of the Vrātyas or unbrahmanised Aryans, after
their open resistance had been more or less crushed. At such a time, the worship of a god who passes as the prototype of terror and fury is quite intelligible.—The thirtieth book, in enumerating the different classes of persons to be dedicated at the purusha-medha, gives the names of most of the Indian mixed castes, whence we may at any rate conclude that the complete consolidation of the Brahmanical polity had then been effected. Some of the names here given are of peculiar interest. So, for example, the mágadhā, who is dedicated in y. 5 “atikrushiḍāya.” The question arises, What is to be understood by mágadhā? If we take atikrushiḍa in the sense of “great noise,” the most obvious interpretation of mágadhā is to understand it, with Mahídhara, in its epic sense, as signifying a minstrel,* son of a Vaiśya by a Kshatriya. This agrees excellently with the dedications immediately following (in v. 6), of the sūta to the dance, and of the saṇḍha to song, though not so well, it must be admitted, with the dedications immediately preceding, of the kšīva (eunuch), the uṣyogā (gambler?), and the puṣīchāla (harlot). The mágadhā again appears in their company in v. 22,† and they cannot be said to throw the best light upon his moral character, a circumstance which is certainly surprising, considering the position held by this caste in the epic; though, on the other hand, in India also, musicians, dancers, and singers (saṇḍhas) have not at any time enjoyed the best reputation. But another interpretation of the word mágadhā is possible.‡ In the fifteenth, the

125 By the Buddhist author Yaśomitra, scholar of the Abhidharmakaśa, the Satarudriya is stated to be a work by Vyāsa against Buddhism, whence, however, we have probably to conclude only that it passed for, and was used as, a principal support for Śiva worship, especially in its detached form as a separate Upaniṣad; see Burnouf’s Introduction à l’Histoire du Bouddhisme, p. 568; I. St., ii. 22.

* How he comes by this name is, it is true, not clear

† Here, however, the k ś i v a is put instead of the aṣyogā, and besides, an express condition is laid down that the four must belong neither to the Śūdra nor to the Brāhmaṇa caste. [By aṣyogā may also be meant an unchaste woman; see J. Str., i. 76.]

‡ Śāyana, commenting on the corresponding passage of the Taitt. Brāhmaṇa (iii. 4. 1), explains the word atikrushiḍa by atiśindūḍaṛṣṭya, “dedicated to the very Blameworthy as his deity” [in Rājendra Lālā Mitra’s edition, p. 347]; this ‘very Blameworthy,’ it is true, might also refer to the bad moral reputation of the minstrel.
so-called Vṛātya book* of the Atharva-Samhitā, the Vṛātya (i.e., the Indian living outside of the pale of Brahmanism) is brought into very special relation to the puśkālī and the māgadha; faith is called his harlot, the mitra (friend) his māgadha; and similarly the dawn, the earth (?), the lightning his harlots, the mantra (formula), hasa (scorn ?), the thunder his māgadhas. Owing to the obscurity of the Vṛātya book, the proper meaning of this passage is not altogether clear, and it is possible, therefore, that here also the dissolute minstrel might be intended. Still the connection set forth in the Sāma-Sūtras of Lātyāyana and Drāhyāyana, as well as in the corresponding passage of the Kāṭiya-Sūtra between the Vṛāyas and the magadhadesāya brahmabandhu, and the hatred with which the Magadhās are elsewhere (see Roth, p. 38) spoken of in the Atharva-Samhitā, both lead us to interpret the māgadha of the Vṛātya book as an heretical teacher. For the passages, also, which we are more immediately discussing, this interpretation vies with the one already given; and it seems, in particular, to be favoured by the express direction in v. 22, that “the māgadha, the harlot, the gambler, and the eunuch” must neither be Śūdras nor Brahmans,—an injunction which would be entirely superfluous for the māgadhā at least, supposing him to represent a mixed caste, but which is quite appropriate if the word signifies “a native of the country Magadha.” If we adopt this latter interpretation, it follows that heretical (i.e., Buddhist) opinions must have existed in Magadha at the time of the composition of this thirtieth adhyāya. Meanwhile, however, the question which of these two interpretations is the better one remains, of course, unsolved.—The mention of the nakṣatradarśa, “star-gazer,” in v. 10, and of the

* Translated by Aufrecht, I. St., t. 130, ff. [The St. Petersburg Diet., s. v., considers the praise of the Vṛātya in Ath. xv. as an idealising of the devout vagrant or mendicant (parivājaka, &c.); the fact of his being specially connected with the puśkālī and the māgadha remains, nevertheless, very strange, and even with this interpretation leads us to surmise suggestions of Buddhism.]

198 In the very same way, the Māgadhā—explained by Śāyana as Magadhadesāyopamo brahmachārī—is contemptuously introduced by the Sūtrakāra (probably Baudhāyanas śastra) to T. S., vii. 5. 9. 4, in association with a puśkālī; see J. St., xii. 330.—That there were good Brahmans also in Magadha appears from the name Magadhakṣara, which is given to Prātibodhīputra, the second son of Hrasva Māgadhākeya, in Śāṅkha. Ār., vii. 14.
ganaka, “calculator,” in v. 20, permits us, at all events, to conclude that astronomical, i.e., astrological, science was then actively pursued. It is to it that, according to Mahidhara at least, the “questions” repeatedly mentioned in v. 10 relate, although Sāyāna, perhaps more correctly, thinks that they refer to the usual disputations of the Brāhmaṇas. The existence, too, of the so-called Vedic quinquennial cycle is apparent from the fact that in v. 15 (only in xxvii. 45 besides) the five names of its years are enumerated; and this supposes no inconsiderable proficiency in astronomical observation. 127—A barren wife is dedicated in v. 15 to the Atharvans, by which term Sāyāna understands the imprecatory and magical formulas bearing the name Atharvan; to which, therefore, one of their intended effects, barrenness, is here dedicated. If this be the correct explanation, it necessarily follows that Atharvan-songs existed at the time of the thirtieth book.—The names of the three dice in v. 18 (krita, tretā, and dvāpara) are explained by Sāyāna, commenting on the corresponding passage of the Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa, as the names of the epic yugas, which are identical with these—a supposition which will not hold good here, though it may, perhaps, in the case of the Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa. 128—The hostile reference to the Charakāchārya in v. 18 has already been touched upon (p. 87). 129

In the earlier books there are two passages in particular which give an indication of the period from which they date. The first of these exists only in the Kāṇva recension, where it treats of the sacrifice at the consecration of the king. The text in the Mādhyaṃdina recension (ix. 40, x. 18) runs as follows: “This is your king, O ye So and So,” where, instead of the name of the people, only the indefinite pronom. āmsa’ is used; whereas in the Kāṇva

---

127 Since aṣṭavātra is here mentioned twice, at the beginning and at the end, possibly we have here to do with a sesquennial cycle even (cf. T. Br., iii. 10. 4. 1); see my paper, Die vedischen Nachrichten von den Nakṣatra, ii. 298 (1862). The earliest allusion to the quinquennial yuga occurs in the Rik itself, iii. 55. 18 (l. 25. 8).

128 Sāyāna on T. Br., iii. 4. 16, p. 361, explains (!) the word by ‘teacher of the art of dancing on the point of a bamboo;’ but the samanartaḥ is introduced separately in v. 21 (T. Br., iii. 4. 17).
Vedic Literature.

recension we read (xi. 3. 3. 6. 3): "This is your king, O ye Kurus, O ye Pańchálas."* The second passage occurs in connection with the horse sacrifice (xxiii. 18). The mahishá, or principal wife of the king, performing this sacrifice, must, in order to obtain a son, pass the night by the side of the horse that has been immolated, placing its šína on her upastha; with her fellow-wives, who are forced to accompany her, she pours forth her sorrow in this lament: "O Ambá, O Ambiká, O Ambálíká, no one takes me (by force to the horse); (but if I go not of myself), the (spiteful) horse will lie with (another, as) the (wicked) Subhadrá who dwells in Kámpíla."† Kámpíla is a town in the country of the Pańchálas. Subhadrá, therefore, would seem to be the wife of the king of that district,† and the benefits of the asvamedha sacrifice are supposed to accrue to them, unless the mahishá consents voluntarily to give herself up to this revolting ceremony. If we are justified in regarding the mahishá as the consort of a king of the Kurus,—and the names Ambiká and Ambálíká actually appear in this connection in the Mahá-Bhárata, to wit, as the names of the mothers of Dhritarásňtra and Pańdu,—we might then with probability infer that there existed a hostile, jealous feeling on the part of the Kurus towards the Pańchálas, a feeling which was possibly at that time only smouldering, but which in the epic legend of the Mahá-Bhárata we find had burst out into the flame of open warfare. However this may be, the allusion to Kámpíla at all events betrays that the verse, or even the whole book (as well as the correspond-

---

* Sáyana, on the corresponding passage of the Bráhma-páta (v. 3. 3. 11), remarks that Baudháyana rebuts eka va Bharatá rojita [thus T. S., i. 8. 10. 2; T. Br., i. 7. 4. 2]. Apastamba, on the contrary, lets us choose between Bharatá, Kuráva, Pańchála, Kurupásáháda, or jjan rojita, according to the people to whom the king belongs. [The Káth., xv. 7, has eka te jjanate rojita.]

† The Bráhma-páta of the White Yajus quotes only the beginning of this verse; consequently the words Subhadra kámpílāndśānim are wanting in it.

† As a matter of fact, we find in the Mahá-Bhárata a Subhadrá as wife of Arjuna, the representative of the Pańchálas; on account of a Subhadrá (possibly on account of her abduction, related in the Mahá-Bhárata?) a great war seems to have arisen, as appears from some verses quoted several times by the scholiast on Páṇini. Has he the authority of the Mahábhárata for this? [the Mahábhárata has nothing about it].
ing passages of the Taitt. Brāhmaṇa), originated in the region of the Pañchālās; and this inference holds good also for the eleventh book of the Kāṇva recension. We might further adduce in proof of it the use of the word arjuna in the Mādhyāmdina, and of phalgunā in the Kāṇva recension, in a formula relating to the sacrifice at the consecration of the king (x. 21): "To obtain intrepidity, to obtain food, (I, the offerer, ascend) these, (O chariot,) I, the inviolate Arjuna (Phalgunā)," i.e., Indra, Indra-like. For although we must take both these words in this latter sense, and not as proper names (see I. St., i. 190), yet, at any rate, some connection must be assumed between this use and the later one, where they appear as the appellation of the chief hero of the Pāṇḍus (or Pañchālas?); and this connection consists in the fact that the legend specially applied these names of Indra* to that hero of the Pāṇḍus (or Pañchālas?) who was predominantly regarded by it as an incarnation of Indra.

Lastly, as regards the critical relation of the rīchas incorporated into the Yajus, I have to observe, that in general the two recensions of the Kāṇvas and of the Mādhyāmdinas always agree with each other in this particular, and that their differences refer, rather, to the Yajus-portions. One half of the Vājasaneyi-Samhitā consists of rīchas, or verses; the other of yajunīshī, i.e., formulas in prose, a measured prose, too, which rises now and then to a true rhythmical swing. The greater number of these rīchas

---

190 In T. S., vi. 4. 19, 1, Kāthā. Az., iv. 8, there are two vocatives instead of the two accusatives; besides, we have sukkha for sukkhadaṁśa. The vocative kāmpīlāsdevinī is explained by Bāhyā, 'O thou that art veiled in a beautiful garment' (kāmpīlāsdevinīā ṣadghosvariṣṭāvādeha uchgyate; see I. St., xii. 312). This explanation is hardly justifiable, and Mahābhārata's reference of the word to the city of Kāmpīla must be retained, at least for the wording of the text which we have in the V. S. In the Pratīṣṭhā-Parīkṣa, Kāmpīla is given as the eastern limit of Mādhyadeśa; see my Pratīṣṭhā-sūtra, pp. 101-105.

190 See V. S., x. 21; the parallel passages in T. S., i. 8, 15, T. Br., i. 7, 9, 1, Kāthā, xv. 8, have nothing of this.

* The Brāhmaṇa, moreover, expressly designates arjuna as the 'secret name' (puhyanāma) of Indra [II. 1. 2. 11, v. 4. 3. 7]. How is this to be understood? The commentary remarks on it: arjuna its Andréasa vahyapadaśma | asta ens khalu (apya) Pāḍājasaramadhyamaṃ prasūřītāḥ. (What is the reading of the Kāṇva recension in these passages? Has it, as in the Samhitā, so here also, not arjuna, but phalgunā?)
recur in the Rīk-Samhitā, and frequently with considerable variations, the origin and explanation of which I have already discussed in the introduction (see above, pp. 9, 10). Readings more ancient than those of the Rīk are not found in the Yajus, or at least only once in a while, which results mainly from the fact that Rīk and Yajus agree for the most part with each other, as opposed to the Śāman. We do, however, find that verses have undergone later alterations to adapt them to the sense of the ritual. And finally, we meet with a large number of readings which appear of equal authority with those of the Rīk, especially in the verses which recur in those portions of the Rīk-Samhitā that are to be regarded as the most modern.

The Vājasaneyi-Samhitā, in both recensions, has been edited by myself (Berlin, 1849–52), with the commentary of Mahādhara, written towards the end of the sixteenth century; and in the course of next year a translation is intended to appear, which will give the ceremonial belonging to each verse, together with a full glossary. Of the work of Usā, a predecessor of Mahādhara, only fragments have been preserved, and the commentary of Mādhava, which related to the Kāṇva recension, appears to be entirely lost. Both were supplanted by Mahādhara’s work, and consequently obliterated; an occurrence which has happened in a similar way in almost all branches of Indian literature, and is greatly to be regretted.

I now turn to the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus; the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, which, from its compass and contents, undoubtedly occupies the most significant and important position of all the Brāhmaṇas. First, as to its

---

131 For which, unfortunately, no sufficient manuscript materials were at my disposal; see Müller, Preface to vol. vi. of his large edition of the Rīk, p. xlvi. seq., and my reply in Literarisches Centrallblatt, 1875, pp. 519, 520.

132 [This promise has not been fulfilled, owing to the pressure of other labours.] The fortieth adhyāya, the Isopanished, is in the Kāṇva recension commented by Śānykara; it has been translated and edited several times together with this commentary (lately again by Roer in the Bibliotheca Indica, vol. viii.) [and vol. xv.—A lithographed edition of the text of the Vājas. Samhitā, with a Hindi translation of Mahādhara’s commentary, has been published by Giriprasadavarman, Rāja of Beesa, 1870–74, in Beesa].

133 Upon what this special statement is based I cannot at present show; but that Mādhava commented the V. S. also is shown, for example, by the quotation in Mahādhara to xiii. 45.
extent,—this is sufficiently denoted by its very name, which describes it as consisting of 100 pathas (paths), or sections. The earliest known occurrence of this name is in the ninth varitika to Pāṇ. iv. 2. 60, and in the gana to Pāṇ. v. 3. 100, both authorities of very doubtful antiquity. The same remark applies to the Naigeya-daivata, where the name also appears (see Benfey’s Śāmaśeda, p. 277). With the single exception of a passage in the twelfth book of the Mahā-Bhārata, to which I shall revert in the sequel, I have only met with it, besides, in the commentaries and in the colophons of the MSS. of the work itself. In the Madhyāmādīna school the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa consists of fourteen kāṇḍas, each of which bears a special title in the commentaries and in the colophons: these titles are usually borrowed from the contents; ii. and vii. are, however, to me inexplicable.† The fourteen kāṇḍas are together subdivided into 100 adhyāyas (or 68 prāpāthakas), 438 brahmaṇas, and 7624 kāndikas. In the Kāṇva recension the work consists of seventeen kāṇḍas, the first, fifth, and fourteenth books being each divided into two parts; the first book, moreover, has here changed places with the second, and forms, consequently, the second and third. The names of the books are the same, but the division into prāpāthakas is altogether unknown: the adhyāyas in the thirteen and a half books that have thus far been recovered number 85, the brahmaṇas 360, the kāndikas 4965. The total for the whole work amounts, according to a list accompanying one of the manuscripts, to 104 adhyāyas, 446 brahmaṇas, 5365 kāndikas. If from this the recension of the Kāṇva school seems considerably

* The gana is an ākṛtīgana, and the sitra to which it belongs is, according to the Calcutta edition, not explained in the Mahābhashya; possibly therefore it does not belong to the original text of Pāṇini. [The varitikās in question is, in point of fact, explained in the Mahābhashya (fol. 67v.), and thus the existence of the name satapatha, as well as shaśaśigotra (see p. 119), is guaranteed, at least for the time when this work was composed; see I. & X., xii. 443.]

† The name of the second book is Ekapaddikā, that of the seventh Hariṭigotra.

‡ For statements disagreeing with this, which are found in the MSS., see note on pp. 119, 120.

† Of the fourth book there exists only the first half; and the third, thirteenth, and sixteenth books are wanting altogether. [It is much to be regretted that nothing has yet been done for the Kāṇva recension, and that a complete copy has not yet been recovered.]
shorter than that of the Mādhyamindas, it is so only in appearance; the disparity is probably rather to be explained by the greater length of the kāṇḍikās in the former. Omissions, it is true, not unfrequently occur. For the rest, I have no means of ascertaining with perfect accuracy the precise relation of the Brāhmaṇa of the Kāvya school to that of the Mādhyamindas; and what I have to say in the sequel will therefore relate solely to the latter, unless I expressly mention the former.

As I have already remarked, when speaking of the Samhitā, the first nine kāṇḍas of the Brāhmaṇa refer to the first eighteen books of the Samhitā; they quote the separate verses in the same order* word for word, explaining them dogmatically, and establishing their connection with the ritual. The tenth kāṇḍa, which bears the name of Agni-rahasya ("the mystery of fire"), contains mystical legends and investigations as to the significance, &c., of the various ceremonies connected with the preparation of the sacred fires, without referring to any particular portions of the Samhitā. This is the case likewise in the eleventh kāṇḍa, called from its extent Aṣṭādhyāyī, which contains a recapitulation of the entire ritual already discussed, with supplements thereto, especially legends bearing upon it, together with special particulars concerning the study of the sacred works and the provisions made for this purpose. The twelfth kāṇḍa, called Madhyama, "the middle one," treats of prāyaścittas or propitiatory ceremonies for untoward events, either previous to the sacrifice, during, or after it; and it is only in its last portion, where the Sautrānṣaṅi is discussed, that it refers to certain of the formulas contained in the Samhitā (xix.—xxi.) and relating to this ceremony. The thirteenth kāṇḍa, called Aṣṭavedha, treats at some length of the horse sacrifice; and then with extreme brevity of the human sacrifice, the universal sacrifice, and the sacrifice to the Manes; touching upon the relative portions of the Samhitā (xxii.—xxxv.) but very seldom, and even then very slightly. The fourteenth kāṇḍa, called Aranyaka, treats in its first three adhyāyas

* Only in the introduction does a variation occur, as the Brāhmaṇa treats first of the morning and evening sacrifices, and not till afterwards of the new moon and full moon sacrifices, which is evidently more correct systematically.
of the purification of the fire, it quotes almost in their entirety the three last books but one of the Samhita (xxxvii.–xxxix.); the last six adhyayas are of a purely speculative and legendary character, and form by themselves a distinct work, or Upanishad, under the name of Vrihad-Aranyaka. This general summary of the contents of the several kandas of itself suggests the conjecture that the first nine constitute the most ancient part of the Brahmana, and that the last five, on the contrary, are of later origin,—a conjecture which closer investigation reduces to a certainty, both on external and internal evidence. With reference to the external evidence, in the first place, we find it distinctly stated in the passage of the Mahá-Bhárata above alluded to (xii. 11734) that the complete Satapatha comprises a Rahasya (the tenth kanda), a Sabraya (the eleventh kanda), and a Parsasha (the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth kandas). Further, in the vritika already quoted for the name Satapatha, we also meet with the word shashthipatha as the name of a work; and I have no hesitation in referring this name to the first nine kandas, which collectively number sixty adhyayas. On the other hand, in support of the opinion that the last five kandas are a later addition to the first nine, I have to adduce the term Madhyama ("the middle one"), the name of the twelfth kanda, which can only be accounted for in this way, whether we refer it merely to the last three kandas but one, or to all the five.*

* The shasvasya concerns, rather, the illustration of the sacrificer himself; see above note 124, p. 108.

125 It is found in the Pratijna-Parisashtha also, and along with it the name adhipatha (!); Satapatha, on the contrary, is apparently wanting there; see my essay on the Pratijna-Satra, pp. 104, 105.

* In the latter case a difficulty is caused by the Kāgya recension, which subdivides the last kanda into two parts (xvi., xvii.); this division, however, seems not to have been generally received, since in the MSS. of Śāṅkara's commentary, at least, the Upanishad (xvii.) is reckoned throughout as beginning with the third adhyaya (viz., of the kanda), so that xvi. and xvii. coincide.—[A highly remarkable statement is found in the MSS. of the Madhyamā recension at v. 3. 1. 14, to the effect that this point marks not only kag-dasya tārāma, with 236 karṣikas, but also, according to a marginal gloss, sātakāshya tārāma, with 3129 karṣikas; see p. 497 of my edition. As a matter of fact, the preceding karṣikas do amount to this latter number; but if we fix it as the norm for the second half, we are only brought down to xii. 7. 3. 18, that is, not even to the close of the twelfth book! The point which marks the exact half for the
Now these last five kāṇḍas appear to stand in the same order in which they actually and successively-originated; so that each succeeding one is to be regarded as less ancient than the one that precedes it. This conjecture is based on internal evidence drawn from the data therein contained,—evidence which at the same time decides the question of their being posterior to the first nine kāṇḍas. In the first place, the tenth kāṇḍa still connects itself pretty closely with the preceding books, especially in its great veneration for Śāndilya, the principal authority upon the building of altars for the sacred fires. The following are the data which seem to me to favour the view that it belongs to a different period from the first nine books. In i. 5. 1, ff., all the sacrifices already discussed in the preceding books are enumerated in their proper order, and identified with the several ceremonies of the Agni-chayana, or preparation of the sacred fireplace.—Of the names of teachers here mentioned, several end in -āyana, a termination of which we find only one example in the seventh, eighth, and ninth kāṇḍas respectively: thus we meet here with a Rauhináyana, Sáyakáyana, Vámakaksháyana (also in vii.), Rájastambáyana, Śāndilyáyana (also in ix.), Sátyáyani (also in viii.), and the Sákáyanins.—The Vánsa appended at the close (i.e., the list of the teachers of this book) differs from the general Vánsa of the entire Bráhmaṇa (at the close of the fourteenth book) in not referring the work to Yájnavalkya, but to Śāndilya, and also to Tura Kávasheya (whose ancestor Kavasha we find on the banks of the Sarasvatí in the Aitareya-Bráhmaṇa). The only tribes mentioned are the Salvas and Kekayas (especially their king, Aśvapati Kajkeya),—two western tribes not elsewhere alluded to in the Bráhmaṇas.—

The present extent of the work (3812 k.) is at vi. 7. 1. 19, where also the MSS. repeat the above statement (p. 555).—It deserves special mention that the notation of the accents operates beyond the limits of the individual kṣaṇikāt, the accent at the end of a kṣaṇikāt being modified by the accent of the first word of the next kṣaṇikāt. From this we might perhaps conclude that the marking of the accounts is earlier in date than the division of the text into kṣaṇikāts. As, however, we find exactly the same state of things with regard to the final and initial words of the individual bráhmaṇas (see Jenner Literaturzeitung, 1875, p. 314), we should also have to refer the bráhmaṇa division to a later date, and this is hardly possible.
legends here as well as in the four succeeding kāṇḍas are mostly of an historical character, and are besides chiefly connected with individual teachers who cannot have lived at a time very distant from that of the legends themselves. In the earlier kāṇḍas, on the contrary, the legends are mostly of a mythological character, or, if historical, refer principally to occurrences belonging to remote antiquity; so that here a distinct difference is evident.—The trūyā vidyā (the three Vedas) is repeatedly discussed in a very special manner, and the number of the rīchas is stated to be 12,000, that of the yajus-verse 3000, and that of the sāmans 4000. Here also for the first time appear the names Adhvaryus, Bāhyrīchas, and Chhandogas side by side;* here, too, we have the first occurrence of the words upanishad (as. śāra of the Veda), upanishadāṃ ādēśāḥ, māmdāsā (mentioned once before, it is true, in the first kāṇḍa), adīdevatam, adhiyājnam, adhyātmam; and lastly, here for the first time we have the form of address bhavān (instead of the earlier bhagavān). Now and then also a sloka is quoted in confirmation, a thing which occurs extremely seldom in the preceding books. Further, many of the technical names of the sāmans and śastras are mentioned (this, however, has occurred before, and also in the tenth book of the Saṃhitā); and generally, frequent reference is made to the connection subsisting with the rīchas and sāmans, which harmonises with the peculiarly mystical and systematising character of the whole kāṇḍa.

That the eleventh kāṇḍa is a supplement to the first nine is sufficiently evident from its contents. The first two adhyāyas treat of the sacrifices at the new and full moon; the four following, of the morning and evening sacrificial fires, of the sacrifices at the three seasons of the year, of the inauguration of the pupil by the teacher (āchārya), of the proper study of the sacred doctrines, &c.; and the last two, of the sacrifices of animals. The Rigveda, Yajurveda, and Sāmaveda, the Atharvāṅgiruṣas, the anuśāsanas, the vidyās, the vākvidyā, the śiśas-purūraṇā, the nārāśānīs, and the gāthās are named as subjects of study. We have

* Along with the sūtravidas (those skilful in witchcraft), surpanīdas, adhīyātmak, and serpent-charmers, devajitahova, the earlier books.
already met with this enumeration (see p. 93) in the second chapter of the Taitt. Aranyaka, although in a considerably later form,* and we find a similar one in the fourteenth kāṇḍa. In all these passages, the commentaries,† probably with perfect justice, interpret these expressions in this way, viz., that first the Samhitās are specified, and then the different parts of the Brāhmaṇas; so that by the latter set of terms we should have to understand, not distinct species of works, but only the several portions respectively so designated which were blended together in the Brāhmaṇas, and out of which the various branches of literature were in course of time gradually developed. The terms anuvāsana (“ritual precept” according to Sāyana, but in Vṛhad-Ār., ii. 5. 19, iv. 3. 25, Kathopan., 6. 15, “spiritual ‘doctrine’”), vidyā, “spiritual doctrine,” and gāthā, “strophe of a song” (along with āloka), are in fact so used in a few passages (gāthā indeed pretty frequently) in these last five books, and in the Brāhmaṇas or Upanishads of the Rīk and Śāman. Similarly vākyavādya in the sense of “disputation” occurs in the seventh kāṇḍa, and itihāsa at least once in the eleventh kāṇḍa itself (i. 6. 9). It is only the expressions purāṇa and nāŚāiris that do not thus occur; in their stead—in the sense of narrative, legend—we find, rather, the terms ākhyāna, vyākhyāna, anvākhyāna, vāyākhyāna. Vyākhyāna, together with anupavyākhyāna and upanvyākhyāna, also occurs in the sense of “explanation.” In these expressions, accordingly, we have evidence that at the time of this eleventh kāṇḍa certain Samhitās and Brāhmaṇas of the various Vedas, and even the Atharva-Samhitā itself, were in existence. But, further, as bearing upon this point, in addition to the single verses from the songs of the Rīk, which are here, as in the earlier books, frequently cited (by “tad etad rishiśāḥ bhya-anvāktam”), we have in the eleventh kāṇḍa one very special quotation, extending over an entire hymn, and introduced by the words “tad etad uttarapratyuktam paṅcaphadāśaścharam Bahyāhaḥ prāhuh.” It is an interesting fact for the critic that in our text of the Rīk the hymn in question

* From it has evidently originated a passage in Yājnavalkya’s Code (i. 45), which does not harmonise at all with the rest of that work.

† Here Sāyana forms an exception, as he at least states the other explanation also.
(maṇḍ. x. 95) numbers not fifteen but eighteen viśvas. Single ślokas are also frequently quoted as confirmation. From one of these it appears that the care taken of horses in the palaces of Janamejaya had at that time passed into a proverb: this is also the first mention of this king. Rudra here for the first time receives the name of Mahādeva* (v. 3. 5).—In iii. 3. 1, ff., special rules are for the first time given concerning the begging (bhikṣā) of the brahma- ẓadrins, &c., which custom is besides alluded to in the thirtieth book of the Šamhitā [v. 18].—But what throws special light upon the date of the eleventh kāṇḍa is the frequent mention here made, and for the first time, of Janaka, king (samrāj) of Videha, as the patron of Yājnavalkya. The latter, the Kaurupaṃchālā Uddālaka Aruni and his son Śvetaketu, are (as in the Vṛihadh-Aranyaka) the chief figures in the legends.

The twelfth kāṇḍa alludes to the destruction of the kingdom of the Śrīnjayas, whom we find in the second kāṇḍa at the height of their prosperity, and associated with the Kurus. This connection may still be traced here, for it seems as if the Kauravya Valhika Prātipāya wished to take their part against Chākra, their enemy, who was a native of the country south of the Revā, and priest of King Dvāṣṭarītu of Daśapurushamprājya, but that his efforts failed.—The names Vārkali (i.e., Vāshkali) and Nāka Maudgalya probably also point to a later period of time; the latter does not occur elsewhere except in the Vṛihadh-Aranyaka and the Taittirīyopanishad.—The Īgveda, the Yajurveda, and the Śamaveda are mentioned, and we find testimony to the existence of the Vedic literature generally in the statement that a ceremony once taught by Indra to Vāsishṭha and formerly only known to the Vāsishṭhas—whence in former times only a Vāsishṭha could act as brahman (high priest) at its performance—might now be studied by any one who liked, and consequently that any one might officiate as brahman thereat. In iii. 4. 1 occurs the first mention of puruṣa Nārīyana.—The name of Proti Kausāṃbeyā Kausurubindi probably presupposes the existence of the Pañchāla city Kausāmbi.

* In the sixth kāṇḍa he is still called mahān devaṃ.
The thirteenth kāyaḥ repeatedly mentions purusha Nārāyana. Here also Kuvera Vaiśravana, king of the Rakshasas, is named for the first time. So, too, we find here the first allusion to the sūktas of the Rik, the anuvākas* of the Yajus, the dasats of the Sāman, and the parvans of the Atharvāpas and Asgirasas, which division, however, does not appear in the extant text of the Atharvaṇa. A division into parvans is also mentioned in connection with the Sarpavidyā and the Devajanavidyā, so that by these names at all events distinct works must be understood. Of Itihāsa and Purāṇa nothing but the name is given; they are not spoken of as divided into parvans, a clear proof that even at that time they were merely understood as isolated stories and legends, and not as works of any extent.128.—While in the first nine books the statement that a subject has been fully treated of already is expressed by tasyo yoko bandhūḥ [or, so sāv eva bandhūḥ, and the like], the same is expressed here by tasyoktam brāhmaṇam.—The use in v. i. 18 of the words ekavacana and bhāvakacana exactly corresponds to their later grammatical significations.—This kāyaḥ is, however, very specially distinguished by the number of gāthās, strophes of historical purport, which it quotes at the close of the account of the horse sacrifice, and in which are given the names of kings who celebrated it in earlier times. Only one of these gāthās appears in the Rik-Saṃhitā (mand. iv. 42. 8); the greater number of them recur in the last book of the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa, and in the Mahā-Bhārata, xii. 910, ff., in both places with many variations.† The question here arises whether we have to regard these gāthās as fragments of more lengthy hymns, or if they must be looked upon merely as separate memorial verses. The fact that in connection with some of these names (if we take into account

* This term, however, occurs in the preceding kāyaḥ also, e.g., in ix. 1. 1. 15.

† This is favoured also by the fact that they are here attributed to fishermen and fowlers; with which may be compared the tale of the fishermaid as mother of Vyāsa, in the Mahā-Bhārata. The whole statement recurs in almost identical terms in the Śāṅkha, Śr., xvi. 2; Āśva val. Śr., x. 7.

128 The passages in the Mahā-Bhārata evidently connect themselves with the Sātpatha-Brāhmaṇa, to which, as well as to its author Yājnavalkya, and his patron Janaka, special regard is had in this book of the Mahā-Bhārata. [See also Śāṅkha., xvi. 8. 25-29. 32.]
the Aitareya-Brahmana also) two, three, four, five, and even six verses are quoted, and always in the same metre, in ślokas, certainly favours the former view. Only one exception occurs where the first and fourth verses are ślokas, but the second tristubh, the third not being quoted at all; it is, however, according to the commentary, understood by implication, so that this instance tells, perhaps, with a very special force in favour of the view in question. The analogy of the gāthās or ślokas of non-historic purport quoted elsewhere cannot be brought forward in support either of the one view or of the other, for the very same uncertainty exists respecting them. Moreover, these verses repeatedly contain very old Vedic forms.* Again, their expressions of eulogy are for the most part very hyperbolical, and they might, therefore, perhaps be looked upon as the utterance of a still fresh feeling of gratitude; so that we should have to consider their origin as in part contemporary with the princes they extol: otherwise this circumstance does not readily admit of explanation.† A passage in the thirteenth kāṇḍa itself directly favours this view (see i. St., i. 187). Among the kings here named the following deserve special mention: Bharata, son of Duhshanta and the Apanas Śakuntalā, and descendant of Sudvumna—Śatānśka; Śatrājīta, king of the Bharatas, and enemy of Dhrītarāṣṭra, king of the Kāśis—Purokutsa; Aikshvāka—Para Ātpāra Hairanyanābha Kausalya—but above all, Janamejaya Pārīkshita, with the Pārikshitiyas (his three brothers), Bhimasena, Ugrasena, and Śrutasena, who by means of the horse sacrifice were absolved from “all guilt, all brahma-
hatyā.” The time when these last four lived cannot be considered as very distant from that of the kāṇḍa itself, since their sacrificial priest Indrota Daivapā Śaunaka (whom the Mahā-Bhārata, xii. 5595, also specifies as such) is once mentioned in it apparently as coming forward in opposi-

* And names too: thus, the king of the Pachžalas is called Kralīva, the explanation given by the Brahmans being that the Pachžalas were “formerly” called Kritis.
† Unless these verses were merely invented by priests in order to stimulate kings to copy and emulate the liberality of their ancestors.

Still this is both in itself a very forced explanation, and besides many of these verses are of purely historical purport, and contain no allusion to the presents given to the priests.
† See Yaj. Ś., 34. 52 (not in the Rik).
§ See Rik, mondo. iv. 42. 8.
tion to Bhāllaveya; while his own opinion, differing from that of the latter, is in turn rejected by Yājnavalkya. On account of the interest of the subject I introduce here another passage from the fourteenth book, from which we may gather the same result. We there find a rival of Yājnavalkya testing him with a question, the solution of which the former had previously obtained from a Gandharva, who held in his possession the daughter of Kāpya Patamchala of the country of the Madras;—the question, namely, “Whither have the Pārikshitas gone?” the solution of which therefore appears to have been looked upon as extremely difficult. Yājnavalkya answers: “Thither where (all) āsvamedha sacrificers go.” Consequently the Pārikshitas must at that time have been altogether extinct. Yet their life and end must have been still fresh in the memory of the people, and a subject of general curiosity.* It almost seems as though their “guilt, their brahmañātīya,” had been too great for people to believe that it could have been atoned for by sacrifices were they ever so holy; or that by such means the Pārikshitas could have become partakers of the reward fixed for other less culpable evil-doers. It appears further as if the Brahmans had taken special pains to rehabilitate their memory, and in this undoubtedly they were completely successful. Or was it, on the contrary, that the majesty and power of the Pārikshitas was so great and dazzling, and their end so surprising, that it was difficult to believe they had really passed away? I prefer, however, the former explanation.

The fourteenth kāñḍa, at the beginning of its first part (that relating to ritual), contains a legend of a contention among the gods, in which Viṣṇu came off victorious, whence it became customary to say, “Viṣṇu is the ērēśṭha (luckiest?) of the gods.” This is the first time that we find Viṣṇu brought into such prominence; indeed, he otherwise only appears in the legend of the three strides, and as the representative of the sacrifice itself,—a position which is, in fact, ascribed to

---

* The country of the Madras lies in the north-west, and is therefore remote from the country of the Kurus. According to the Mahā-Bādra, however, Mādrī, second wife of Pāṇḍu and mother of the two youngest Pāṇḍavas, Nakula and Sahadeva, was a native of this region, and Pārīkṣita also had a Mādravati wife.
him here also. - Indra, as here related, afterwards strikes off his head in jealousy.\(^\text{120}\) The second part of this kanda, the Vrihad-Aranyaka, which consists of five prapâthakas, or six adhyayas, is again divided into three kandas, the Madhukânda, adhy. i. ii. (prop. i. 1–ii. 5); the Yajnavalkya-kanda, adhy. iii. iv. (prop. ii. 6–iv. 3); and the Khila-kanda, adhy. v. vi. (prop. iv. 4–v. 5). Of these three divisions, each succeeding one appears to be later than that which precedes it, and each closes with a Vâna or statement of the line of teachers, carried back to Brahman, the primeval source. The third brahmâna of the Madhu-kanda is an explanation of three slokas prefixed to it, a form of which we have no previous example. The fifth (adhy. ii. 1) contains, as has already been stated (p. 51), another recension of the legend related in the fourth adhyâya of the Kaushitakya-Upanishad, of Ajâtastra, the King of Kâsi, who was jealous of Janaka’s fame as a patron of learning. The eighth (adhy. ii. 4) contains another recension of the closing legend in the Yajnavalkya-kanda, of Yajnavalkya’s two wives, Maitreyî and Kátyâyâni,—this being the first mention we have of these names. Here, as also in the eleventh kanda, we find an enumeration of the subjects of Vedic study, namely, Rigveda, Yajurveda, Sâmaveda, the Atharvâpâras, itihása, purâna, vidyâs, upanishâds, slokas, stûtras, anvâyâkęyânas, vyâkhyaânas.\(^*\) The same enumeration recurs in the Yajnavalkya-kanda (adhy. vi. 10). Samkara and Dvivedagangâ, the commentators of the Vrihad-Aranyaka, both, like Sâyâna (on the eleventh kanda), take the expressions itihása, &c., to mean sections in the Brâhmañas. They are, in fact, as I have already pointed out (p. 122), used in

\(^{120}\) This is wrong. The gods send forth ants to gnaw the bowstring of Vishnu, who stands leaning on his bended bow; the string, snapping and springing upwards, severs his head from his body. The same legend recurs not only in the parallel passage of the Taitt. Ar. (v. 1), but also in the Pañch. Br., vii. 5, 6; but whilst in the Sàt. Br. it is related of Vishnu, the Taitt. Ar. tells it of Makha, Vaishnavâ, and the Pañch. Br. of Makha alone (cf. also T. S., iii. 2. 4. 1). In the Satapatha, Makha is only mentioned among the gods who assembled, though, to be sure, he appears immediately before Vishnu.

\(^*\) The last five expressions take here the place of anusûdana, edakas, mûrdâs, and gâhás in the eleventh book. The latter are clearly the more ancient.
this sense in the Brāhmaṇas themselves. It is only in regard to śūtra* that I am unable to prove a similar use (though Dviveda-ganḍa pretty frequently calls certain sentences by the name of śūtra, e.g., i. 2. 18, 22, 3. 1, &c.); and this term raises a doubt whether the opinion of the commentators ought to hold good with reference to these passages also, and their time. The ninth (which is the last) brāhmaṇa is evidently the one from which the Madhu-kāṇḍa received its name. It treats of the intimate relation existing between the four elements (earth, water, fire, air), the sun, the quarters of the heavens, the moon, lightning, thunder, ākāśa (ether), &c., on the one hand, and all beings on the other; this relation being set forth by representing the one as the madhu (honey) of the other. This doctrine is traced to Dadhyānicht Ātharvāṇa, as is also, in fact, done in the Rik-Samhitā itself (i. 116. 12, 117. 22). In the beginning of the fourth kāṇḍa of the Śatap. Brāhmaṇa also (iv. i. 5. 18) we find the madhu nāma brāhmaṇam mentioned expressly in this connection; Sāyaṇa, too, quotes Śātyāyana (-Vājasaneyau) in support of it. A very early date is thus guaranteed for the name at least, and probably also for the contents of this chapter; though its form, of course, cannot make any pretension to high antiquity. The concluding Vaṇśa here, as elsewhere, varies very much in the two schools; that is, as regards the last twenty members or so back to Yāsaka and Āsurāyana; but from these upwards to the mythical fountain-heads the two schools generally agree. Āsurāyana himself (consequently, also Yāsaka, who is recorded as his contemporary) is here placed two stages after Āsuri; at the end of the Khila-kāṇḍa he is even designated as his pupil; Āsuri, again, being set down as the pupil of Yājñavalkya. The list closes, therefore, with about the twenty-fifth member from the latter. It must consequently have been continued long after the Madhu-kāṇḍa had been finally put into shape, since both the analogy of the Vaṇśa contained in the last brāhmaṇa but one of the Khila-kāṇḍa and the very nature of the case forbid the

---

* The word śūtra is found several times here, but in the sense of a band, embraces and holds together. * thread, band;’ only, to denote the supreme Brahmaṇ itself, which, like everything.
conclusion that its redaction could have taken place so late as the twenty-fifth generation from Yajnavalkya. The commentators never enter into any explanation of these Vānasas; doubtless, therefore, they too regarded them as supplements. The names themselves are naturally highly interesting, and, as far as least as the later stages are concerned, are probably strictly authentic.—The aim of the Yajnavalkya-kāṇḍa is the glorification of Yajnavalkya, and it recounts how, at the court of his patron Janaka, king of Videha, he silenced all the Brahmans of the Kurupānchāla, and, gained his patron’s full confidence (like the corresponding legends in the twelfth book of the Mahā-Bhārata). The legend narrated in the eleventh kāṇḍa (vi. 3. 1 ff.) may perhaps have been the model; at least the Yajnavalkiya here begins in exactly the same manner, and gives also, almost in the same words, the account of the discomfort and punishment of Vidagdha Sākalya, which alone is given in the eleventh kāṇḍa. It closes with a legend already given in the Madhu-kāṇḍa, but with some deviations; the expressions pāṇḍitiva, muni, and manuṇa, occurring in this kāṇḍa, are worthy of special notice as being new (iii. 2. 1, iv. 2. 25); further, ekahaṇa, brahmaṇa, tāpasa (iv. 1. 12, 22), pravrāja (iv. 2. 25, where bhikṣhṇaḥ is recommended), and pratibuddha (iv. 2. 17; the verb pratibuddha occurs in this sense i. 2. 21), and lastly, the names chāṇḍāla and paulkasa (iv. 1. 22). I am now of opinion† that it is to this Yajnavalkiya-kāṇḍa that the vārttika to Pāṇini’s iv. 3. 105 refers when it speaks of the Yajnavalkāni brahmaṇāni as not purdha-prokta, but tulyakāla, “contemporaneous,” i.e., with Pāṇini. The wording of the vārttika does not necessarily imply that

* Among them Aśvala, the king’s Hotar, Vidgadhā Sākalya, who lost his life for his impertinence, Kabola Kaṇhānīkaya, and Gārgi Vaiśākhāvai, who all four, (the latter, at least, according to the Gṛhya-Sūtra) may be looked upon as representatives of the Rik, towards which therefore a kind of jealousy is here unmistakably exhibited.

† Formerly I was of different opinion; see l. c., l. 57. Many of the views there expressed—especially pp. 161–232—have here either been further developed or modified after careful consideration of the various passages, as may be perceived by comparison.

149 “The word must occur in the later portions of the Rik-Samhitā, viz., viii. 17. 14, and x. 136. 2-5.”—First German edition, Errata. Paulkaśa is found also in V. S. 30. 17.
these Brāhmaṇas originated from Yājnavalkya himself; consequently they might bear his name simply because treating of him. I prefer the latter view, for it appears to me very hazardous to regard the entire Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa, or even its last books only, as directly bearing the name of Yājnavalkya,—however fully it may embody his system,—or to set it down as contemporaneous with, or but little anterior to, Pāṇini. In regard to the Yājnavalkya-kāṇḍa, however, I have not the slightest hesitation in doing the latter. Finally, the Khila-kāṇḍa, or last kāṇḍa of the Vṛihad-Āranyaka, is uniformly described by the commentators as such a khila, or supplement; and as a matter of fact it is clearly enough distinguished from the other kāṇḍas. Its first adhyāya—the fifth of the Vṛihad-Āranyaka—is made up of a number of small fragments, which contain for the most part mystical plays upon words, of the most clumsy description. The second adhyāya contains two brāhmaṇas, parts of which, as I have already remarked (p. 71), recur in precisely the same form in the Chhāndogypaṇishad vii. 1, 3. Of the third brāhmaṇa, which contains ritual injunctions, we also find another recension, ibid. vii. 2. It concludes with a Vaṁśa, not, however, in the form of a list, but of a detailed account. According to it, the first author of the doctrine here taught was Uddālaka Aruni, who imparted it to Yājnavalkya, here for the first time called Vājasaneyya; his pupil was Madhūnka Paṁgāya, from whom the doctrine was transmitted to Chūḍa Bhāgavitti, then to Jānaki Ayāḥsthūṇa, and lastly to Satyakāma Jābala. The name of the latter (a teacher often alluded to in the Chhāndogypaṇishad) is in fact borne in later works by a school of the White Yajuś, so

142 On this subject compare Goldstücker's detailed discussion in his Pṛṣṇi, p. 132-140, and my special rejoinder, I. St., v. 65-74, xiii. 443, 444, I. Str., ii. 214. According to these expositions, the author of the varāṇas must, on the one hand, have considered the Yājnavalkyaṇi Brāhmaṇa as originally promulgated (prokta) by Yājnavalkya; but, on the other hand, he must also have looked upon the recension then extant as contemporaneous with Pāṇini. Although he here counts Yājnavalkya among the purohitas, "ancient,"—and this interpretation is required by the wording of the svṛttika,—yet the Kaṭāki, on the contrary, expressly declares him to be "not chivaṭika."

* In the Yājnavalkyaṇa Uddālaka Aruni is, like the other Brahmanes, silenced by Yājnavalkya, no mention being made of his being the preceptor of the latter.
that we might perhaps ascribe to him the final adjustment of this doctrine in its existing form. The fourth and last brāhmaṇa of this adhyāya is, like the third, surprising, from the nature of its contents, which, consisting as they do of the rites to be observed before, and at the time of, coitus, as well as after the birth of a son, more properly pertain to a Grīhya-Sūtra. It too closes with a Vaṁśa; this time of quite unusual length, and distinguished, as far as the more recent members are concerned, by this peculiarity, that their names are formed by the addition of puṭra to the mother’s name. (see above p. 71), and that both parts of the names are accentuated. Āsuri is here called the pupil of Yājnavalkya, and the latter the pupil of Uddālaka. Then, having passed through ten more stages and arrived at Āditya, the sun-god, as the original author, we find the following words as the close of the whole Brāhmaṇa: dāitydhī māni śuklāni yajānśi Vājasaneyānā Yājnavalkyena "khyāyante, ‘these White Yajus texts originating from Āditya are transmitted by Vājasaneyā Yājnavalkya.’ According to Śaṅkara and Dhvivedaganga, this Vaṁśa does not refer to the Khila-kāṇḍa, but to the entire Pravachana, the entire Veda (i.e., the White Yajus). This view is at all events favoured by the fact that the Vaṁśa at the close of the tenth book (the only one which appears in the whole of the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa, besides those of the Madhu-kāṇḍa, Yājnavalkiya-kāṇḍa, and Khila-kāṇḍa) evidently refers to this Vaṁśa, and presupposes its existence when at its commencement it says: sanānam a Śāṁjñiptiprutā, ‘up to Śāṁjñiviputra the teachers are the same.’ For, ascending from this Śāṁjñiviputra, there are still in this Vaṁśa three steps up to Yājnavalkya, while in the tenth book, as before remarked, the doctrine is not traced up to the latter at all, but from Śāṁjñiviputra through five steps to Śaṅdīlya, and through two more to Tura Kāvasheya. §—This latter circumstance suggests to

* In the Kāyva recension the Vaṁśas invariably form separate chapters.
† Or: ‘these White Yajus texts are named by Vājasaneyā Yājnavalkya as originating from Āditya’ (?).
‡ The Kāyva recension adds this Vaṁśa here too at the close after the words: Yājnavalkyenā "khyāyante.
§ Who is quoted in the Aitār. Brāhmaṇa as contemporaneous with Janamejaya (as his sacrificial priest); see I. S.), l. 203, note.
us, moreover, the possibility of yet another division of the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa with reference to the origin of the different kāṇḍas. For in the first five and the last four kāṇḍas, the name of Yājnavalkya meets us exclusively, and very frequently, as that of the teacher whose opinion is appealed to as the decisive authority, whose system consequently is in any case there set forth.* Further, if we except the Yājnavalkya-kāṇḍa and the gāthās in the thirteenth kāṇḍa, races settled in eastern or central Hindustān are the only ones mentioned in these kāṇḍas, viz., the Kurupaṇḍalas, Kosalavidehas, Śvikenas, and Śrīnājas. Once only the Prāchyas (eastern tribes) are opposed to the Vāhikas (western tribes); again there is once mention made of the Udīcyas (inhabitants of the north); and lastly, the (southern) Nishadhas are once alluded to in the name of their king, Nala Naishadhā (or, as he is here called, Naishidhā). From this the remaining kāṇḍas—the sixth to the tenth—differ palpably enough. They recognise Śāndilya as the final authority† instead of Yājnavalkya, whom they do not even name; neither do they mention any but north-western races, viz., the Gandhāras with their king Nagnajit, the Salvas, and the Kekayas.‡ May not the above-mentioned Vanāśa apply not only to the tenth book, but to these five kāṇḍas? Since the latter treat specially of the fire-ritual, of the erection of the sacred fire-altars, their possible north-

---

* The fact that this is so clear may easily account for the circumstance that the Purāṇas have here for once a statement in conformity with fact, as they cite Yājnavalkya as the author of the White Yajus. We may here mention that the name of Yājnavalkya occurs nowhere else in Vedic literature, which might be explained partly by the difference of locality, partly by his having edited the White Yajus after the text of the other Vedas had been fixed; though the latter reason seems insufficient, since other teachers of the White Yajus are mentioned frequently in later Vedic literature, as, for instance, Aruni, Śvetaketu, Satyakāsa Jātaka, &c., who are either his contemporaries, or belong to even later times. Besides, his patron Janaka is mentioned at least in the Kaushitaky-Upanishad. [In two sections of the Kaushitaki, or, Śāndilya-Aranyaka, which, however, are clearly of very late origin, Yājnavalkya himself is actually cited (9. 7 and 13. 1); but these passages are themselves direct quotations from Satap. Br. xiv.—In the Gopatha-Br., which shows so many special points of relationship to the Satapatha, Yājnavalkya is never mentioned.]† So do the Śama-Sūtras; Śāndilya is mentioned besides in the Chhândogyp. only.‡ The legend concerning these texts in the Chhândogyp.
western origin might be explained by the fact that the doctrine upon this subject had, though differing from that of the Persa-Aryans, been kept particularly pure in the north-west owing to the proximity of this latter people. However this may be, whether the north-western origin of the doctrine of these five kāṇḍas be well founded or otherwise, they at any rate belong, in their present form, to the same period as (the tenth possibly to a somewhat later period than) the first five kāṇḍas. On this point the mention of Aruṇa Aupaveśi, Aruṇi, Śvetaketu Aruṇeya, and of Indradvyaṃna (in the tenth book), as well as the frequent rephrasure of the Charakādhvaryus, is decisive. That the various parts of the Brāhmaṇa were blended together by one arranging hand is evident in particular from the repeated occurrence of phrases intimating that a subject has already been treated of in an earlier part, or is to be found presented more in detail in a later part. A closer investigation of the various instances where this occurs has not as yet been within my power.

The number of deviations in regard to ritual or readings cited in the Brāhmaṇa is very great. To these regard is had here and there even in the Śamhitā itself, two different mantra being quoted side by side as equally good. Most frequently the citation of such variations in the Brāhmaṇa is introduced by the words ity eke, or tad dhāt; yet pretty often the names of individual teachers are also mentioned, who must here, in part at least, be looked upon as representing the schools which bear their names. Thus in addition to those already named we have: Ashūṭha Sāvayasa, Barku Vārshna, Aupoditeya, Pāṇchi, Takshan, Jīvala Chailaki, Āsuri, Mādhukī, Kahoḍa Kauṣhtakī, Vārshnya Sātyayajna, Sātyayajni, Tāṇḍya, Budila Aśvatarāśī,

---

* Ought we to bring the Śāktayana into direct connection with the latter? But then what would become of the connection between Śāktayana (in the Maitrāyani-Upanishad) and the Śākyas? [1]

[1] See on this my detailed discussion in I. St., xiii. 267—269, where I call special attention to various differences in point of language between books i.—v. and vi.—ix.

[2] The strong consensus passed upon the residents on the seven western rivers in ix. 3, 1. 24 must be ascribed to this 'arranging hand'; see I. St., xiii. 267.—That the White Yajus was arranged in eastern Hindustān, seems to be proved by the statements in the Pratiṣṭhā-Parāśāhitas respecting the extent of the Madhvaśākha; see my essay on the Pratiṣṭhā-Sūtra, pp. 101, 105.
Ráma Aupatasvini, Kaukústa, Mábhitthi, Muḍimbha, An-
danya, Saumápana Mánutanatavayau, Satyakáma Jábála, Sai-
láli, &c. Besides the Charakádhvanyus, Bhállaveya in par-
ticular is regularly censured, from which I conclude, as
already stated (p. 95), that the Bhállavi-Bráhmaṇa should
be reckoned among those of the Black Yajus. By the
"éka,” where these are found fault with, we should prob-
ably also understand (e.g., once for certain in the first
káṇḍa) the adherents of the Black Yajus. Once, however
(in the eighth káṇḍa), a reading of the Káṇva school is
quoted by “éka” and disputed. How the matter stands
in the Bráhmaṇa of the latter as to this passage, whether
it finds fault with the reading of the Mádhyamána school,
I am not able to say. A collection of passages of this
kind would naturally be of peculiar interest.

The legends interspersed in such numbers throughout
the Bráhmaṇa have a special significance. In some of
them the language is extremely antiquated, and it is prob-
able therefore that before their incorporation into it they
possessed an independent form. The following deserve
special mention from their being treated in detail, viz.,
the legends of the Deluge and the rescue of Manu; of the
emigration of Videgha Máthava from the Sárasvatí to the
Sadántrá in the country of the Kosala-Videhas; of the
restoration to youth of Chyavana by the Áśvins at the
request of his wife Sukanyá, the daughter of Saryáta Má-
nava; of the contest between Kádrá and Suparṇi; of the
love and separation of Purúravas and Urváśí, and others.
Many of them reappear as episodes in the epic, in a
metrical garb, and often very much altered. It is
obvious that we have here a much more intimate con-
nection with the epic than exists in the other Bráhma-
naṇas. The names Valhika, Janamejaya, and Nagnajit
have the most direct reference to the legend of the Mahá-
Bhárata; as also the names already discussed above in
connection with the Samhitá, Ambá, Ambiká, Ambálíká,
Subhádrá, and the use there made of the words arjuna and
pañguna. In any case, we must look for the explanation

* Compare the Mutibhas in the Mábhuki (or Pañgya), and Kaśñit-
Aitar. Br.—Of the above, only Bu-
djila, the Saumápana, Satyakáma,
of this in the circumstance, that this Brâhmaṇa substantially originated and attained its final shape among the tribes of the Kurupaṇḍalaś and the neighbouring Kosala-Vidēhas. The king of the latter, Janaka, who is represented in it as the chief patron of the sacred doctrine it embodies, bears the same name as the father of Sītā and father-in-law of Rāma, in the Rāmāyaṇa. This is, however, the only point of contact with the Rāmāyaṇa legend which can here be traced, and as the name Janaka seems to have belonged to the whole family, it also virtually disappears. Nevertheless I am inclined to identify the father of Sītā with this exceptionally holy Janaka, being of opinion that Sītā herself is a mere abstraction, and that consequently she had assigned to her the most renowned father possible. As regards the special relation in which the Brâhmaṇa stands to the legend of the Mahā-Bhārata, Lassen, it is well known, takes as the fundamental feature of the latter a conflict between the Kurus and the Paṇḍalaś, ending in their mutual annihilation, the latter being led by the family of the Pāṇḍuś, who came from the west. Now at the time of the Brâhmaṇa, we find the Kurus and the Paṇḍalaś still in full prosperity, * and also united in the closest bonds of friendship as one people.† Consequently this internece strife cannot yet have taken place. On the other hand, in the latest portions of the Brâhmaṇa, we find the prosperity, the sin, the expiation, and the fall of Janamejaya Pārikshita and his brothers Bhūmasena, Ugrasena, and Śrutasena, and of the whole family of the Pārikshitas, apparently still fresh in the memory of the people and discussed as a subject of controversy. In the Mahā-Bhārata boundless confusion prevails regarding these names. Janamejaya and his brothers, already mentioned, are represented either as great-grandsons of Kuru, or else as the great-grandsons of the Pāṇḍuś Arjuna, at whose snake-sacrifice Vaiśampāyana related the history of th

* Though certainly in the last portions of the Br. the Kosala-Vidēhas seem to have a certain preponderance; and there had perhaps existed as early as the time of the Samhitā (see p. 114) a certain rivalry between the Kurus and Paṇḍalaś.

† At least I am not able to offer another explanation of the word Kurupaṇḍalaś; it is, moreover, noteworthy that no name of a king of the Kurupaṇḍalaś is ever mentioned. Such names are quoted only for Kauravya- or Paṇḍala- kings.
great struggle between the Kurus and the Pândus. Adopting the latter view, which appears to be the better warranted, from the fact that the part of the Mahá-Bhárata which contains it is written in prose, and exhibits a peculiarly ancient garb, the supposed great internecine conflict between the Kurus and the Pañchálas, and the dominion of the Pánḍavas, must have been long past at the time of the Bráhmaṇa. How is this contradiction to be explained? That something great and marvellous had happened in the family of the Párikshitas, and that their end still excited astonishment at the time of the Bráhmaṇa, has already been stated. But what it was we know not. After what has been said above, it can hardly have been the overthrow of the Kurus by the Pañchálas; but, at any rate, it must have been deeds of guilt; and indeed I am inclined to regard this as yet unknown 'something' as the basis of the legend of the Mahá-Bhárata.\(^{144}\) To me it appears absolutely necessary to assume, with Lassen, that the Pánḍavas did not originally belong to the legend, but were only associated with it at a later time,\(^{345}\) for not only is there no trace of them anywhere in the Bráhmaṇas or Sútras, but the name of their chief hero, Arjuna (Phálguna), is still employed here, in the Sátpatha-Bráhmaṇa (and in the Samhitás), as a name of Indra; indeed he is probably to be looked upon as originally identical with Indra, and therefore destitute of any real existence. Lassen further (I. A. K., i. 647, ff.) concludes, from what Megasthenes (in Arrian) reports of the Indian Heracles, his sons and his daughter Pávāśa, and also from other accounts in Curtius, Pliny, and Ptolemy,\(^*\) that at the time when Megasthenes wrote, the mythical association of Kúśa (I) with the Pánḍavas already ex-

\(^{144}\) See Indian Antiquary, ii. 58 (1873). I may add the following, as it possibly has a bearing here. Vriddhadyumna Ábbhipratána (see Ait. Br., iii. 43) was cursed by a Brahman on account of improper sacrifice, to the effect that: tasma sa praif samarum Kuvaráś Kurulakostuḍh chupasañcita bí, Sáñkh., xv. 16. 12 (and so it came to pass). For the glorification of the Kauravya king Párikshit the four verses, Sáñkh. Br., xii. 17. 1-4 (Ath., xx. 137. 7-10), serve; although in Ait. Br., vi. 22 (Sáñkh. Br., xxx. 5), they are referred to 'fire' or 'year;' but see Gopatha-Br., xi. 12. Another legend respecting Jánamejaya Párikshit is found in the Gopatha-Br., ii. 5.

\(^{345}\) See my detailed discussion of this in I. St., ii. 402-404.

\(^*\) Curtius and Pliny wrote in the first, Arrian and Ptolemy in the second century A.D.
But this conclusion, although perhaps in itself probable, is at least not certain; and even if it were, it would not prove that the Pāṇḍavas were at that time already associated with the legend of the Kūrus. And if we have really to assign the arrangement of the Mādhyaṁdina recension (see p. 106) to about the time of Megasthenes, it may reasonably be inferred, from the lack of all mention of the Pāṇḍavas in it, that their association with the Kūrus had not then been established; although, strictly speaking, this conclusion has weight not so much for the period when the arrangement of the work actually took place, as for the time to which the pieces arranged belong.

As with the epic legends, so also do we find in the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa several points of contact with the legends of the Buddhists, on the one hand, and with the later tradition concerning the origin of the Sāmkhya doctrine, on the other. First, as regards the latter. Āsurī, the name of one of its chief authorities, is at the same time the name of a teacher frequently mentioned in the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa. Again, though only in the Yājnavalkya-kāṇḍa, we have mention of a Kāpya Patarṇchala of the country of the Madras as particularly distinguished by his exertions in the cause of Brahmanical theology; and in his name we cannot, but see a reference to Kapila and Patarṇjali, the traditional founders of the Sāmkhya and Yoga systems.

As regards the Buddhist legends, the Śākyas of Kapilavastu (whose name may possibly be connected with the Śākāyanīns of the tenth kāṇḍa, and the Śākāyanī of the Maitrāyaṇa-Upanishad) called themselves - Gautamas, a family name which is particularly often represented among the teachers and in the lists of teachers of the Brāhmaṇa. It is, moreover, the country of the Kosalas and Videhas that is to be looked upon as the cradle of Buddhism.—Śvetākṣetra (son of Aruṇi), one of the teachers most frequently mentioned in the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa, is with the Buddhists the name of one of the earlier births of Śākyamuni.

* The incest of Hercules with Hīrāampo must certainly be traced to the incest of Prajāpati and his daughter, so often touched on in the Brāhmaṇa. [That Vāsudeva and Arjuna occur together in Pāṇ, iv. 3, 98, cannot be considered as a proof of their being connected with each other; see I. St., xiii. 349, ff.]
(see Ind. Stud., ii. 76, note).—That the māgadhā of the Samhitā may perhaps also be adduced in this connection is a point that has already been discussed (pp. III. 112).—The words arhant (iii. 4. 1. 3; ff.), brāmaṇa (Vṛih. Ār., iv. 1. 22, as well as Taitt. Ār., ii. 7, beside tāpasa), mahābrāhmaṇa† (Vṛih. Ār., ii. 1. 19. 22), and pratibuddha, although by no means used in their Buddhistic technical sense, yet indicate how this gradually arose.—The name Chelaka also, in the Brāhmaṇa may possibly have some connection with the peculiarly Buddhistic sense attached to the word chela. Ajātaśatru and Brahmadatta,+ on the contrary, are probably but namesakes of the two persons designated by the Buddhists under these names as contemporaries of Buddha (?). The same probably also applies to the Vātsiputriyās of the Buddhists and the Vātsiputra the Vṛih. Ārany. (v. 5. 31), although this form of name, being uncommon, perhaps implies a somewhat closer connection. It is, however, the family of the Kātyāyanas, Kātyāyaniputras, which we find represented with special frequency among the Buddhists as well as in the Brāhmaṇa (although only in its very latest portions). We find the first mention† of this name in the person of one of the wives of Yājñavalkya, who is called Kātyāyani, both in the Madhu-kāṇḍa and the Yājñavalkya-kāṇḍa; it also appears frequently in the lists of teachers, and almost the whole of the Sūtras belong—

† Beside mahārāja, which is found even earlier, I. 5. 3. 21, II. 5. 4. 9.
+ With the surname Chākītāñjaya.

Vṛih. Ār. Madhyā., i. 1. 26.—In Mahā-Bhārata, xii. 5136, 8603, a Pāṇḍya rāja named Brahmadatta is mentioned, who reigned in Kāmpilya.—Chākītāñjaya is to be distinguished from Chākītāñjaya in the Chāndogya, III. 8.—[On a curious coincidence of a legend in the Vṛihār. Ār. with a Buddhistic legend, see I. St., iii. 156, 157.]

† In the tenth book of the Taitt. Ār., Kātyāyana (instead of ṣaṅk) in a name of Durgā; on this see see I. St., ii. 152 [xii. 422].—In the Garga-pādā in Pāṇini, Kātyāyana is wanting. [But Kātyāyani is to be gathered from Pāṇini himself, iv. 1. 18; see I. St., v. 61, 63, 64. A Kātyāyaniputra Jātākaraṇya is quoted in the Sāṅkh. Ār. viii. 10. Patanjali in the Mahābhārata mentions several Kātyas (I. St., xii. 399, 407), and indeed the śrutikākṣara directly belongs to this family. In no other Vedic texts have I found either the Kātas or the Kātyas, Kātyāyanas, excepting in the prajurṣa section appended at the end of the Śāvyākṣara-Śrāvita-Sūtra, xii. 13–15, in which the Kātas and the patronymic Kātya, are mentioned several times. The Kuru-Katas are cited in the gana 'Garga,' and the family of the Katas seems therefore to have been specially connected with the Kuras; see I. St., i. 227, 228.]
SUTRAS OF THE WHITE YAJUS.

ing to the White Yajus bear this name as that of their author.

The Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa has been commented in the Mādhyamādīna recension by Harīsvirin and Sāyana; but their commentaries are so far extant only in a fragmentary form.²ⁱ⁶ The Vīṇḍyād-Araṇyaka has been explained by Dviveda Ganga (of Gujarāt); and in the Kāvya recension by Sāṃkara, to whose commentary a number of other works by his pupils, &c., attach themselves. As yet only the first kāṇḍa, with extracts from the commentaries, has been published, edited by myself. In the course of the next three years, however, the work will be printed in its entirety.²¹⁷ The Vīṇḍyād-Araṇyaka in the Kāvya recension has been edited by Poley, and recently by Roer, together with Sāṃkara's commentary and a gloss thereon.²¹⁸

I now turn to the Sūtras of the White Yajus. The first of these, the Śrauta-Sūtra of Kātyāyana, consists of twenty-six adhyāyas, which on the whole strictly observe the order of the Brāhmaṇa. The first eighteen correspond to its first nine kāṇḍas; the Sautrāmaṇī is treated of in the nineteenth, the horse sacrifice in the twentieth adhyāya; the twenty-first contains the human, universal, and Manes sacrifices. The next three adhyāyas refer, as before stated (p. 80), to the ceremonial of the Sānveda, to its several ekādhas, ahuṇas, and tātratas; yet they rather specify these in the form of lists than present, as the other adhyāyas do, a clear picture of the whole sacrificial proceedings. The twenty-fifth adhyāya treats of the prāyahschittas, or expiatory ceremonies, corresponding to the first part of the twelfth kāṇḍa; and lastly, the twenty-sixth adhyāya contains the pravargya sacrifice, corresponding to the first part of the fourteenth kāṇḍa.—Only a few teachers are cited by name, and among these are two belonging to authors of Sūtras of the Black Yajus, viz., Laugākshi and Bhāradvāja; besides whom, only Jātukarṇya, Vātaya, Bādari, Kāśa-

²¹⁶ And in very bad manuscripts.
²¹⁷ The last fasciculus was published in 1855. A translation of the first book, and also of some legends specially mentioned above, is printed in vol. 1. of my Indische Streifen (1868).
²¹⁸ Roer's translation (1866) includes the commentary of the first adhyāya; he also gives several extracts from it in the subsequent chapters.
kṛitani, and Kārshṇājīni are named. We meet with the three last of these elsewhere only¹⁴⁹ in the Vedānta-Sūtra of Bādarāyaṇa, Bādari excepted, who appears also in the Mīmāṃsā-Sūtra of Jaimini. Vātsyāyaṇa is a name which occasionally occurs in the Vaiśṇas of the Śatapatha-Brahmana;¹⁵⁰ and the same applies to Jātukārṇya, who appears in the Vaiśṇa of the Madhu- and Yājnavalkya-kāṇḍas in the Kāṇḍa recension as a pupil of Āsurāyaṇa and of Yāska. (In the Mādhyamīnī recension, another teacher intervenes between the last-named and Jātukārṇya, viz., Bhrāradvāja.) He is also mentioned in the Aitareya-Āranyaka, and repeatedly in the Prātiśākhya-Sūtra of the White Yajus. Besides these, “eke” are frequently quoted, whereby reference is made to other Śākhās. One passage gives expression to a certain hostility towards the descendants of the daughter of Atri (the Hāleyas, Vāleyas, Kaudreyas, Saubhreyas, Vāmarathyas, Gopavanas); while the descendants of Atri himself are held in especial honour. A similar hostility is exhibited in other passages towards the descendants of Kanva, Kaśyapa, and Kautsa; yet these three words, according to the commentaries, may also be taken as appellatives, kaṇva as “deaf,” kaśyapa as “having black teeth” (śvāvadanta), and kautsa as “doing blamable things.” The first adhyāya is of peculiar interest, as it gives the paribhāṣas, or general rules for the sacrificial ceremonial. Otherwise this work, being entirely based upon the Brāhmaṇa, and therefore in no way an independent production, contains but few data throwing light upon its probable age. Amongst such we may reckon in particular the circumstance that the word viṣaya, “conquest,” sc. of the

¹⁴⁹ Kāraṣṭriya appears as a grammatical also; he is possibly even earlier than Pāṇini; see I. Sc., xiii. 308, 413. On a Vedic commentator Kāraṣṭriya, see above, pp. 42, 91.

¹⁵⁰ In addition to this there is quoted in ix. 5. 1. 62 the opinion of a teacher bearing this name; a Vātasa is mentioned in the Aitar. Āraṇyaka and Śākhā. Āraṇyaka.

* The use of maṃṣi, xx. 7. 1, to denote 101, may also be instanced as pointing to later times; it belongs to the same class as agni = 3, dhāra = 11, &c. [This is wrong; a little before, in xx. 5. 16, mention is made of 101 maṃṣi, and in xx. 7. 1 we have simply a reference back to this. We might rather cite gāvyatraśiṣṭampana, &c., xx. 11. 21, ff., in the sense of 24, &c., but there is this material difference from the later use, that it is not gāvyatraśiṣṭa alone which means 24, but gāvyatraśiṣṭampana.]
points of the compass,* is once used in the sense of "the points of the compass" themselves (xx. 4. 26), which evidently presupposes the custom of the dig-vijayas—probably also poetical descriptions of them (?). The adhyayas relating to the Sáman ceremonial (xxii.–xxiv.) are the richest in this kind of data. They treat, for instance, like the Sáma-Sútras, of the sacrifices on the Sarasvatí, and also of the Vyáya-sacrifices, at which we find the Mágadhádáśya brhmabandhu (xxii. 4. 22) occupying the same position as in Látyáyana.

The Kátyáyana-Sútra has had many commentators, as Yásgó, Pitribhúti, Kárká (quoted by Sáyaña, and therefore prior to him), Bhártríyajna, Sír-Ananta, Devayáni, or Yájnikadeva), and Mahádeva. The works of the third last, and that of Kárká are, however, the only ones that seem to have been preserved. The text, with extracts from these commentaries, will form the third part of my edition of the White Yajus.† To this Sútra a multitude

---

* See Lassen, J. A.K., i. 542. [According to the St. Petersburg Dictionary, the word in the above passage should only mean ‘gain, the thing conquered, booty,’ but a reference to locality is made certain by the parallel passage, Látyá, ix. 10. 17: vijátya us ‘mádhye yuñit (yo yasya deha vijátya sydt, as táṣya m. y.;) for the deva-vijayas, it is true, we do not gain anything by this passage.]

† This name must be read Yásgópá, see my edition, Introd., p. vii.

‡ A Dikáryántasaogóra Kárkódáasaká occurs in an inscription published by Dowson in Journal R. A. S., i. 283 (1865), of Sídastaka-sákin (Práántarāga), dated asuk. 380 (but of what era?).

[They are, however, incomplete, in part exceedingly so.] The earliest MS. hitherto known of the eváda of Yájnikadeva is dated asuk. 1639. I have given the names of these commentators in the order in which they are cited by one another; no doubt there were other commentators also preceding Yásgópá [Yásgópá]. In the Fort William Catalogue, under No. 742, a commentary by Mahádhara is mentioned, but I question provisionally the correctness of this statement. [The correct order is: Kárká, Pitribhúti, Yásgópá, Bhártríyajna. They are so cited by Ananta, who himself seems to have lived in the first half of the sixteenth century; provided he be really identical with the Sír-mádanantakáyachútomáyajín, or Mahádeva, the author of the Muhúrtamáda, mentions as his father; see my Catalogue of the Berlin MSS., No. 579. Deva on l. 10. 13 quotes a Nádyásapábbhávyá; might not Ananta’s son be his author?]
of Paddhatis (outlines), extracts, and similar works attach themselves, and also a large number of Parīśishṭas (supplements), which are all attributed to Kātyāyana, and have found many commentators. Of these, we must specially draw attention to the Nigama-Parīśishta, a kind of synonymic glossary to the White Yajus; and to the Pātravārdāhyāya, an enumeration of the different families of the Brahmins, with a view to the proper selection of the sacrificial priests, as well as for the regulation of the intermarriages forbidden or permissible among them. The Charana-vyāhā, an account of the schools belonging to the several Vedas, is of little value. Its statements may for the most part be correct, but it is extremely incomplete, and from beginning to end is evidently quite a modern compilation.

The Sūtra of Vaijavāna, to which I occasionally find allusion in the commentaries on the Kātyāya-Sūtra, I am inclined to class among the Sūtras of the White Yajus, as I do not meet with this name anywhere else except in the Vānās of the Śatap. Br. Here we have both a Vaijavāpa and a Vaijavāpāyana, both appearing among the most recent members of the lists (in the Kānya recension I find only the latter, and he is here separated by five steps only from Yāska). A Grihya-Sūtra of this name is also cited.

The Kātyāya Grihya-Sūtra, in three kāndas, is attributed to Pāraskara, from whom a school of the White

nymous epitoa (sepākshiptasāra) of Deva, the MS. of which dates from samvat 1629. None of these commentaries is complete.

* By Gādārā, Hariharamāra, Rāpūtabhūtī, Gangādharā, &c.

† Printed, but unfortunately from a very bad codex, in my Catalogue of the Berlin MSS., pp. 54-62. [See I. St., x. 88, ff.]

184 Edited in J. St., iii. 247-283 (1854); see also Müller, A. S. L., p. 368, ff., and Rājendra Līla Mītra in the preface to his translation of the Chāndogopyānished, p. 3. The enumerations of the Vedic schools in the Vāishu-Purāṇa, iii. 4, and especially in the Vāyu-Purāṇa, chap. ix. (see Aufricht's Catalogus, p. 54, ff.), contain by far richer material. If all these schools actually existed—but there is certainly a great deal of mere error and embellishment in these statements—then, in truth, lamentably little has been left to us! 185 See Stenzler's account of its contents in Z. D. M. G., viii. (1855), and his essay on the aryakāmya (Pār., i. 8, Breslau, 1855).—The sections on marriage ceremonial have been published by Haas, I. St., v. 283, ff., whilst the sections on the śākaśram have been edited by Speijer (1872), together with critical variants (pp. 17-23) to the MS. of the whole text which was used by Stenzler.
Yajus also (according to the Charanavvyuha) derived its name. The word Pàraskara is used as a sanyâd, or proper name—but, according to the gagna, to denote a district—in the Sûtra of Pàñini; but I am unable to trace it in Vedic literature. To this Grihya-Sûtra there are still extant a Paddhati by Vásudeva, a commentary by Jayarâma, and above all a most excellent commentary by Râmakrishna under the title of Samâkára-ganapati, which ranks above all similar works from its abundant quotations and its very detailed and exhaustive handling of the various subjects. In the introduction, which deals with the Veda in general and the Yajurveda in particular, Râmakrishna declares that the Kànya school is the best of those belonging to the Yajus. Under the name of Pâraskara there exists also a Smrîti-Sâstra, which is in all probability based upon this Grihya-Sûtra. Among the remaining Smrîti-Sastras, too, there are a considerable number whose names are connected with those of teachers of the White Yajus; for instance, Yàjnavalkya, whose posteriority to Manu quite corresponds to the posteriority of the White Yajus to the Black Yajus—and no doubt also to that of the Kàtiyâ-Sûtra to the Mânava-Sûtra;—further, Kàtyâyana (whose work, however, as we saw, connects itself with the Sàmaveda), Kànya, Gautama, Sàndilya, Jâbali, and Parasara. The last two names appear among the schools of the White Yajus specific in the Charanavvyuha, and we also find members of their families named in the Vânas of the Satapatha-Brâhma, where the family of the Parasares is particularly often represented.*

The Pràtiśâkhya-Sûtra of the White Yajus as well as its Anukramani, names at its close Kâtyâyana as its author. In the body of the work there is mention, first, of three grammarians, whom we also find cited in the Pràtiśâkhyas of the Rik, in Yàska, and in Pànini, viz., Sàkaṭayana, Sàkalya, and Gârgya; next, of Kâtyapa, likewise mentioned by Pànini; and, lastly, of Dàlbhya, Jàtukarnya, Saunaka (the author of the Rik-Prâtiśâkhyas?), Aupsâvi,

* [See J. St., i. 156.] Pànini, iv. 3, 110 (a rule which possibly does not belong to him), attributes to a Pàrâsarya a Bhikshu-Sûtra, i.e., a compendium for religious mendhi-
Kāṇva, and the Mādhyamindas. The distinction in i. 18, 19 between vedas and ṛṣaṇyāya, i.e., works in bhāṣā,—which corresponds to the use of the latter word in Pāṇini,—has already been mentioned (p. 57). The first of the eight adhyāyas contains the samājītas and paribhāṣās, i.e., technical terms* and general preliminary remarks. The second adhyāya treats of the accent; the third, fourth, and fifth of samskāra, i.e., of loss, addition, alteration, and constancy of the letters with reference to the laws of euphony; the sixth of the accent of the verb in the sentence, &c.; the eighth contains a table of the vowels and consonants, lays down rules on the manner of reading (svādhīṣṭa), and gives a division of words corresponding to that of Yāska. Here, too, several ślokas are quoted referring to the deities of the letters and words, so that I am almost inclined to consider this last adhyāya (which is, moreover, strictly speaking, contained in the first) as a later addition.† We have an excellent commentary on this work by Uvāṭa, who has been repeatedly mentioned, under the title of Mātrimodaka.157

The Anukramāṇi of Kātyāyana contains, in the first place, in the first four adhyāyas (down to iv. 9), an index of the authors, deities, and metres of the several suklāmī yajūśās “White Yajus-formulas” contained in the “Mādhyaṁdineśas Vājasaneyake Yajusvadāmadnye sarve [?] sakhiie saśubkriye,” which the saint Yājnavalkya received from Vivasvant, the sun-god. For their viṣṇyoga, or liturgical use, we are referred to the Kalpakāra. As regards the names of authors here mentioned, there is much to be remarked. The authors given for the rīchas usually agree with those assigned to the same verses in the Rig-anukramaṇi; there are, however, many exceptions to this. Very often the particular name appears (as is also the case in

---

* Among them tīṁ, kṛit, tadātha, and uṇadā, terms quite agreeing with Pāṇini’s terminology.
136 Rather: ‘reciting,’ because here too we must dismiss all ideas of writing and reading.
† In that case the mention of the Mādhyamindas would go for nothing.
157 In connection with my edition of this Pratiśākhya, text and translation, with critical introduction and explanatory notes, in I. St., iv. 65-160, 177-334, Goldstücker in his Pāṇini, pp. 186-207, started a special controversy, in which inter alia he attempts in particular to show that the author of this work is identical with the author of the sūtras to Pāṇini; see my detailed rejoinder in I. St., v. 91-124.
the R̄g-anukramaṇi) to be borrowed from some word occurring in the verse. In the case where a passage is repeated elsewhere, as very often happens, it is frequently assigned to an author different from the one to whom it had previously been attributed. Many of the Rishis here mentioned do not occur among those of the R̄g, and belong to a later stage than these; among them are several even of the teachers mentioned in the Śatapatha-Bṛāhmaṇa. The closing part of the fourth adhyāya* contains the dedication of the verses to be recited at particular ceremonies to their respective Rishis, deities, and metres, together with other similar mystical distributions. Lastly, the fifth adhyāya gives a short analysis of the metres which occur. In the excellent but unfortunately not altogether complete Paddhati of Śrīhala to this Anukramaṇi we find the liturgical use of each individual verse also given in detail.

The Yajus recension of the three works called Vedāṅgas, viz., Śikṣā, Chhandas, and Jyotisha, has already been discussed (p. 60).†

We come now to the Atharvaveda.

The Samhitā of the Atharvaveda contains in twenty kāṇḍas 158 and thirty-eight prapāṭhakas nearly 760 hymns and about 6000 verses. Besides the division into prapāṭhakas, another into anusūdkas is given, of which there are

* Published together with the fifth adhyāya, and the beginning of the work, in my edition of the Vājasaneyi-Samhitā, introduction, pp. lv.—lvi.
† For particulars I refer to my Catalogue of the Berlin MSS., pp. 96—100 (and to my editions, already mentioned, of these three tracts).

158 This division of the Ath. S. into twenty books is attested for the period of the author of the saṃhitās, and also by the Gopatha-Bṛāhmaṇa I. 8; see I. St., xiii. 433; whereas both the Ath. S. itself (19, 22, 23) and the Ath. Par. 48. 4–6 still contain the direct intimation that it formerly consisted of sixteen books only; see I. St., iv. 432–434.
some ninety. The division into parvams, mentioned in the thirteenth book of the Satapatha-Bráhmaṇa, does not appear in the manuscripts; neither do they state to what school the existing text belongs. As, however, in one of the Parisイラshतas to be mentioned hereafter (the seventh), the richas belonging to the ceremony there in question are quoted as Paippaládá mantráḥ, it is at least certain that there was a Śamhitá belonging to the Paippaládá school, and possibly this may be the Śamhitá now extant. Its contents and principle of division are at present unknown in their details. We only know generally that “it principally contains formulas intended to protect against the baneful influences of the divine powers, against diseases and noxious animals; cursings of enemies, invocations of healing herbs; together with formulas for all manner of occurrences in every-day life, prayers for protection on journeys, luck in gaming, and the like” — all matters for which analogies enough are to be found in the hymns of the Rik-Śamhitá. But in the Rik the instances are both less numerous, and, as already remarked in the introduction (p. 11), they are handled in an entirely different manner, although at the same time a not inconsiderable portion of these songs reappears directly in the Rik, particularly in the tenth mandala. As to the ceremonial for which the hymns of the Atharvan were used, what corre-

109 According to a tract recently published by Roth, Des Atharvavedas in Kashmir (1875), this is not the case; the extant Śamhitá seems rather to belong to the school of the Śaunakas, whilst the Paippaládá-Śamhitá has come down to us in a second recension, still preserved in Kashmir.

109 The arrangement in books i.—vii. is according to the number of verses in the different pieces; these have, on an average, four verses in book i., five in ii., six in iii., seven in iv., eight to eighteen in v., three in vi., and only one in vii. Books viii.—xiii. contain longer pieces. As to the contents, they are indiscriminately mixed up. Books xiv.—xvii., on the contrary, have all a uniform subject-matter; xiv. treats of marriage, xv. of the glorification of Vṛjya, xvi., xvii. of certain conjurations, xviii. of burial and the festival of the Manes. Book xix. is a mixture of supplementary pieces, part of its text being in a rather corrupt condition; book xx. contains,—with one peculiar exception, the so-called kutsāparīkṣa,—only complete hymns addressed to Indra, which are borrowed directly and without change from the Rigveda. Neither of these two last books is noticed in the Atharva-Prátiṣṭhākhyā (see note 167), and therefore they did not belong to the original text at the time of this work.

* Of the stars, too, i.e., of the lunar asterisms.

+ See Roth, Zur Litt. und Gesch des Weda, p. 12.
ATHARVA-SAMHITA.

sponds to it in the other Vedas is found, not in the Śrauta-Sūtras, but with few exceptions in the Grihya-Sūtras only; and it appears therefore (as I have likewise already remarked) that this ceremonial in its origin belonged rather to the people proper than to the families of priests. As in the Śaṅkīvēśa-Brāhmaṇa and in the Sāma-Sūtras we actually meet with a case (see p. 78) where an imprecatory ceremony is borrowed from the Vṛātinás, or Aryan who had not adopted the Brahmanical organisation, we may further reasonably conjecture that this was not a solitary instance; and thus the view naturally presents itself that, though the Atharva-Samhitā originated for the most part in the Brahmanical period, yet songs and formulae may also have been incorporated into it which properly belonged to these unbrahmanical Aryans of the west.* And as a matter of fact, a very peculiar relation to these tribes is unmistakably revealed in the fifteenth kṣaṇa, where the Supreme Being is expressly called by the name of Vṛātya, 141 and is at the same time associated with the attributes given in the Sāmaveda as characteristics of the Vṛātyas. In the same way, too, we find this word Vṛātya employed in the Atharva-Upanishads in the sense of "pure in himself" to denote the Supreme Being. The mention of the māgadhā in the Vṛātya-book, and the possibility that this word may refer to anti-brahmanical Buddhist teachers, have already been discussed (p. 112). In a passage communicated by Roth, op. c. p. 38, special, and hostile, notice is taken of the Aṅgas and Magadhas in the East, as well as of the Gandhāris, Mājavants, Śūdras, Mahāvīrīshas, and Valhikas in the North-West, between which tribes therefore the Brahmanical district was apparently shut in at the time of the composition of the song in question. Intercourse with the West appears to have been more active than with the East, five of the races settled in the West being mentioned, and two only of those belonging to the

* In the Vīshṇu-Purāṇa the Sāndhavas, Sāndhavāyanas are mentioned as a school of the Atharvan.

141 This explanation of the contents of this book and of the word vṛātya is based upon its employment in the Prāśnopanishad 2, 7, and in the Chālikopanishad, v. 11 (see I. St., i. 445, 446, ix. 15, 16). According to Roth, on the contrary (see above p. 112, note), the purpose of the book is rather "the idealising of the devout vagrant or mendicant (parivṛttika, &c.)."
East. In time it will certainly be possible, in the Atharva-
Samhitā also, to distinguish between pieces that are older
and pieces that are more modern, although upon the whole
geographical data are of rare occurrence. Its language
exhibits many very peculiar forms of words, often in a
very antique although prakritized shape. It contains,
in fact, a mass of words used by the people, which from
lack of occasion found no place in the other branches of
the literature. The enumeration of the lunar asterisms in
the nineteenth kānda begins with kṛittikā, just as in the Tai-
tirya-Samhitā, but otherwise it deviates considerably from
the latter, and gives for the most part the forms of the
names used in later times. 162 No direct determination of
date, however, can be gathered from it, as Colebrooke ima-
gined. Of special interest is the mention of the Asura
Krishṇa * Kesin, from the slaying of whom Krishṇa (Aṅgi-
rasa?, Devakīputra) receives the epithets of Kesīhan, Kesī-
sūdana in the Epic and in the Purāṇas. In those hymns
which appear also in the Rīk-Samhitā (mostly in its last
maṇḍala), the variations are often very considerable, and
these readings seem for the most part equally warranted
with those of the Rīk. There are also many points of
contact with the Yajus.

The earliest mention of the Atharva-songs occurs under
the two names “Atharvaṇas” and “Aṅgirasas,” names
which belong to the two most ancient Rishi-families, or to
the common ancestors of the Indo-Aryans and the Persa-
Aryans, and which are probably only given to these songs
in order to lend all the greater authority and holiness to
the incantations, &c., contained in them.† They are also
often specially connected with the ancient family of the
Bhrigus. 163 Whether we have to take the “Athar-

162 The piece in question proves, on special grounds, to be a later sup-
plement; see J. St., iv. 433, n.
* An Asura Krishṇa we find even
in the Rīk-Samhitā, and he plays a
prominent part in the Buddhist
legends (in which he seems to be
identified with the Krishṇa of the
epic (n).
† See J. St., i. 295, ff. That these
names indicate any Persa-Aryan in-
fluence is not to be thought of;
and if, according to the Bhavishya-
Purāṇa (Wilson in Reinaud’s Mèm.
sur l’Inde, p. 394), the Parsa (Magas)
have four Vedas, the Veda (I Yas-
nan), Viśvavada (Viśpered), Viḍut
(Vendid), and Aṅgiras, this is a
purely Indian view, though indeed
very remarkable.
163 See my essay Zwei vedische
Texte über Ominia und Portenta, pp
346-348.
vānas” in the thirtieth book of the Vāj. Śamhitā as Atharvan-songs is not yet certain; but for the period to which the eleventh, thirteenth, and fourteenth books of the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, as well as the Chhāndogypa- nishad and the Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka (ii. and viii.), belong, the existence of the Atharvan-songs and of the Atharvaveda is fully established by the mention of them in these works. The thirteenth book of the Śatapatha- Brāhmaṇa even mentions a division into parvans, which, as already remarked, no longer appears in the manuscripts. In the eighth book of the Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka, the adesa, i.e., the Brāhmaṇa, is inserted between the three other Vedas and the “Atharvāṅgirasas.” Besides these notices, I find the Atharvaveda, or more precisely the “Atharvanikas,” only mentioned in the Nīdāna-Śūtra of the Sāmaveda (and in Pāṇini). The names, too, which belong to the schools of the Atharvaveda appear nowhere in Vedic literature, with the exception perhaps of Kauśika; still, this patronymic does not by any means involve a special reference to the Atharvan. Another name, which is, however, only applied to the Atharvaveda in the later Atharvan-writings themselves, viz., in the Pārīśīṣṭas, is “Brāhma-veda.” This is explained by the circumstance that it claims to be the Veda for the chief sacrificial priest, the Brahman, while the other Vedas are represented as those of his assistants only, the Hotar, Udgātar, and Adhvaryu.

* Corresponding to the sākras, amandāras, and dasata of the Rik, Yajus, and Sāman respectively.

† Members of the family of the Atharvans are now and then mentioned; thus especially Dāhīyaṇab Ásth, Kahaśdha Ásth., whom the Vāishu-Puṇāya designates as a pupil of Sumantu (the latter we met in the Gṛhya-Śūtras of the Rik, see above, p. 57), and others.

‡ It seems that even in later times the claim of the Atharvan to rank as Veda was disputed. Yājnavalkya (i. 101) mentions the two separately, vṛddhārva; though in another passage (i. 44) the “Atharvāṅgirasas” occur along with Rik, Sāman, and Yajus. In Manus’s Code we only once find the śrutīr aṭhavāṅgirasā, as magic formulas; in the Rāmāyana likewise once ii. 26. 20 (Gorr.) the menstrā cāṭhārvaṁ (the latter passage I overlooked in J. St., i, 297). [In Patanjali’s Mahābhāṣya, however, the Atharvan is cited at the head of the Vedas (as in the Rig-Gṛhya, see above, p. 58), occasionally even as their only representative; see J. St., xiii, 431-32.]

184 This explanation of the name, though the traditional one, is yet very likely erroneous; by Brahma-veda (a name which is first mentioned in the Sāṅkh. Gṛhya, i. 16) we have rather to understand “the Veda of brahmaṇa,” of prayers, i.e., here in the narrower sense of “incantations.” (St. Petersbourg Dict.)
—a claim which has probably no other foundation than the circumstance, cleverly turned to account, that there was, in fact, no particular Veda for the Brähman, who was bound to know all three, as is expressly required in the Kaushitaki-Brāhmaṇa (see I. St., ii. 305). Now the weaker these pretensions are, the more strongly are they put forward in the Atharvan-writings, which indeed display a very great animosity to the other Vedas. Towards one another, too, they show a hostile enough spirit; for instance, one of the Pariśisṭhas considers a Bhārgava, Paippalāda, and Śaunaka alone worthy to act as priest to the king,* while a Mauda or Jalada as purohitā would only bring misfortune.

The Atharva-Samhitā also, it seems, was commented upon by Śāyaṇa. Manuscripts of it are comparatively rare on the Continent. Most of them are distinguished by a peculiar mode of accentuation.† A piece of the Samhitā of some length has been made known to us in text and translation by Aufrecht (I. St., i. 121-140); besides this, only some fragments have been published.‡

The Brāhmaṇa-stage is but very feebly represented in the Atharvaveda, viz., by the Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa, which, in the manuscript with which I am acquainted (E. I. H., 2142), comprises a pūrva- and an uttara-portion, each containing five prapāṭhakas; the MS., however, breaks off with the beginning of a sixth (i.e., the eleventh) prapā-

* Yāsavalkya (i. 312) also requires that such an one be well versed acharādāgīreṇa.
† Dots are here used instead of lines, and the suvīra stands mostly beside, not above, the akṣara.
‡ The whole text has been edited long since (1855-56) by Roth and Whitney. The first two books have been translated by me in I. St., iv. 393-439, and xiii. 129-216, and the nuptial formulas contained in the fourteenth book, together with a great variety of love charms and similar formulas from the remaining books, ibid., v. 204-266. For the criticism of the text see Roth’s tracts, Ueber den Atharvaveda (1856), and Der Atharvaveda in Ka-Amir (1875). In the Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa (i. 29), and in Patanjali’s Mahābhāṣya (see I. St., xiii. 433; although, according to Burnell, Introd. to Vedaś.-Brāhmaṇa, p. xxii., the South Indian MSS. omit the quotation from the Atharvaveda), the beginning of the Samhitā is given otherwise than in our text, as it commences with i. 6, instead of i. 1.
It is similarly given by Bhāṣādkar, Indian Antiquary, iii. 132; and two MSS. in Haug’s possession actually begin the text in this manner; see Haug’s Brāhmaṇa und die Brāhmaṇen, p. 45.—Burnell (Introd. to Vedaś.-Br., p. xxi.) doubts whether the Ath. S. was commented by Śāyaṇa.
SUTRAS OF THE ATHARVAN.

In one of the Parásishṭás the work is stated to have originally contained 100 prapáthakas. The contents are entirely unknown to me. According to Colebrooke's remarks on the subject, Atharvan is here represented as a Prajápati who is appointed by Brahman as a Demiurge; and this is, in fact, the position which he occupies in the Paráshishṭas and some of the Upanishads. The division of the year into twelve (or thirteen) months consisting of 360 days, and of each day into thirty mukūrtas, which Colebrooke points out as remarkable, equally appears in the Bráhmaṇas of the Yajus, &c. 152

Departing from the order hitherto followed I will add here what I have to say about the Sátras of the Atharva-veda, as these are the only other writings which have reference to the Samhitá, whereas the remaining parts of the Atharvan-literature, corresponding to the Aranyakas of the other Vedas, have no reference to it whatever.

In the first place, I have to mention the Saunakiyá chatur-ādhyáyíka, a kind of Prátiśákhyá for the Atharva-Samhitá, in four ādhyáyas, which might possibly go back to the author of the Rik-Prátiśákhyá, who is also mentioned in the Prátiśákhyá of the White Yajus. The Saunakas are named in the Charanavyúha as a school of the Atharvan, and members of this school are repeatedly mentioned in the Upanishads. The work bears here and there a more generally grammatical character than is the case with the remaining Prátiśákhyás. Sáka-

152 M. Müller first gave us some information as to the Gopáthá-Brihmaná in his History of A. S. L., p. 445-455; and now the work itself has been published by Rájendra Lala Mitrá and Harachandra Vidyabhásha in the Bódh. Indica (1870-72). According to this it consists of eleven (i.e., 5 + 6) prapáthakas only. We do not discover in it any special relation to the Ath. S., apart from several references thereto under different names. The contents are a medley, to a large extent derived from other sources. The first half is essentially of speculative, cosmogonic import, and is particularly rich in legends, a good number of which appear in the same form as in the Sátpáthá-Brihmaná, xi. xii., and are therefore probably simply copied from it. The second half contains a brief exposition of a variety of points connected with the Śrauta ritual, specially adapted, as it seems, from the Aitára. Br. Very remarkable is the assumption in l. 28 of a deśapati, lord of evil (11), who at the beginning of the Dvarapara (-yuga) is supposed to have acted as ríštadeśa skádchá. This reminds us of, and doubtless rests upon, the Mára of the Budháñs.
tāyana and other granimatical teachers are mentioned. In the Berlin MS.—the only one as yet known—each rule is followed by its commentary. 127

An Anukramanī to the Atharva-Samhitā is also extant; it, however, specifies for the most part only divine beings, and seldom actual Rishis, as authors.

The Kausīka-Sūtra is the sole existing ritual Sūtra of the Atharvaveda, although I am acquainted with an Atharvāṇa-Grihya through quotations. 128 It consists of fourteen adhyāyas, and in the course of it the several doctrines are repeatedly ascribed to Kausīka. In the introduction it gives as its authorities the Mantras and the Brahmaṇas, and failing these the sampradāya; i.e., tradition, and in the body of the work the Brahmaṇa is likewise frequently appealed to (by iti br.); whether by this the Ga-patha-Brahmaṇa is intended I am unable to say. The style of the work is in general less concise than that of the other Sūtras, and more narrative. The contents are precisely those of a Grihya-Sūtra. The third adhyāya treats of the ceremonial for Nirṛiti (the goddess of misfortune); the fourth, gives maṇḍayarjanas, healing remedies; the sixth, &c., imprecations, magical spells; the tenth treats of marriage; the eleventh of the Manes-sacrifice; the thirteenth and fourteenth of expiatory ceremonies for various omens and portents (like the Adbhuta-Brahmaṇa of the Sāmaveda). 129

127 Of this Prātiśākhya also Whitney has given us an excellent edition in Journal Am. Or. Soc., viii. (1862), x. 156, ff. (1872, additional). See also my remarks in I. St., iv. 79-82. According to Whitney, this work takes no notice of the two last books of the existing Ath. text, which it otherwise follows closely; since therefore the Atharva-Samhitā in Patanjali’s time already comprised twenty books, we might from this directly infer the priority of the Saṇ. chat.; unless Patanjali’s statement refer not to our text at all, but rather to that of the Paippalāda school; see Roth, Der Atharvaveda in Kashmir, p. 15.—Bühler has discovered another quite different Ath. Prātiśākhya; see Monatsber. of the Berl. Acad. 1871, p. 77.

128 By which is doubtless meant just this Kausīka-Sūtra. A Srauta-Sūtra belonging to the Atharvaveda has recently come to light, under the name of Vaitāna-Sūtra; see Haug, J. St., ix. 176; Bühler, Cat. of MSS. from Gujardt, i. 190, and Monatsberichte of the Berl. Acad. 1871, p. 76; and some fuller accounts in Roth’s Atharvaveda in Kashmir, p. 22.

129 These two sections are published; with translation and notes, in my essay, Zwei vedische Texte über Omina und Portenta (1859); the section relating to marriage ceremonies is communicated in a paper by Haas, Uber die Heiratsgebräuche der ailen Inder in J. St., v. 373, ff.
To this Sūtra belong further five so-called Kalpas: the Nakshatra-Kalpa, an astrological compendium relating to the lunar mansions, in fifty ḫaṇḍikās; the Śānti-Kalpa, in twenty-five ḫaṇḍikās, which treats likewise of the adoration of the lunar mansions, and contains prayers addressed to them; the Viṭāna-Kalpa, the Śamhitā-Kalpa, and the Abhichāra-Kalpa. The Vishṇu-Purāṇa and the Chānapaṇḍya, to be presently mentioned, name, instead of the last, the Āṅgirasa-Kalpa. Further, seventy-four smaller Pariśishtas also belong to it, mostly composed in ślokas, and in the form of dialogues, like the Purāṇas. The contents are Grihya-subjects of various kinds; astrology, magic, and the doctrine concerning omens and portents are most largely represented. Some sections correspond almost literally to passages of a like nature in the astrological Samhitās. Among these Pariśishtas, there is also a Chānana-ṛṇaḥ, which states the number of the riḥas in the Atharva-Samhitā at 12,380, that of the paryayās (hymns) at 2000; but the number of the Kausīkodāni pariśishtāni only at 70. Of teachers who are mentioned the following are the chief: first, Brihaspati Atharvan, Bhāgavant Atharvan himself, Bhrigu, Bhārgava, Āṅgirasa, Āṅgirasa, Kāvyas (or Kavi) Uṣanas; then Saunaka, Nārada, Gautama, Kāmkāyana, Karmagha, Pippalāda, Māhāki, Garga, Gārgya, Vṛiddhagarga, Atreyas, Padmayoni, Krauseṭṭāki. We meet with many of these names again in the astrological literature proper.

I now turn to the most characteristic part of the literature of the Atharvan, viz., the Upaniṣads. Whilst the Upaniṣads κατ᾽ ἓξοχρυ so called, of the remaining Vedas all belong to the later, or even the latest, portions of these

---

170 An account of the contents of both texts is given in my second essay on the Nakshatras, pp. 390–393 (1862); Haug in I. St., ix. 174, mentions an Aranyaka-Jyotishā, different from the Nakshatras-Kalpa.
171 Haug, l. c., speaks of 72; amongst them is found a Nighantu, which is wanting in the Berlin MS. Compare the Nigama-Pariśishta of the White Yajur. — Texts of this kind are quoted even in the Mahābhāṣya; see I. St., xiii. 463.
172 One of the Pariśishtas relating to this subject has been communicated to me in I. St., x. 317, ff.; it is the fifty-first of the series. The statements found therein concerning the planets presuppose the existence of Greek influence; cf. ibid., p. 319, viii. 413.
Vedas, they at least observe a certain limit which they never transgress, that is to say, they keep within the range of inquiry into the nature of the Supreme Spirit, without serving sectarian purposes. The Atharvan Upanishads, on the contrary, come down as far as the time of the Puranas, and in their final phases they distinctly enter the lists in behalf of sectarian views. Their number is as yet undetermined. Usually only fifty-two are enumerated. But as among these there are several which are of quite modern date, I do not see why we should separate these fifty-two Upanishads from the remaining similar tracts which, although not contained in the usual list, nevertheless call themselves Upanishads, or Atharvopani-

shads; more especially as this list varies in part according to the different works where it is found, and as the manuscripts mix up these fifty-two with the remaining Upanishads indiscriminately. Indeed, with regard to the Upanishad literature we have this peculiar state of things, that it may extend down to very recent times, and consequently the number of writings to be reckoned as belonging to it is very considerable. Two years ago, in the second part of the Indische Studien, I stated the number at ninety-five, including the Upanishads contained in the older Vedas.* The researches instituted by Walter Elliot in Masulipatam among the Telingana Brahmans on this subject have, however, as Dr. Roer writes to me, yielded the result that among these Brahmans there are

* This number is wrong; it ought to be ninety-three. I there counted the Anandavalli and Burjigavalli twice, first among the twenty-three Atharvopanishads omitted by Anquetil, and then among the nine Upanishads borrowed from the other Vedas which are found in his work. The number would further have to be reduced to ninety-two, since I cite Colebrooke’s Amrîtavindu and Anquetil’s Amṛtāntāda as distinct Upanishads, whereas in point of fact they are identical; but then, on the other hand, two Upanishads identified by me ought to be kept distinct, viz., Colebrooke’s Prāṇāṅgikotra and Anquetil’s Prāṇa, the latter (Prāṇa-

vopanishad) being different from the former. — The number now here finally arrived at—ninety-six—is obtained (1) by the addition of six new Upanishads, viz., the Bhālavī-Upanishad, the Sampatopa, the second Mahopanishad, and three of the Upanishads contained in the Atharvasirīs (Gana- pathi, Sārya, Devi); (2) by the omission of two, the Rudopanishad and the Atharvavyas Rudopanishad, which are possibly identical with others of those cited; and (3) by counting the Mahābhāṣyopanishad as only one, whereas Colebrooke counts it as two.
123 Upanishads actually extant; and if we include those which they do not possess, but which are contained in my list just referred to, the total is raised to 147.* A list of these 123 is given in two of them, viz., in the Mahávákyamuktávalí and in the Muktikopanishad, and is exactly the same in both. According to the statement given above, there must be among these 123 fifty-two† in all which are wanting in my own list, and these include the two names just mentioned.—A Persian translation made in 1656 of fifty Upanishads is extant in Anquetil du Perron’s Latin rendering.

If now we attempt to classify the Upanishads so far known, the most ancient naturally are those (I–12) which are found in the three older Vedas only;‡ I have already remarked that these never pursue sectarian aims. A seeming—but only a seeming—exception to this is the Satarudriya; for although the work has in fact been used for sectarian purposes, it had originally quite a different significance, which had nothing to do with the misapplication of it afterwards made; originally, indeed, it was not an Upanishad at all.§ A real exception, however, is the Svetásvataraopanishad (13), which is in any case wrongly classed with the Black Yajus; it is only from its having incorporated many passages of the latter that it has been foisted in here. It belongs to about the same rank and date as the Kaivalyopanishad. Nor can the Maitriyapa-Upanishad (14) reasonably claim to be ranked with the Black

* According to the previous note, only 145.
† According to last note but one, only fifty. (In the list published by W. Elliot of the Upanishads in the Muktikopan, see Journal As. Soc. Beng., 1851, p. 607, ff., 108 names are directly cited (and of these 98 are analysed singly in Taylor’s Catalogue (1860) of the Oriental MSS. of Fort St. George, ii. 457–474). But to these other names have to be added which are there omitted; see I. St., iii. 324–326. The alphabetical list published by M. Müller in Z. D. M. G., xix. 137–158 (1865), brings the number up to 140 (170, Burnell, Indian Antiquary, ii. 267): Since then many new names have been brought to our knowledge by the Catalogues of MSS. published by Burnell, Bühler, Kielhorn, Rajendra Lal Mitra, Hang (Brahman und die Brahmanen, pp. 29–31), &c.; so that at present I count 235 Upanishads, many of which, however, are probably identical with others, as in many cases the names alone are at present known to us.)
‡ Namely, Aláreya, Kaushtakal, Vyshkala, Chundogya, Satarudriya, Sisahávali or Taiti. Sampitopanishad, Chhádageya (?), Tadera, Sivasamkala, Purushashútra, Isi, Vrihad-Aranyaka.
§ See on this I. St., ii. 14–47.
Yajus; it belongs rather, like the Śvetāsvatara-panishad, only to the Yoga period. Still it does not, at least in the part known to me, pursue any sectarian aim (see pp. 96–99).

Apart from the two last-named Upanishads, the transition to the Atharvapanishads is formed on the one hand by those Upanishads which are found in one of the other three Vedas, as well as in a somewhat modified form in an Atharvan-recension, and on the other hand by those Upanishads of which the Atharvan-recension is the only one extant, although they may have formerly existed in the other Vedas as well. Of the latter we have only one instance, the Kāṭha-ūpanishad (15, 16); of the former, on the contrary, there are several instances (17–20), viz., Kena (from the Sāma-veda), Bhriguvali, Anandavali, and Brhdāndarāyaṇa (Taitt. Ār., viii.–ix.).

The Atharvapanishads, which are also distinguished externally by the fact that they are mostly composed in verse, may themselves be divided into three distinct classes, which in their beginnings follow the earlier Upanishads with about equal closeness. Those of the first class continue directly to investigate the nature of Ātman, or the Supreme Spirit; those of the second deal with the subject of absorption (yoga) in meditation thereon, and give the means whereby, and the stages in which, men may even in this world attain complete union with Ātman; and lastly, those of the third class substitute for Ātman some one of the many forms under which Śiva and Vishnu, the two principal gods, were in the course of time worshipped.

Before proceeding to discuss these three classes in their proper order, I have to make some observations on the Atharvan-recensions of those Upanishads which either belong at the same time to the other Vedas also, or at any rate originally did so.

The Atharvan-text of the Kena-upanishad, in the first place, differs but very little from its Sāma-text. The reason why this Upanishad has been incorporated into the Atharvan collection seems to be the fact that Umā Haimavati is here (and for the first time) mentioned, as she

---

172 In the remaining parts also there is nothing of the kind to be found.
was probably understood in the sense of the Śiva sects. With the Atharvan-text both of the Ānandavallī and of the Bhṛiguvalī * I am unacquainted. Of the Brihadarāṣṭrapīṭopaṃ, † also, which corresponds to the Nārāyanīyopaṃ of the Taitt. Āraṇyaka, only a few data are known to me; these, however, sufficiently show that the more ancient and obscure forms have here throughout been replaced by the corresponding later and regular ones. †—The two Kaṭhavallīs, for the most part in metrical form, are extant in the Atharvan-text only. § The second is nothing but a supplement to the first, consisting as it does almost exclusively of quotations from the Vedas, intended to substantiate more fully the doctrines there set forth. The first is based upon a legend (see pp. 92, 93) related in the Taitt. Brāhmaṇa [iii. 11. 8]. Nachiketas, the son of Āruṇi, ‡ asks Death for a solution of his doubt whether man exists after death or not. After much reluctance, and after holding out enticements of all kinds, which Nachiketas withstands, Death at length initiates him into the mystery of existence. Life and death, he says, are but two different phases of development; true wisdom consists in the perception of identity with the Supreme Spirit, whereby men are elevated above life and death. The exposition in this first part is really impressive: the diction, too, is for the most part antique. A few passages, which do not harmonise at all with the remainder, seem either to have been inserted at a later time, or else, on the contrary, to have been retained

* Two lists of the Atharvopaniṣads in Chambers’s Collection (see my Catalogue, p. 95) cite after these two vallīs (39, 40), also Madhyavallī and an utteravallī (41, 42)!
† By Colebrooke it is reckoned as two Upanishads.
‡ Thus we have vismaṣyajī instead of vya-chā-sarja; Kanyākumārdī instead of orī; Kṛtydṛṣyājī instead of vyāndī, &c.
§ See J. St., ii. 195, sq., where the various translations and editions are cited. Since then this Upanishad has appeared in a new edition, with Śrāvpaka’s commentary, in the Itib. Indic. vol. viii., edited by Dr. Roer [and translated in vol. xv.].

† Two other names, which are given to the father of Nachiketas, viz., Audiddalaki and Vaiśasravaṇa, conflict with the usual accounts. Vaiśasravaṇa appears also in the passage above referred to of the Taittiriya-Brāhmaṇa; whether Audiddalaki does so likewise I am unable to say. [Audiddalaki is wanting in the T. Br., as also the whole passage itself.] Benfey (in the Göttinger gelehrte Anzeigen, January 1852, p. 129) suggests that we should refer Audiddalaki Āruṇi to Nachiketas; but the incompatibility of the two names is not thereby removed. Āruṇi is Uddalaka, and Audiddalaki is Āruṇeya,
from a former exposition drawn up more for a liturgical purpose. Its polemics against those holding different opinions are very sharp and bitter. They are directed against tarka, "doubt," by which the Sāmkhyas and Baudhāyas are here probably intended. The sacredness of the word om as the expression for the eternal position of things is very specially emphasised, a thing which has not occurred before in the same way. The gradation of the primeval principles (in iii. 10, 11) exactly corresponds to the system of the deistical Yoga, whereas otherwise the exposition bears a purely Vedāntic character.

Of the Atharvopanishads proper the Mundaka- and Praśna-Upanishads (21, 22) connect themselves most closely with the Upanishads of the older Vedas and with the Vedānta doctrine;174 indeed, in the Vedānta-Sūtra of Bādarāyaṇa reference is made to them quite as often as to these others. The Mundaka-Upanishad, mostly in verse, and so called because it "shears" away, or frees from, all error, is very like the Kāthakop. with regard to doctrine and style; it has, in fact, several passages in common with it. At the outset it announces itself as an almost direct revelation of Brahman himself. For Aṅgiras, who communicates it to Śaunaka, has obtained it from Bhāradvājā Satyavāna, and the latter again from Aṅgirā, the pupil of Atharvaṇ, to whom it was revealed by Brah-

---

174 The list of the Atharvopani-
shads begins, as a rule, with the Mundakopanishad; and, according to the statements in Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa’s scholium on the smaller Ath.
Upanishads now being edited (since 1872) in the Bibl. Indica by Rāmac-
mayā Tarkaratna, a settled order of these Upanishads must still have been in existence in the time of Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa, since he denotes the individual Upanishads as, e.g., the seventh, the eighth, &c., reckoning from the Mundaka. This order is occasionally ascribed by him to the Saunaka-school. Compare as to this the remarks of Colebrooke, Misc. Esq., i. 93, according to which the first fifteen Upanishads only would belong to the Saunaktiyas, and the following Up. to other Śākhās. But Nārāyaṇa, with whom, as regards the order of the first twenty-eight names, Colebrooke agrees in the main (from this point their state-
ments differ), also quotes the Saunaka-granthāvistarā for the Brahmad-
vindu No. 18, and the Śākhā Sāmakavartīdī for the Athopani-
shad No. 28, as authority for these numbers, or places, of the two Upa-
nishads. The Gopālānapaṇi, however, is marked by him as the forty-
sixth ‘Athara-Poippāla,’ and the Vāsudevopanishad as the forty-ninth ‘kakadragranthāgama;’ see Rājen-
dra Lāla Mitrā, Notices of Sanskrit MSS., i. 18 (1870).

* Aṅgirā is a name which occurs nowhere else.
man himself. Shortly afterwards, Vedic literature is opposed, as the inferior science, to speculation. The former is stated to consist of the four Vedas, and of the six Vedāṅgas, which are singly enumerated. Some manuscripts here insert mention of the itihāsa-purāṇa-nītya-māmāṇa-dharmāṇāstrāṇi; but this is evidently a later addition. Such additions are also found in other passages of this Upanishad in the manuscripts. This enumeration (here occurring for the first time) of the different Vedāṅgas is of itself sufficient to show that at that time the whole material of the Vedas had been systematically digested, and that out of it a new literature had arisen, which no longer belongs to the Vedic, but to the following period. We may further conclude from the mention of the Tretā in the course of the work that the Yuga-system also had already attained its final form. On the other hand, we here find the words kāli (the dark one) and kardīk (the terrible one) still reckoned among the seven tongues of fire, whereas in the time of the dramatic poet Bhavabhūti (eighth century A.D.) they are names of Durgā—the wife of Śiva, developed out of Agni (and Rudra)—who under these names was the object of a bloody sacrificial worship. Since evidently a considerable time is required for the transition from the former meaning to the latter, the Muṇḍakop. must be separated by a very wide interval from the date of Bhavabhūti,—a conclusion which follows besides from the circumstance that it is on several occasions turned to account in the Vedānta-Sūtra, and that it has been commented by Śaṅkara.—The Praėṇopaniṣadh, in prose, seems to be borrowed from an Atharva-Brāhmaṇa, viz., that of the Pippalāda-school. It contains the instruction by Pippalāda of six different teachers, amongst whom the following names are especially significant in regard to the date of the Upanishad: Kauśalya Āśvalāyana, Vaidārdbhī Bhārgava, and Kabandhin Kātyāyana. In the course of

* In the colophons, at least, it is once so described; by Śaṅkara, too, at the beginning of his commentary, it is called brāhmaṇa; although this proves but little, since with him all the Upanishads he comments pass a. śrutī and brāhmaṇa.—The name Pippalāda is probably to be traced to the conception found in the first verse of the Muṇḍaka i. 1 (taken from Rik sudg. i. 164. 20) [1]. The same verse recurs in the Śvetāvā- taropaniṣadh iv. 6 and in Nir xiv 30.
the work Hiranyanábha, a prince of the Kósálas, is also mentioned,—the same doubtless who is specially extolled in the Puráñas. As in the Muñḍakopan., so here also some interpolated words are found which betray themselves as such by the fact that they are passed over by Śámkara in his commentary. They refer to Atharvan himself, and to the half mátrá (mora), to which the word om, here appearing in its full glory, is entitled in addition to its three mors (a, u, m), and are evidently a later addition by some one who did not like to miss the mention of these two subjects in an Atharvapanishad, as in these they otherwise invariably occur. Both Muñḍaka and Praśna have been several times edited and translated, see I. St., I. 280, ff., 439, ff., again recently by Dr. Roer in vol. viii. of the Bibliotheca Indica together with Śámkara's commentary. The name of Pippaláda is borne by another Upanishad, the Garbha-Upanishad (23), which I add here for this reason, although in other respects this is not quite its proper place. Its contents differ from those of all the other Upanishads, and relate to the human body, to its formation as embryo and the various parts of which it is composed, and the number and weight of these. The whole is a commentary on a trísháta strophe prefixed to it, the words of which are passed in review singly and further remarks then subjoined. The mention of the names of the seven musical notes of the present day, as well as of the weights now in use (which are found besides in Varáha Mihira), brings us to a tolerably modern date; so also the use of Devadatta in the sense of Cátus. A few passages in which, among other things, mention is made, for instance, of Náráyána as Supreme Lord, and of the Sámkhya and Yoga as the means of attaining knowledge of him, reappear in the fourteenth book—supplementary one—of Yáska's Nirukti. Whether Śámkara expounded this Upanishad is as yet uncertain. It is translated in Ind. Stud., ii. 65–71. In the Brahmopanishad also (24), Pippaláda appears, here with the title bhagaván Áñgirás; he is thus identified with the latter, as the authority for the particular

---

172 Roer’s translation is published in vol. xvi. of the Bibl. Indica (1853).  
173 Edited with Náráyána’s commentary in the Bibliotheca Indica, 1872; in his introduction described as pañchahkáhanda ‘śrañmanda’ (read ‘śvānta’) Muñḍat Pippaládabhūvdh tathā.
doctrine here taught which he imparts to Śaunaka (mahāśāla), exactly as is the case in the Munḍakopanishad. There is, for the rest, a considerable difference between this Upanishad 177 and the Munḍaka and Praśna; it belongs more to the Yoga-Upanishads properly so called. It consists of two sections: the first, which is in prose, treats, in the first place, of the majesty of Atman; and later on, in its last portion, it alleges Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Rudra, and Akṣhara to be the four pādas (feet) of the nirvāṇam brahma; the first eleven of the nineteen verses of the second section discuss the subject of the Yogi being allowed to lay aside his yajnopavita, or sacred thread, as he stands in the most intimate relation to the sūtra, or mundane thread; the whole therefore amounts to a mere play upon words. The last eight verses are borrowed from the Śvetāsvatara-Upanishad, Munḍakopanishad, and similar Upanishads, and again describe the majesty of the One.—The Māṇḍūkyopanishad (25–28) is reckoned as consisting of four Upanishads, but only the prose portion of the first of these, which treats of the three and a half mātras of the word om, is to be looked upon as the real Māṇḍūkyopanishad, all the rest is the work of Gaudapāda, whose pupil Govinda was the teacher of Śaṅkara; it dates therefore from about the seventh century A.D. Similarly, there are two works by Śaṅkara himself specified among the Upanishads, viz., the Ṛtavajraśūti (29), in prose, and the Triṣṇītya (30), likewise in prose; both composed in a Vedānta sense. The former treats at the outset of what makes a Brāhmaṇa a Brāhmaṇa; it is not jati (birth), varna (colour), pāṇḍitṛya (learning); but the Brāhmaṇa (he who knows Brahmā) is alone a Brāhmaṇa.† Then it passes to the different definitions of moksha (liberation),

177 Edited with Śāṅkara's comm. in Bibl. Ind. 1873; in the introduction described as: cātāraśūtāṃśa śāstra; the two sections of the text seem to have been transposed in some of the MSS.

* As such, it has been commented on by Śaṅkara under the title dharmadīśa. For particulars see J. St., ii. 100–109. [Roer has published the entire Māṇḍūkyopanishad together with Śaṅkara's comm. in Bibl. Ind. vol. viii., also a translation of sect. 1 in vol. xv.]

† This portion has been used by a-Buddhist (Āṣāggaśa), almost literally, against the system of caste in general; in the tract of the same title which is given by Gildemeister, Bibl. St., Praef. p. vi. mot.; see also
stating the only correct one to be the perception of the oneness of jīva (the individual soul) and paramēśvara (the All-Soul), and lastly, distinctly rejecting all sects, it expounds the two highly important words tat (the Absolute) and teṣām (the Objective). The Tripūrī treats of the relation of Ātman to the world, and stands as fourth prakāraṇa in a series of seven little Vēdānta writings attributed to Śaṅkara.

The Sarvopanishatsūropanishad (31), in prose, may be considered as a kind of catechism of these doctrines; its purpose is to answer several queries prefixed to it as an introduction. The same is the case with the Nirālambopanishad (32), which, however, exhibits essentially the Yoga standpoint. The Ātmapanishad (33), in prose, contains an inquiry by Āṅgiras into the three factors (purusahās), the body, the soul, and the All-Soul. The Prāṇayānishotropanishad (34), in prose, points out the relation of the parts and functions of the body to those of the sacrifice, whence by implication it follows that the latter is unnecessary. At its conclusion it promises to him who reads this Upanishad the same reward as he receives who expires in Vārānasī, viz., deliverance from transmigration.

The Arśikopanishad (35) contains a dialogue on the nature of Ātman: between Viśvāmitra, Jamadagni, Bharadvāja, Gautama, and Vasisṭha, the last of whom, appealing to the opinion of "K'hak" (another MS. in Anquetil has "Kapī" = Kapila?), obtains the assent of the others.

Burnouf, Introd. à l'Hist. du Buddha. Ind., p. 215. [Text and translation see now in my essay Die Vajrásāch des Abhūtakās (1860). By Haug, Brahmān und die Brahmanen, p. 29, the Upanishad is described as adma-
vedaśādī.]

178 See my Catalogue of the Berlin MSS., p. 180. By Rađendra Līlā Mitra, however (Notices of Sanskrit MSS., i. 10, 11), a different text is cited as the ērāmāchaśkaraśaṅkara-śāstra śīrṣāti triṇyutrapanishad.

179 See L. St., i. 301; edited with Nārāyaṇa's comm. in Bibl. Ind. 1874; described in the introd. as Tūltiṣṭyāyaḥ sarvanishthādi śātra śaipītiśc chaturdāta (f).


* Translated in L. St., ii. 56, 57. [Text and Nārāyaṇa's comm. in Bibl. Ind. 1873, described in the introd. as ēkāntāśaṅkaraśāstra śīrṣāti ñānakaśāstra śīrṣāti.]

181 Text and Nārāyaṇa's comm. in Bibl. Ind. 1873; described in the introd. as ekāntaśaṅkaraśāstra; see Taylor, ii. 472. Rađendra L. M. i. 49. Burnouf, Catalogue, p. 63.

182 See L. St., ix. 48–52. The name of the Upanishad is not yet certain.
The second class of the Atharvopanishads, as above stated, is made up of those whose subject is Yoga, or absorption in Atman, the stages of this absorption, and the external means of attaining it. These last chiefly consist in the giving up of all earthly connections, and in the frequent repetition of the word om, which plays a most prominent part, and is itself therefore the subject of deep study. Yajnavalkya is repeatedly named in the Upanishads of this class as the teacher of the doctrines they set forth;* and indeed it would seem that we ought to look upon him as one of the chief promoters of the system of religious mendicancy so intimately associated with the Yoga-doctrine. Thus, in the Tārakopanishad (36) he instructs Bharadvaja as to the saving and sin-dispelling efficacy of the word om,183 and similarly in the Śākalyopanishad (37)* Śākalya as to true emancipation.184 The one, however, in which he stands out most prominently is the Jābdalo panishad (38), in prose, which, moreover, bears the name of a school of the White Yajus, although no doubt wrongly, as it must in any case be considered as merely an imitation of the Āraṇyaka of this Veda (see I. St., ii. 72-77). Still, it must have been composed before the Bādarāyaṇa-Sūtra, as several passages of it† seem to be given in the latter (unless these passages have been borrowed from a common source?). Of special importance with regard to the mode of life of the Paramāhansas, or religious mendicants, are also, in addition to the Upanishad just mentioned, the Kaṭhaṅkruti (39); Colebrooke gives the name incorrectly as Kaṭhaṅkruri), in prose, and the Arunikopanishad (40), likewise in prose;‡ both are to be

---

183 See I. St., ix. 46-48. * This name seems to result as the most probable one from comparison of the variants in Anquetil. 184 See I. St., ii. 170. † They presuppose the name Vārāṇaśa for Benares. [The text of the Jābdalo panishad with Nārāyaṇa's comm. appeared in Bibl. Ind. 1874; it is described in the introd. as, yatjñāt and ekakṣatra-dvitiyattam (the latter, however, is said of the Āranyaka-panishad also!); see also Burnell, p. 61, Taylor ii. 474, Rājendra L. M. i. 92 (Commentary by Śamkarāṇanda). There are, besides, quite a number of other Upanishads bearing the name of Jābdlo, viz., Bṛhadājñāt, Māhājñāt, Lāghu- jñāt, Bhūtā, Rudra, Rudrā-kahā]. ‡ Translated in I. St., ii. 176-181. [Text and Nārāyaṇa’s comm. in Bibl. Ind., 1872; described in the introd. as pāñcavaśī. There is also a commentary upon it by Śamkarāṇanda; see Rājendra L. M. i. 92.—The Kaṭhaṅkruti, also, is
regarded as supplements to the Āranyaka of the Black Yajus, as the Jābālopanishad is to that of the White Yajus. The Bhāltavi-Upanishad (41), also belongs to this class, to judge by quotations from it, and so does the Samavatārsviti (42); similarly the Samyūṣopanishad (43) and the Paramahāṃśopanishad (44), both in prose. The Haṃsopanishad (45) I have not yet met with; but from its name it probably also belongs to this place. The Āṣramopanishad (46), in prose, gives a classification of the four Indian orders—the Brahmachārins, Grihasthas, Vānaprasthas, and Parivrājakas. It is even quoted by Śaṃkara, and the names applied in it to the several classes are now obsolete. The Śrīmaddattopanishad (47), consists of twelve ślokas put into the mouth of one of these religious mendicants, and uniformly concluding with the refrain: tasyāḥ haṃ panchamātram, ”I am his, i.e., brahman’s, fifth Āṣrama.” Apart from the two Upanishads already mentioned, the Māṇḍūkya and the Tāraka, the investigation of the sacred word om is principally conducted in the Atharvaśīlā (48), in prose (explained by Śaṃkara), in which instruction is given on this subject by Atharvan to Pippalāda, Sanatkumāra, and Aṅgiras; † further, in the Brahmavidyā (49), in thirteen ślokas now and then quoted by Śaṃkara; † and lastly, in the Śaunaka

edited in Bibl. Ind. (1873), with Nārāyaṇa’s commentary; although under the name Kaṭṭha, it is clear from Nārāyaṇa’s words in his introduction, Yajurvede tu Charākād uddālai’ṣād kaṭṭhādīrṇaḥ (1) | saṃyūṣopanishatālaiḥ chaṭṭhāḥ kṛitaḥ(1) śrutiḥ | that this mode of spelling here, as well as in Burnell’s Catalogue, p. 69, is a mere mistake, and that Nārāyaṇa himself connected the Upanishad with the Kathas; see also Bühler, Catalogue of MSS. from Gujar., i. 58.)

† The Paramahāṃśopanishad is translated in I. St., i., 173–176. [Text with Nār.’s comm. in Bibl. Ind., 1874; described in the introd. as tīrthānaddhaḥ ‘charākādhāḥ śāstra-vratam.” — The Saṃyūṣopanishad, too, is printed ibid., 1872; we there find a direct reference made to four angulaka of the Ath. S. (xviii.); their text is therefore given by the editor in the scholiast, and that in a double form acc. to two MSS. (pp. 131–175); see also Rājendra L. M. i. 54, Taylor, ii. 469.)

46 Text and Nār.’s comm. in Bibl. Ind., 1874; described in the introd. as aṅkāṭākāṭādattam | dāhūrvap. By Rājendra L., i. 90, a comm. by Śaṃkarānanda ’is specified; see besides Burnell, p. 65.

† See I. St., ii. 55.—Here, therefore, we have Pippalāda and Aṅgiras appearing side by side (see above, p. 160), [Text and Nār.’s comm. in Bibl. Ind., 1873; described in the introd. as aṅkāṭām manḍita.]

† Translated in I. St., ii. 55. [Text and Nār.’s comm. in Bibl. Ind., 1873.]
(50) and the Prapana (51). These two are found in Anquetil only. The various stages of gradual absorption into Atman form the contents of the following Upanishads (52-59): Haconsananda (in prose), Keshurika (24 slokas), Nadvaindu (20 slokas), Brahmanindu (22 slokas; also called Amritavindu), Amritavindu (38 slokas; also called Amritananda), Dhyanaavindu (23 slokas), Yogasiikha (10 slokas), and Yogatattva (15 slokas); while the majesty of Atman himself is depicted in the Chulikah (60, in 21 slokas) and Tejovindu (61, in 14 slokas): * in the former direct reference is repeatedly made to the doctrine of the Atharvans. The range of ideas and the style are quite identical in all the Upanishads just enumerated. The latter frequently suffers from great obscurity, partly because there occur distinct grammatical inaccuracies, partly because the construction is often very broken and without unity. Many verses recur in several of them; many again are borrowed from the Svetsyavataraopanishad or Maityayanopanishad. Contempt for caste as well as for writing (grantha) is a trait which appears again and again in almost all these Upanishads, and one might therefore be inclined to regard them as directly Buddhist, were they not entirely free from all Buddhistic dogmas. This agreement is to be explained simply by the fact that Buddhism itself must be considered as having been originally only a form of the Sankhya-doctrine.

The sectarian Upanishads have been set down as forming the third class. They substitute for Atman one of the forms of Vishnu or Siva, the earlier ones following the Yoga-doctrine most closely, whilst in those of a modern date the personal element of the respective deities comes

186 See I. St., ix. 52-53 and 49-52; the Prapanaopanishad is mentioned by Taylor, ii. 328.
* For the Haconsananda see I. St., i. 385-387; the Keshurika is translated, ib., ii. 171-173; likewise Amritavindu, ii. 59-62; Tejovindu, ii. 62-64; Dhyanaavindu, ii. 1-5; Yogasiikha [so we ought to read] and Yogatattva, ii. 47-50, [Amritananda, ix. 23-25; Chulikah, ix. 10-21. All these Upanishads are now published in the Bibliotheca Indica with Nardiya's comm. (1872-73), excepting the Haconsandopanishad, which, however, seems to be identical with the Haconsanah printed ibid. In the introductions to the comm. Chulikha is described as paschamii; Brahmanindu as arshadaii Samanagravmahavato; Dhyanaavindu as visndi (visdi?); Tejovindu as ekavi-ising; Yogasiikha as grantaasendhere (!) deductioistim (probably meant for dvidivi?); Yogatattva as travyomindi (46).
more and more into the foreground. A special characteristic of this class are the unmeasured promises usually held out at the close of the work to him who reads and studies it, as also the quotation and veneration of sacred formulas containing the name of the particular deity.

First, as regards the Upanishads of the Vishnu-sect,—the oldest form under which Vishnu is worshipped is Nârâyaṇa. We find this name for the first time in the second part of the Śatapatha-Brâhmaṇa, where, however, it is not in any way connected with Vishnu; it rather stands, as at the commencement of Manu and the Vishnu-Purâṇa, in the sense of Brahman (mascul.). This is also the case in the Nârâyaṇiyopanishad of the Taittirīya-Aranyaka, and in its Atharvan-recension as Brâhmaṇârâyaṇiyopanishad, although in the latter he is at least called Hari, and in one passage brought into direct relation to Vâsadēva and Vishnu. It is in the Mahâ-Upanishad (62)—a prose tract, which* in its first part contains the emanation of the universe from Nârâyaṇa, and in its second a paraphrase of the principal passage of the Nârâyaṇiyopanishad,—that Nârâyaṇa first distinctly appears as the representative of Vishnu, since Śûlapâni (Śiva) and Brahman proceed from him, and Vishnu is not mentioned at all. In the Nârâyaṇiyopanishad (64, in prose), on the contrary, Vishnu also emanates from him, exactly as in the Nârâyaṇa section† of the twelfth book of the Mahâ-Bhârata (a book which in other respects also is of special significance in relation to the Śaṅkhya- and Yoga-doctrines. The sacred formula here taught is: om namo Nârâyaṇâya. There exists of this Upanishad another, probably a later, recension which forms part of the Atharvasiras to be mentioned hereafter, and in which Devakîputra Madhusûdana is mentioned as particularly brahmaṇya, pious, as is also the case in the Atmaprabodha-Upanishad (65), which like-

* Translated in J. St., ii. 5-8 [see also Taylor, ii. 468, Râjendra L. M. i. 25]; besides it there must have existed another Mahâ-Upan. (63), which is cited by the adherents of the Mâdhava sect as a warrant for their belief in a personal soul of the universe, distinct from the soul of man.

† At the time of the (last) arrangement of the present text of the Mahâ-Bhârata, Nârâyaṇa worship must have been particularly flourishing.

See also Râjendra L. M. i. 12, 91 (comm. by Śâmkarâvananda).
wise celebrates Nārāyaṇa as the Supreme Lord; see I. St., ii. 8, 9. He (Nārāyaṇa) is named, besides, in the same quality in the Garbhapanishad (in a passage recurring in the Nirukti, xiv.) and in the Sākalyopanishad.

The second form under which we find Viṣṇu worshipped is Nyṛisīṁha. The earliest mention of him hitherto known appears in the Taitt. Ār., x. 1. 8 (in the Nārāyaṇi-yop.), under the name of Nārasiṁha, and with the epithets vajraṇakha and tīkṣṇadānīṣṭa. The only Upanishad in which he is worshipped is the Nyṛisīṁhatāpanīyopanishad (in prose). It is relatively of considerable extent, and is also counted as six separate Upanishads (66–71), as it consists of two parts, the first of which is in turn subdivided into five distinct Upanishads. The first part treats of the Anuṣṭubh-formula † sacred to Nyṛisīṁha, the mantra-dāja nārasiṁha anuṣṭubha, with which the most wonderful tricks are played; wherein we have to recognize the first beginnings of the later Mālāmantras with their Tantra-ceremonial. A great portion of the Māṇḍūkyopanishad is incorporated into it, and the existence also of the Atharvaśikha is presupposed, as it is directly quoted. The contents of the second part are of a more speculative character, but in respect of mystical trifling it does not yield to the first part. In both, the triad—Brahman, Viṣṇu, and Śiva—is repeatedly mentioned. As regards language, the expression buddha for the supreme Atman, which occurs (along with nitya, buddha, satya, mukta, &c.) in the second part, is of peculiar interest; and the expression is still retained in Gauḍapāda and Śaṅkara; originally it belongs evidently to the Śaṁkhya school (see above, pp. 27, 129).

This Upanishad has been interpreted by Gauḍapāda and Śaṅkara; and in addition to much that is quite modern, it presents a great deal that is ancient. It probably dates from about the fourth century A.D., as at that

† It runs vṛtraḥ pṛthviḥ mahāviṣṇu-
time the Nrisinha worship flourished on the western coast of India; while otherwise we find no traces of it.

The Rāmatāpanīyopanishad (72, 73), in which Rāma is worshipped as the Supreme God, shows a great resemblance to the Nrisinhathāpānīyop., especially in its second part. This second part, which is in prose, is, properly speaking, nothing but a collection of pieces from the Tārakopanishad, Māṇḍūkyaopanishad, Jābālopanishad, and Nrisinhopanishad, naturally with the necessary alterations. Yājnavalkya here appears as the proclaimer of the divine glory of Rāma. A London MS. adds at the close a long passage which is unknown to the commentator Anandavāna (a native of the town Kuṇḍina). The crowning touch of the sectarian element in this Upanishad is found in the circumstance that Rāma is implored by Śiva (Śaṃkara) himself to spare those a second birth who die in Māṇikānīkā or in the Gangā generally, the two principal seats of the Śiva worship. The first part, in ninety-five ślokās, contains at the beginning a short sketch of Rāma’s life, which bears a great similarity to that at the beginning of the Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa (in the Brahmanda-Purāṇa). The Mantrarāja is next taught by the help of a mystical alphabet, specially invented for the purpose.* This Upanishad evidently belongs to the school of Rāmānuja, possibly to Rāmānuja himself, consequently its earliest date would be the eleventh century A.D.

Under the names Viṣṇu, Purushottama, and Vāsudeva, Viṣṇu is mentioned as the supreme Ātman in several

---

* The Nṛsānīya- and a Vālaha-Mantra are also mentioned.

---

196 See text and translation of this Upanishad in I. St., ix. 53–173; and specially on the chronological question, pp. 62, 63. In the Bīd. Indica also, this Upanishad has been published by Rāmāmaya Tarkaratna (1870–71), with Śaṃkara’s commentary (it is, however, doubtful whether the commentary on the second part belongs to Śaṃkara), together with the small (Nṛsānīya) Šaṅkūpanishad and Nārāyaṇa’s comment on it.

197 See text and translation in my essay Die Rāma-Tīrthāna-Upan-
Upanishads.* Krishna Devakiputra appears likewise in some of them (the Ātmaprabodha and Nārāyaṇa), not, however, as supreme Atman, but merely, as in the Chāndogya, as a particularly pious sage. It is in the Gopālatāpanīyopanishad (74, 75) that we first find him exalted to divine dignity. Of this Upanishad, the second part at least, in prose, is known to me.† It treats first of the gopis of Mathurā and Vrajā, then it passes to the identification of Mathurā with Brahmapura, &c.; and it belongs without doubt to a very modern period, as it exhibits hardly any points of contact with other Upanishads in regard to contents and language. The Gopichandana-panishad (76) also probably belongs to this place: I know it only by name.

At the head of the Upanishads belonging to the Śiva-sect's stands, according to the use that has been made of it, the Śutarudriya. I have already remarked, however, that this is nothing but an abuse. In its germs the worship of Śiva may be traced even in the later portions of the Yajus.† He appears very prominently as Mahādeva in a portion of the Nārāyanīyopanishad, and here he is already associated with his spouse. The Śvetāsvatara-panishad also pays homage to him. Among the Atharvopanishads the most ancient in this regard is the Kaivalyopanishad (77), a mixture of prose and slokas, in which bhagavān mahādeva himself instructs Aśvalāyana concerning his own majesty; in a similar way he acts as his own herald § in the Atharvavirās (78), in prose. The latter

---

* And also, in particular, under the name Vāsudeva, in the writings ascribed to Śaṅkara.
† The lists in the Chambers collection specify a Gopālatāpīṇī, Madhyātabhāṣa, Udotātāpīṇī, and Bhākadavatātāpīṇī /
181 The text of this Upanishad, with Vīśvēśvara's commentary, is printed in the Ebd. Indica (1870), edited by Harachandra Vidyabhaskara and Vīśvāmadāsaṭrī. Occasionally, extracts are added from the commentaries by Nārāyaṇa and Jīvagosāmin. According to Jājendra, I. 18, its first section is described in Nārāyaṇa's introduction as शास्त्रादर्शितम् एकः परुषः एकः 'a treatise on the merits of putting on sectarian marks on the forehead with an ochrous earth, called gopichandana.'
‡ As in the Atharva-Samhitā and in the Śākhyā-Saṁhitā (see pp. 44, 110).
§ Like Krishna in the Bhagavadgītā. The Kaivalyopanishad is translated I. Ś., ii. 9-14; on Atharvavirās see ibid., i. pp. 352-355. [Text of, and two commentaries on,
Upanishad has been expounded by Śaṅkara. Under the same title, "head of Atharvan,"—a name that is also borne by Brahman himself, although in a different relation,—there exists a second Upanishad, itself a conglomerate of five different Upanishads referring to the five principal deities, Gaṇapati (79), Nārāyaṇa, Rudra, Sūrya (80), and Devī (81). Its Nārāyaṇa-portion is a later recension of the Nārāyanopanishad (64, see above, p. 166), and the Rudra-portion follows the first chapter of the Atharvasiras proper. All five have been translated by Vans Kennedy. In the Mahā-Bhārata (i. 2882), and the Code of Vishṇu, where the Atharvasiras is mentioned along with the Bhū-rūḍāni sāmāṇi, and in Vishṇu also, where it appears beside the Śatarudriya (as the principal means of expiation), the reference probably is to the Upanishad explained by Śaṅkara (1).—The Rudrop and Atharvaṇāya-Rudrop, are known to me only through the Catalogue of the India Office Library. Possibly they are identical with those already named; I therefore exclude them from my list. The Mrityulaṅghanopanishad (82) is quite modern, and with it is wor-

the Kaivalypapanishad printed in Bibl. Ind. 1874; the first commentary is that of Nārāyaṇa; the second is described by the editor as that of Śaṅkara, in the colophon as that of Śaṅkaraśāriṃша; it follows, however, from Rājendra Līla Mītra’s Catalogue, i. 32, that it is different from the commentary written by the latter; and according to the same authority, ii. 247, it is identical rather with that of Vidyāraṇya. In Nārāyaṇa’s introduction this Upanishad is described (exactly like the Jātakop. i) as ekstakṣaśrītākṣatānti. The Śūra- or Atharvasiras-Upanishad is likewise printed in Bibl. Ind. 1872, with Nārāyaṇa’s comm., which describes it as rudrākṣaśrīta saṃskṛtaḥ. See also Rājendral, i. 32 (comm. by Śaṅkaraśāriṃша), 49.

See I. St., ii. 53, and Vans Kennedy, Researches into the Nature and Affinity of Hindu and Ancient Mythology, p. 442, &c. [Taylor, ii. 459-471. By Rājendral., i. 61, a Gaṇapati- or Śaṅkaraśāriṃشاه panyopanishad is mentioned; by Bühler, Cat. of MSS. from Guj., i. 70, a Gaṇapati- or Śaṅkaraśāriṃشاه panyopanishad and a Gaṇpatatāpimī; and by Kielhorn, Sanskrit MSS. in the Southern Division of the Bombay Pres. (1869), p. 14, a Gaṇapati- or Śaṅkaraśāriṃشاه panyopanishad.]

† So we have probably to understand Anquetil’s Amat Lanbou, since he has also another form, Mṛat Lanbou; instead of, id est ‘halitus mortis,’ we ought to read ‘salitus mortis.’ [See now I. St., ix. 21-23; according to this it is doubtful whether the name ought not to be written Mrityulāṅgula (1). An Upanishad named Mrityulaṅgha is mentioned by Bühler, Cat. of MSS. from Guj., i. 120; a Mrityulaṅgula, however, appears as Sād Upanishad in the Catalogue of Panḍit Radhākrishṇa’s library. Finally, Barnell, in publishing the text in the Indian Antiquary, ii. 266, gives the form Mṛityulaṅgula.]
thily associated the Kālāgni-rudrapanishad (83), in prose, of which there are no less than three different recensions, one of which belongs to the Nandikesvara-Upanurāga. The Tripura-rupanishad (84) also appears from its name—otherwise it is unknown to me—to belong to this division; it has been interpreted by Bhatta Bhāskara Miśra. The Śkandopanishad (85), in fifteen ēlokas, is also Śiva-ītic (likewise the Amritānaṁdopanishad). The adoration of Śiva’s spouse, his Śakti,—the origin of which may be traced back to the Kenopanishad and the Nārāyaṇiyopanishad,—is the subject of the Sundarilāpanyo-panishad (known to me by name only), in five parts (86–90), as well as of the Devī-Upanishad (79), which has already been mentioned. The Kaulopanishad (91), in prose, also belongs to a Śākta sectary.

Lastly, a few Upanishads (92–95) have to be mentioned, which are known to me only by their names, names which do not enable us to draw any conclusion as to their contents, viz., the Pindopanishad, Nīlānukopanishad (Colebrooke has Nīlārudra), Pāṅgalopanishad, and Darśanopanishad. The Garudopanishad (96), of which I know two totally different texts, celebrates the serpent-destroyer Garuḍa, and is not without some antiquarian interest.

193 It treats specially of the tripaṅga-vidhi; see Taylor, i. 461; Rājendr., i. 59; Burnell, p. 61.
194 See on it Taylor, ii. 470; Burnell, p. 62.
195 “Identifies Śiva with Visāṇu, and teaches the doctrines of the Advaita school.” Taylor, ii. 467; Burnell, p. 65.
* In the Tejīndu (61) also, brahmaṇ is described as dpava, śim-bhava, śīkta.
196 The Pindop. and the Nīlārudrup.—this is its proper name—are now printed in Bāb. Ind. (1873), with Nārāyaṇa’s comm.; the former, which treats of the pindas to the preta, is described by Nārāyaṇa as saptavīśatipūrṇi, the latter as sho-dāsa; it is addressed to Rudra (see also Rājendr., i. 51), and consists only of verses, which closely follow those contained in Vāj. S. xvi. On the Pāṅgalop. and Darśanop., see Taylor, ii. 468–471.
† As is done in the Nārāyana-purāṇa, also, and more especially in the Suparśuṇāyana, which is considered to belong to the Rik [edited by Ellmar Grube, 1875; see also I. St., xiv. 1, ff.—The Garudopanishad is now printed in Bāb. Ind. (1874), with Nārāyaṇa’s commentary; in the introduction it is described as chatusvahādvyāśattamā.]
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SANSKRIT LITERATURE.

Having thus followed the first period of Indian literature, in its several divisions, down to its close, we now turn to its second period, the so-called Sanskrit literature. Here, however, as our time is limited, we cannot enter so much into detail as we have hitherto done, and we must therefore content ourselves with a general survey. In the case of the Vedic literature, details were especially essential, both because no full account of it had yet been given, and because the various works still lie, for the most part, shut up in the manuscripts; whereas the Sanskrit literature has already been repeatedly handled, partially at least, and the principal works belonging to it are generally accessible.

Our first task, naturally, is to fix the distinction between the second period and the first. This is, in part, one of age, in part, one of subject-matter. The former distinction is marked by the language and by direct data; the latter by the nature of the subject-matter itself, as well as by the method of treating it.

As regards the language, in the first place, in so far as it grounds a distinction in point of age between the two periods of Indian literature, its special characteristics in the second period, although apparently slight, are yet, in reality, so significant that it appropriately furnishes the name for the period; whereas the earlier one receives its designation from the works composing it.

Among the various dialects of the different Indo-Aryan tribes, a greater unity had in the course of time been established after their immigration into India, as the natural result of their intermingling in their new homes, and of
their combination into larger communities. The grammatical* study, moreover, which by degrees became necessary for the interpretation of the ancient texts, and which grew up in connection therewith, had had the effect of substantially fixing the usage; so that a generally recognised language, known as the बड़हस्ति, had arisen, that, namely, in which the Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras are composed.† Now the greater the advance made by the study of grammar, the more stringent and precise its precepts and rules became, and all the more difficult it was for those who did not occupy themselves specially therewith to keep in constant accord with grammatical accuracy. The more the language of the grammatically educated gained on the one hand in purity, and in being purged of everything not strictly regular, the more foreign did it become on the other hand to the usage of the majority of the people, who were without grammatical training. In this way a refined language gradually disconnected itself from the vernacular, as more and more the exclusive property of the higher classes of the people;‡ the estrange-

* Respecting the use of the verb syātri in a grammatical signification, Sāyaṇa in his introduction to the Rik (p. 35. 22 ed. Müller) adduces a legend from a Brāhmaṇa, which represents Indra as the oldest grammarian. (See Lassen, L. A. K., ii. 475.) The legend is taken from the Ts. vi. 4. 7. 3. All that in there stated, indeed, is that such was syātri by Indra; manifestly, however, the later myths which do actually set up Indra as the oldest grammarian connect themselves with this passage.

† Bāṣālika-mana in Kātyāyana, Śrauta-Sūtra, i. 8. 17, is expressly interpreted as brāhmaṇa-mana; see Vāji. Sanā. Specimen, i. 196, 207. [I. St., x. 428-429, 437.] Yāsaka repeatedly opposes bāṣālika and avantaśākṣa (i.e., "in the Veda reading," "in the text of the hymns") to each other; similarly, the Prāti-Sākhya - Sūtras employ the words bāṣālika and bāṣālika-as opposed to chaṇḍas and veśa, i.e., anāhita (see above, pp. 57, 103, 144). The way in which the word bāṣālika is used in the Grihya-Sūtra of Śākhāyana, namely, in contradistinction to Sātra, shows that its meaning had already by this time become essentially modified, and become restricted, precisely as it is in Pāṇini; to the extra-Vedic, so to say, prose literature. (The Śāṅkya-Grihya gives instead of bāṣālika, in the corresponding passage, bāṣālika-mahābālātāśākṣa.) This is incorrect; rather, in the passage in question, these words follow the word bāṣālika; see the note on this point at p. 56.) In the same way, in the Nir. xiii. 9, mantra, kalpa, brāhmaṇa, and the yadvaḥādriti (sc. bāṣālika) are opposed to each other (and also Rik, Yajus, Śāmaṇa, and the yadvaḥādriti).

‡ Ought the passage cited in Nir. xiii. 9 from a Brāhmaṇa [cf. Kāth. xiv. 5], to the effect that the Brāhmaṇas spoke both tongues, that of the gods as well as that of men, to be taken in this connection? or has this reference merely to a conception resembling the Homeric one?
ment between the two growing more and more marked, as the popular dialect in its turn underwent further development. This took place mainly under the influence of those aboriginal inhabitants who had been received into the Brahmanic community; who, it is true, little by little exchanged their own language for that of their conquerors, but not without importing into the latter a large number of new words and of phonetic changes, and, in particular, very materially modifying the pronunciation. This last was all the more necessary, as the numerous accumulations of consonants in the Aryan bhasa presented exceeding difficulties to the natives; and it was all the easier, as there had evidently prevailed within the language itself from an early period a tendency to clear away these troublesome encumbrances of speech—a tendency to which, indeed, the study of grammar imposed a limit, so far as the educated portion of the Aryans was concerned, but which certainly maintained itself, and by the very nature of the case continued to spread amongst the people at large. This tendency was naturally furthered by the native inhabitants, particularly as they acquired the language not from those who were conversant with grammar, but from intercourse and association with the general body of the people. In this way there gradually arose new vernaculars, proceeding directly from the common bhasa, and distinguished from it mainly by the assimilation of consonants, and by

* And therefore specially so called down even to modern times; whereas the grammatically refined bhasa afterwards lost this title, and substituted for it the name Sanskrita-bhasa, the cultivated speech. The name Prakrit-bhasa, which was at the same time applied to the popular dialects, is derived from the word prakrtya, nature, origin, and probably describes these as the natural, original continuations of the ancient bhasa; or does prakrtya here signify having a prakrty or origin, or derived? [Out of the signification original, lying at the root of (prakriti-bhasa), unmodified, arose that of ‘normal,’ then that of ‘ordinary,’ ‘communis,’ vulgaris, and lastly, that of ‘pro-

ceeding in common from.’ The term directly opposed to it is not sanskrita, but samkrit; see, e.g., Ath. Parid. 49.1, ‘samatptum purvam samkryd syama añc prakrtya ye cha samkrttah.’] The earliest instances as yet known of the name Sanskrit as a designation of the language occur in the Mrohaka (p. 44.2, ed. Stenzler), and in Vasa-Mibira’s Bhisham-Samhitaa, 85.3. The following passages also of the Ramanaya are doubtless to be understood in this sense, viz., v. 18. 19. 29. 17. 34 (82.3), vi. 104. 2. Pāṇini is familiar with the word Sanskrita, but does not use it in this sense; though the Pāṇiniśa Śiṣeśa does so employ it (v. 3), in contradistinction to prakṛtya.
the curtailment or loss of terminations. Not unfrequently, however, they present older forms of these than are found in the written language, partly because the latter has rigo-
rously eliminated all forms in any way irregular or obso-
lete, but partly also, no doubt, from the circumstance that
grammar was cultivated principally in the north or north-
west of India, and consequently adapted itself specially to
the usage there prevailing. And in some respects (e.g., in
the instr. plur. of words in a?)\textsuperscript{197} this usage may have
attained a more developed phase than appears to have
been the case in India Proper,\textsuperscript{*} since the language was not
there hampered in its independent growth by any external
influence; whereas the Aryans who had passed into India
maintained their speech upon the same internal level
on which it stood at the time of the immigration,\textsuperscript{†} how-

\textsuperscript{197} This example is not quite per-
tinent, as the instr. plur. in -dis is of very ancient date, being reflected
not only in Zend, but also in Slavonic and Lithuanian; see Bopp,
\textit{Vergl. Gram.}, i. 156\textsuperscript{2} (159\textsuperscript{5}).

\* The difference in usage between the Eastern and Western forms of
speech is once touched upon in the \textit{Brahmāṇa} of the \textit{White Yajus},
where it is said that the \textit{Vāhikas} style \textit{Agni Bhasa}, while the \textit{Prāch-
ysa}, on the contrary, call him \textit{Sāres}. \textit{Yāsaka} (ii. 2) opposes the \textit{Kambojas}
(the \textit{Peras-Aryan}) to the \textit{Aryas} (the \textit{Indo-Aryan}); stating that the latter,
for instance, possess derivatives only of the root \textit{ṣa} \textit{ṣa}, whereas the \textit{Kam-
bojas} possess it also as a verb. (Grammarians of the \textit{Kambojas} are
hardly to be thought of here, as \textit{Roth, Zur Lit.}, p. 67, supposes.)
\textit{Yāsaka} further opposes the \textit{Prāchyaśa} and the \textit{Udchyaśa}, and the same is
done by \textit{Pāṇini}. According to the \textit{Brahmāṇa}, the \textit{Udchyaśas} were most
conversant with grammar [see \textit{I. St.}, i. 153, ii. 309, 310, xii. 363, ff.]
Barnett’s identification of the \textit{Kambojas} here, and in the other earlier
passages where they are mentioned, with Cambodian in \textit{Farther India}, see
his \textit{Elements of South Indian Palaeo-
graphy}, pp. 31, 32, 94, is clearly a
mistake. For the time of the \textit{Pāli}
ever considerable were the external modifications which it underwent.

The second period of Indian literature, then, commences with the epoch when the separation of the language of the educated classes—of the written language—from the popular dialects was an accomplished fact. It is in the former alone that the literature is presented to us. Not till after the lapse of time did the vernaculars also in their turn produce literatures of their own,—in the first instance under the influence of the Buddhist religion, which addressed itself to the people as such, and whose scriptures and records, therefore, were originally, as for the most part they still are, composed in the popular idiom. The epoch in question cannot at present be precisely determined; yet we may with reasonable certainty infer the existence of the written language also, at a time when we are in a position to point to the existence of popular dialects; and with respect to these we possess historical evidence of a rare order, in those rock-inscriptions, of identical purport, which have been discovered at Girnar in the Gujarát peninsula, at Dhauli in Orissa, and at Kapur di Giri 128 in Kabul. J. Prinsep, who was the first to decipher them, and Lassen, refer them to the time of the Buddhist king Aśoka, who reigned from B.C. 259; but, according to the most recent investigations on the subject,—by Wilson, in the "Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society," xii., 1850 (p. 95 of the separate impression)—they were engraved "at some period subsequent to B.C. 205,"* and are are still, therefore, of uncertain date. However this question may be settled, it in any case results with tolerable certainty

128 This name ought probably to be written Kaparadiyiri? See my paper on the Śatrumāyla Mahāmya, p. 118. In these inscriptions, moreover, we have a text, similar in purport, presented to us in three distinct dialects. See farther on this subject Bourseul's admirable discussion of these inscriptions in his Lotus de la bonne Loi, p. 652, ff. (1852); J. St., iii. 467, ff. (1855); and Kern, De Gedenkstukken van Aśoka den Buddhïst (1873, particularly p. 32 ff., 45 ff.).

* And that not much later; as is vouched for by the names of the Greek kings therein mentioned—Alexander, Antigonus, Megas, Ptolemy, Antiochus. These cannot; it is true, be regarded as contemporaneous with the inscriptions; but their notoriety in India can hardly have been of such long duration; that the inscriptions can have been composed long after their time. See Wilson, I. 8.
that these popular dialects were in existence in the third century B.C. But this is by no means to be set down as the limit for the commencement of their growth; on the contrary, the form in which they are presented to us sufficiently shows that a very considerable period must have elapsed since their separation from the ancient \textit{bhāṣā}. This separation must therefore have taken place comparatively early, and indeed we find allusions to these vernaculars here and there in the Brāhmaṇas themselves.\footnote{Thus in the second part of the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa the Śyāparṇa, a clan of the western Śalvas, are mentioned as \textit{pādārīśe vācāti vadiśāvā}, \textit{speaking a filthy tongue}; and in the Pañcharavindā-Brāhmaṇa, the Vṛṣyas are found fault with for their debased language. The \textit{Asuras} are similarly censured in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa (iii. 2. 1. 24), where, at the same time, the Brahmaṇs are warned against such forms of speech; \textit{tasmād brāhmaṇa na seclāh}.—I may remark here in passing that M. Müller, in his edition of the Rik, in Śaśya’s introduction, p. 36. 21, erroneously writes \textit{kḷaya} as one word: it stands for \textit{kc ṭayo},—the \textit{Asura} corruption of the battle-cry \textit{kc ṭayo} (or \textit{ṛayo}): according to the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, it even took the form \textit{kc ṭayo}.} 

The direct data, attesting the posteriority of the second period of Indian literature, consist in these facts: first, that its opening phases everywhere presuppose the Vedic period as entirely closed; next, that its oldest portions are regularly based upon the Vedic literature; and, lastly, that the relations of life have now all arrived at a stage of development of which, in the first period, we can only trace the germs and beginning. Thus, in particular, divine worship is now centred on a triad of divinities, Brahmā, Vishnu, and Śiva; the two latter of whom, again, in course of time, have the supremacy, severally allotted to them, under various forms, according to the different sects that grew up for this purpose. It is by no means implied that individual portions of the earlier period may not run on into the later; on the contrary, I have frequently endeavoured in the preceding pages to show that such is the case. For the rest, the connection between the two periods is, on the whole, somewhat loose: it is closest as regards those branches of literature which had already attained a definite stage of progress in the first period, and which merely continued to develop further in the second.—Grammar, namely, and Philosophy. In regard to those branches, on the contrary, which are more independent
growth of the second period, the difficulty of connecting them with the earlier age is very great. We have here a distinct gap which it is altogether impossible to fill up. The reason of this lies simply in the fact, that owing to the difficulty of preserving literary works, the fortunate successor almost always wholly supplanted the predecessor it surpassed: the latter thus became superfluous, and was consequently put aside, no longer committed to memory, no longer copied. In all these branches therefore—unless some other influence has supervened—we are in possession only of those master-works in which each attained its culminating point, and which in later times served as the classical models upon which the modern literature was formed, itself more or less destitute of native productive energy. This fact has been already adduced as having proved equally fatal in the case of the more ancient Brāhmaṇa literature, &c.; there, much to the same extent as here, it exercised its lamentable, though natural influence. In the Vedic literature also, that is to say, in its Śākhās, we find the best analogy for another kindred point, namely, that some of the principal works of this period are extant in several—generally two—recensions. But along with this a further circumstance has to be noted, which, in consequence of the great care expended upon the sacred literature, has comparatively slight application to it, namely, that the mutual relation of the manuscripts is of itself such as to render any certain restoration of an original text for the most part hopeless. It is only in cases where ancient commentaries exist that the text is in some degree certain, for the time at least to which these commentaries belong. This is evidently owing to the fact that these works were originally preserved by oral tradition; their consignment to writing only took place later, and possibly in different localities at the same time, so that discrepancies of all sorts were inevitable. But besides these variations there are many alterations and additions which are obviously of a wholly arbitrary nature, partly made intentionally, and partly due to the mistakes of transcribers. In reference to this latter point, in particular, the fact must not be lost sight of that, in consequence of the destructive influence of the climate, copies had to be renewed very frequently. As a rule, the more ancient Indian manuscripts
are only from three to four hundred years old; hardly any will be found to date more than five hundred years back. Little or nothing, therefore, can here be effected by means of so-called diplomatic criticism. We cannot even depend upon a text as it appears in quotations, such quotations being generally made from memory,—a practice which, of course, unavoidably entails mistakes and alterations.

The distinction in point of subject-matter between the first and second periods consists mainly in the circumstance that in the former the various subjects are only handled in their details, and almost solely in their relation to the sacrifice, whereas in the latter they are discussed in their general relations. In short, it is not so much a practical, as rather a scientific, a poetical, and artistic want that is here satisfied. The difference in the form under which the two periods present themselves is in keeping with this. In the former, a simple and compact prose had gradually been developed, but in the latter this form is abandoned, and a rhythmic one adopted in its stead, which is employed exclusively, even for strictly scientific exposition. The only exception to this occurs in the grammatical and philosophical Sūtras; and these again are characterised by a form of expression so congeised and technical that it cannot fittingly be termed prose. Apart from this, we have only fragments of prose, occurring in stories which are now and then found cited in the great epic; and further, in the fable literature and in the drama; but they are uniformly interwoven with rhythmical portions. It is only in the Buddhist legends that a prose style has been retained, the

---

Regarding the age, manner of preparation, material, and condition of text of Indian MSS., see Rāj. Lala Mitra’s excellent report, dated 15th February 1875, on the searches instituted by him in native libraries down to the end of the previous year, which is appended to No. IX. of his Notices of Sanskrit MSS. Quite recently some Devanāgarī MSS. of Jain texts, written on broad palm-leaves, have been discovered by Bühler, which date two centuries earlier than any previously known. A facsimile of one of these MSS. in Bühler’s possession, the Avāyaka-Sūtra, dated Saurāvat 1189 (A.D. 1152), is annexed to the above-mentioned report: “It is the oldest Sanskrit MS. that has come to notice,” Rāj. L. Mitra, Notices, iii. 68 (1874). But a letter from Dr. Rast (19th October 1875) intimates that in one of the Sanskrit MSS. that have lately arrived in Cambridge from Nepal, he has read the date 128 of the Nepal era, i.e., A.D. 1008. Further confirmation of this, of course, still remains to be given.
language of—which, however, is a very peculiar one, and is, moreover, restricted to a definite field. In fact, as the result of this neglect, prose-writing was completely arrested in the course of its development, and declined altogether. Anything more clumsy than the prose of the later Indian romances, and of the Indian commentaries, can hardly be; and the same may be said of the prose of the inscriptions.

This point must not be left out of view, when we now proceed to speak of a classification of the Sanskrit literature into works of Poetry, works of Science and Art, and works relating to Law, Custom, and Worship. All alike appear in a poetic form, and by ‘Poetry’ accordingly in this classification we understand merely what is usually styled belles-lettres, though certainly with an important modification of this sense. For while, upon the one hand, the poetic form has been extended to all branches of the literature, upon the other, as a set-off to this, a good deal of practical prose has entered into the poetry itself, imparting to it the character of poetry ‘with a purpose.’ Of the epic poetry this is especially true.

It has long been customary to place the Epic Poetry at the head of Sanskrit literature; and to this custom we here conform, although its existing monuments cannot justly pretend to pass as more ancient than, for example, Pāṇini’s grammar, or the law-book which bears the name of Manu. We have to divide the epic poetry into two distinct groups: the Itihāsa-Purāṇas and the Kāvyas. We have already more than once met with the name Itihāsa-Purāṇa in the later Brāhmaṇas, namely, in the second part of the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, in the Taittirīya-Āranyaka, and in the Chhāndogypapanishad. We have seen that the commentators uniformly understand these expressions to apply to the legendary passages in the Brāhmaṇas themselves, and not to separate works; and also that, from a passage in the thirteenth book of the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, it results with tolerable certainty that distinct works of this description cannot then have existed, inasmuch as the division into parvanas, which is usual in the extant writings of this class, is there expressly attributed to other works, and is not employed in reference to these Itihāsa-Purāṇas themselves. On the other hand, in the Sarpa-vidyā (‘serpent-knowledge’) and the Devajana-vidyā (‘genealogies of
the gods')—to which, in the passage in question, the distribution into parvans, that is to say, existence in a distinct form, is expressly assigned—we have in all probability to recognise mythological accounts, which from their nature might very well be regarded as precursors of the epic. We have likewise already specified as forerunners of the epic poetry, those myths and legends which are found interspersed throughout the Brāhmaṇas, here and there, too in rhythmic form,* or which lived on elsewhere in the tradition regarding the origin of the songs of the Rīk. Indeed, a few short prose legends of this sort have been actually preserved here and there in the epic itself. The Gāthās also—stanzas in the Brāhmaṇas, extolling individual deeds of prowess—have already been cited in the like connection: they were sung to the accompaniment of the lute, and were composed in honour either of the prince of the day or of the pious kings of old (see I. St., i. 187). As regards the extant epic—the Mahā-Bhārata—specially, we have already pointed out the mention in the Taśțīrīya-Āranyaka, of Vyāsa Pārśārya¹⁰⁷ and Vaiśampāyana,²⁰⁸ who are given in the poem itself as its original authors; and we have also remarked (p. 143) that the family of the

---

³ As, for instance, the story of Harisandra in the second part of the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa.

¹⁰⁷ Vyāsa Pārśārya is likewise mentioned in the sūtras of the Śāma-
vidhāna-Brāhmaṇa, as the disciple of Vaiśvākṣena, and preceptor of Jaimini; see I. St., iv. 377.—The Mahābhārata, again, not only contains frequent allusions to the legend of the Mahā-Bhārata, and, even metrical quotations that connect themselves with it, but it also contains the name of Suka Vaśyākṣi; and from this it is clear that there was then already extant a poetical version of the Mahā-Bhārata story; see I. St., xiii. 357. Among the prior births of Buddha is one (No. 436 in Westergaard's Catalogus, p. 40), bearing the name Kaśha-Dipāyana, i.e., Kaśha-Dvaitapāyana.

²⁰⁸ Vaiśampāyana appears elsewhere frequently, but always in special relation to the transmission of the Yajur-Veda. By Pāṇini, it is true (iv. 3. 104), he is simply cited generally as a Vedic teacher, but the Mahābhārata, commenting on this passage, describes him as the teacher of Kaṭha and Kauṭāpin. In the Calcutta Scholium, again, we find further particulars (from what sources I cf. śārāṇāthasa Siddha. Kaum., i. 590), according to which (see I. St., xiii. 440) nine Vedic schools, and among them two belonging to the Śāma-Veda, trace their origin to him. In the Rig-Grihyas he is evidently regarded (see above, pp. 57, 58), after the manner of the Vishnu-Purāṇa, as the special representative of the Yajur-Veda; and so he appears in the Anukṛ. of the Aṣṭāyūḍha school, at the head of its list of teachers, specially as the preceptor of Ṛṣaka Pāṇgi.
Parásaras is represented with especial frequency in the vanás of the White Yajus.* We also find repeated allusions in the Bráhmanas to a Naimishiya sacrifice, and, on the authority of the Mahá-Bhárata itself, it was at such a sacrifice that the second recitation of the epic took place in presence of a Śaunaka. But, as has likewise been remarked above [pp. 34, 45], these two sacrifices must be kept distinct, and indeed there is no mention in the Bráhmanas of a Śaunaka as participating in the former. Nay, several such sacrifices may have taken place in the Naimisha forest [see p. 34]; or it is possible even that the statement as to the recitation in question may have no more foundation than the desire to give a peculiar consecration to the work. For it is utterly absurd to suppose that Vyása Párasaryya and Vaishampayana—teachers mentioned for the first time in the Taîtirīya-Aranyaka—could have been anterior to the sacrifice referred to in the Bráhmanas. The mention of the "Bhárata" and of the "Mahá-Bhárata" itself in the Grihya-Sútras of Ásvaláyana (and Sánkháyana) we have characterised [p. 58] as an interpolation or else an indication that these Sútras are of very late date. In Páṇini the word "Mahá-Bhárata" does indeed occur; not, however, as denoting the epic of this name, but as an appellative to designate any individual of special distinction among the Bháratas, like Mahá-Jákala, Hāllihila (see J. St., ii. 73). Still, we do find names mentioned in Páṇini which belong specially to the story of the Mahá-Bhárata—namely, Yudhishtíhira, Hāstimapura, Vásudeva, Arjuna,† Andhaka-Vrishnayas, Droña (?); so that the legend must in any case have been current in his day, possibly even in a poetical shape; however surprising it may be that the name Pándu ‡ is never—mentioned by him. The earliest direct

* This renders Lessen's reference (I. A.K., i. 629) of the name Páraśarya to the astronomer or chronologer Páraśara, highly questionable.
† A worshipper of Vásudeva, or of Arjuna, is styled 'Vásudevaka,' 'Arjunaka.' Or is Arjuna here still a name of Indra? [From the context he is to be understood as a Káshtriya; see on this, J. St., xiii. 349, 55; Ind. Antiq. iv. 246.]
‡ This name only occurs in the Mahá-Bhárata and in the works resting upon it. Yet the Buddhists mention a mountain tribe of Pándyas, as alike the foes of the Śákya (i.e., the Káshás) and of the inhabitants of Ujjayini; see Schiefner, Leben des Śákyanunmi, pp. 4, 40 (in the latter passage they appear to be connected with Taksháshila), and, further, Lessen, I. A.K., ii. 100, 55; Foucaux, Règles Chir Rol Pe, pp. 228, 229 (25, 26).
evidence of the existence of an epic, with the contents of the Mahā-Bhārata, comes to us from the rhetor Dion Chrysostom, who flourished in the second half of the first century A.D.; and it appears fairly probable that the information in question was then quite new, and was derived from mariners who had penetrated as far as the extreme south of India, as I have pointed out in the Inpische Studien, ii. 161–165.* Since Megasthenes says nothing of this epic, it is not an improbable hypothesis that its origin is to be placed in the interval between his time and that of Chrysostom; for what ignorant† sailors took note of would hardly have escaped his observation; more especially if what he narrates of Herakles and his daughter Pandaia has reference really to Krishna and his sister, the wife of Arjuna, if, that is to say, the Pāṇḍu legend was already actually current in his time. With respect to this latter legend, which forms the subject of the Mahā-Bhārata, we have already remarked, that although there occur, in the Yajus especially, various names and particulars having an intimate connection with it, yet on the other hand these are presented to us in essentially different relations. Thus the Kuru-Paṇḍālas in particular, whose internecine feud is deemed by Lassen to be the leading and central feature of the Mahā-Bhārata, appear in the Yajus on the most friendly and peaceful footing: Arjuna again, the chief hero of the Pāṇḍus, is still, in the Vājasaneyi-Samatā and the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa, a name of Indra;‡ and astly, Janamejaya Pārikshita, who in the Mahā-Bhārata is the great-grandson of Arjuna, appears, in the last part of the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa, to be still fresh in the memory of the people, with the rise and downfall of himself and his house. I have also already expressed the conjecture that it is perhaps in the deeds and downfall of this Janamejaya that we have to look for the original plot.

* It is not, however, necessary to suppose, as I did, l. c., that they brought this intelligence from the south of India itself; they might have picked it up at some other part of their voyage.

† That they were so appears from their statement as to the Great Bear, l. c.

‡ In the thirteenth book of the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa, Indra also bears the name Dharma, which in the Mahā-Bhārata is especially associated with Yudhishthira himself, though only in the forms dharma-rajā, dharma-putra, &c.
of the story of the Mahá-Bhárata; * and, on the other hand, that, as in the epics of other nations, and notably in the Persian Epos, so too in the Mahá-Bhárata, the myths relating to the gods became linked with the popular legend. But so completely have the two been interwoven that the unravelling of the respective elements must ever remain an impossibility. One thing, however, is clearly discernible in the Mahá-Bhárata, that it has as its basis a war waged on the soil of Hindustán between Aryan tribes, and therefore belonging probably to a time when their settlement in India, and the subjugation and brahmanisation of the native inhabitants, had already been accomplished. But what it was that gave rise to the conflict—whether disputes as to territory, or it may be religious dissensions—cannot now be determined.—Of the Mahá-Bhárata in its extant form, only about one-fourth (some 20,000 ślokas or so) relates to this conflict and the myths that have been associated with it; 201 while the elements composing the remaining three-fourths do not belong to it at all, and have only the loosest possible connection therewith, as well as with each other. These later additions are of two kinds. Some are of an epic character, and are due to the endeavour to unite here, as in a single focus, all the ancient legends it was possible to muster,—and amongst them, as a matter of fact, are not a few that are tolerably antique even in respect of form. Others are of purely didactic import, and have been inserted with the view of imparting to the military caste, for which the work was mainly intended, all possible instruction as to its duties, and especially as to the reverence due to the priesthood. Even at the portion which is recognisable as the original basis—that relating to the war—many generations must have laboured before the text attained to an approximately settled shape. It is noteworthy that it is precisely in this part that repeated allusion is made to the Yavanás, Śakás, Pahlavas, 2012 and other peoples; and that

* Which of course stands in glaring contradiction to the statement that the Mahá-Bhárata was recited in his presence.

201 And even of this, two-thirds will have to be sifted out as not original, since, in the introduction to the work (I. 81) the express intimation is still preserved that it previously consisted of 8800 ślokas only.

2012a In connection with the word Pahlava, Th. Nöeldeke, in a communication dated 31 November
these, moreover, appear as taking an actual part in the conflict—a circumstance which necessarily presupposes that at the time when these passages were written, collisions with the Greeks, &c., had already happened. But as to the period when the final redaction of the entire work in its present shape took place, no approach even to a direct conjecture is in the meantime possible; but at any rate, it must have been some centuries after the commencement of our era.* An interesting discovery has

1875, mentions a point which, if confirmed, will prove of the highest importance for determining the date of composition of the Mahâ-Bhârata and of the Râmâyana (see my Essay on it, pp. 22, 25), as well as of Manu (see x. 44). According to this, there exists considerable doubt whether the word Pahlav, which is the basis of Pāhlava, and which Oeser sen (v. sup., p. 4, note) regards as having arisen out of the name of the Parthians, Parthians, can have originated earlier than the first century A.D. This weakening of th to ð is not found, in the case of the word Māhâra, for example, before the commencement of our era (in the MIIPO on the coins of the Indo-Scythians, Lassen, I. AK., ii. 337, and in Meierdates in Tacitus). As the name of a people, the word Pahlav became early foreign to the Persians, learned reminiscences excepted: in the Pahlavi texts themselves, for instance, it does not occur. The period when it passed over to the Indians, therefore, would have to be fixed for about the 2d-4th century A.D.; and we should have to understand by it, not directly the Persians, who are called Pârasiskas, rather, but specially the Arasidian Parsians.

232 Of especial interest in this connection is the statement in H. 578, 579, where the Yavana prince Bhangadatta (Apollodotus I), according to von Gutschmidt’s conjecture; reg. after n. o. 160, appears as sovereign of Maru (Marwar) and Naraka, as ruling. Varuṇa like, the west...
recently been made in the island of Bali, near Java, of the Kavi translation of several parvans of the Mahá-Bhárata, which in extent appear to vary considerably from their Indian form.204 A special comparison of the two would not be without importance for the criticism of the Mahá-Bhárata. For the rest, in consequence of the utter medley it presents of passages of widely different dates, the work, in general, is only to be used with extreme caution. It has been published at Calcutta,205 together with the Hari-
vanśa, a poem which passes as a supplement to it.*—
Respecting the Jaimini-Bhárata, which is ascribed, not to Vyása and Vaisampáyana, but to Jaimini, we have as yet no very precise information: the one book of it with which I am acquainted is wholly different from the corresponding book of the ordinary Mahá-Bhárata.†

204 See the observations, following R. Friederich's account, in I. St., ii. 136 ff.
205 1834–39 in four vols.; recently also at Bombay (1863) with the commentary of Nīlakantha. Hippolyte Fauche's incomplete French translation (1863–72, ten vols.) can only pass for a translation in a very qualified sense; see as to this I. Str., ii. 410 ff. Individual portions of the work have been frequently handled: e.g., Pavie has translated nine pieces (Paris, 1844) and Foucaux eleven (Paris, 1862). Bopp, it is well known, early made the finest episodes accessible, beginning with the Nala (London, 1819), whereby he at the same time laid the foundation of Sanskrit philology in Europe. For the criticism of the Mahá-Bhárata, the ground was broken and important results achieved by Lassen in his Indische Alterthums-
kunde (vol. i. 1847). For the contents of the work, see Monier Williams's Indian Epic Poetry (1863), and Indian Wisdom (1875).

* In Albdini's time, the 11th century, it passed as a leading author-

ity; see Journ. Asiatic. Aug. 1844, p. 130. [Subandhu, author of the Vana-vadattē, had it before him, in the 7th century; see I. Str., i. 380. A French translation by A. Langlois appeared in 1834.]

† See my Catal. of the Sanskrit MSS. in the Berl. Libr., pp. 111–118: according to Wilson (MacG. Coll., ii. 1), this book would appear to be the only one in existence; see also Weigle in Z. D. M. G., ii. 278. [This book, the divamadākāram pārśa, was printed at Bombay in 1863; according to its concluding statements as they appear in this edition, Jaimini's work embraced the entire epos; but up to the present, apart from this 13th book, nothing further is known of it; see as to this my paper in the Monatsschr. der Berl. Acad., 1869, p. 10 ff. A Kamarese translation of this book is assigned to the beginning of the 13th century (ibid., pp. 13, 35); quite recently, however, by Kittel, in his Preface to Nágarjuna's Práçadā, pp. vii. lxxi., it has been relegated to the middle of the 18th (!) century. The peculiar colouring of the Krishna sect, which pervades the whole book, is noteworthy; Christian legendary matter and other Western influences are unmistakably present; Monatsschr., l.c., p. 37 ff. A good part of the content has been communicated by
... Side by side with the Itihāsa we find the Purāṇa mentioned in the Brāhmaṇas, as the designation of those cosmogonic inquiries which occur there so frequently, and which relate to the 'agra' or 'beginning' of things. When in course of time distinct works bearing this name arose, the signification of the term was extended; and these works came to comprehend also the history of the created world, and of the families of its gods and heroes, as well as the doctrine of its various dissolutions and renovations in accordance with the theory of the mundane periods (yugas). As a rule, five such topics are given as forming their subject (see Lassen, I. A.K., i. 479), whence the epithet Pañcha-lakṣaṇa, which is cited in Amara's lexicon as a synonym of Purāṇa. These works have perished, and those that have come down to us in their stead under the name of Purāṇas are the productions of a later time, and belong all of them to the last thousand years or so. They are written (cf. Lassen, i. c.) in the interests of, and for the purpose of recommending, the Śiva and Viṣṇu sects; and not one of them corresponds exactly, a few correspond slightly, and others do not correspond at all, with the description of the ancient Purāṇas preserved to us in the Scholiasts of Amara, and also here and there in the works themselves. "For the old narratives, which are in part abridged, in part omitted altogether, have been substituted theological and philosophical doctrines, ritual and ascetic precepts, and especially legends recommending a particular divinity or certain shrines" (Lassen, I. A.K., i. 481). Yet they have unquestionably preserved much of the matter of these older works; and accordingly it is not uncommon to meet with lengthy passages, similarly worded, in several of them at the same time. Generally speaking, as regards the traditions of primitive times, they closely follow the Mahā-Bhārata as their authority; but they likewise advert, though uniformly in a prophetic tone, to the historic

Talboys Wheeler in his History of India, vol. i. (1867), where, too, there is a general sketch of the contents of the Mahā-Bhārata itself; see I. Str., ii. 392.—It remains further to mention the re-cast of the Mahā-Bhārata by the Jaina Amarakūḍa, which is extant under the title Bīḍa-Bhārata, in 44 sor- gas of 6550 anuvākh verses, and which appeared in the Benares Paṇḍit (1869 ff.), edited by Veṣṇu Ramāśāstrin. This work belongs probably to the 11th century, see Z. D., M. O., xxvii. 170.
lines of kings. Here, however, they come into the most violent conflict, not only with each other, but with chronology in general, so that their historical value in this respect is extremely small. Their number is considerable, amounting to eighteen, and is doubled if we reckon the so-called Upapurāṇas, in which the epic character has been thrust still more into the background, while the ritual element has come quite to the front. Up to this time only one single Purāṇa, the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa, has been published—the greater part of it at least—edited [and translated] by Burnouf: but of the others we have excellent notices in Wilson’s translation of the Vishnu-Purāṇa.

As the second group of Epic Poetry we designated the Kāvyas, which are ascribed to certain definite poets (kavis); whereas the Itihasas and Purāṇas are attributed to a mythical personage, Vyāsa, who is simply Ācārka (Redaction) personified. At the head of these poems stands the Rāmdāṣya of Vālmiki, whose name we found cited among the teachers of the Taattīrīya-Prātiśākhya. In respect of language, this work is closely related to the war-portion of the Mahā-Bhārata, although in individual cases, where the poet displays his full elegance, it bears plainly enough on its surface, in rhyme and metre, the traces of a later date. In

263 As also in the separate analyses of various Purāṇas, now collected in vol. 4. of Wilson’s Essays on Sanskrit Literature (ed. Rout, 1884). Above all, we have here to mention, further, the minute accounts given of the Purāṇas by Aufrecht in his Catal. Cod. Sans. Bibl. Ecd., pp. 7-87. The Vishnu-Purāṇa has been recently published at Bombay, with the commentary of Ratnagarbhavāta (1867); Wilson’s translation of it has been republished, edited by Fitzedward Hall in five vols. (1864-1870), with material additions and corrections. There are now also several editions of the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa; amongst them, one with the comm. of Śrīdharavīmin (Bombay, 1856). The Mārkandeyas-Purāṇa has been edited in the Bibl. Indica by K. M. Basierjesa (1855-1862); and the Agni-Purāṇa is now appearing in the same series (begun 1870; caps. 1-214, thus far). An impression of the Kāthi-Purāṇa appeared at Calcutta in 1873; and lithographed editions of the Liṅga-Purāṇa (1858) and of portions of the Padma, Skanda, Garuda, Brahmavimarsa, and other Purāṇas have appeared at Bombay; see J. Sch., I. 245 ff., 301 ff.

2 The words kavi, in the sense of ‘singer, poet,’ and kārya, in that of ‘song, poem,’ are repeatedly used in the Veda, but without any technical application; see Vṛdd. Samh. Spec., II. 127 [trans. not cited kārya chhandas, Sat., vili. 5. 2. 4].

† Whether by this name we have to understand the same person is of course not certain, but considering the singularity of the name, it is at least not improbable.
regard to contents, on the contrary, the difference between it and this portion of the Mahá-Bhárata is an important one. In the latter human interest everywhere preponderates, and a number of well-defined personages are introduced, to whom the possibility of historical existence cannot be denied, and who were only at a later stage associated with the myths about the gods. But in the Rámáyana we find ourselves from the very outset in the region of allegory; and we only move upon historical ground in so far as the allegory is applied to an historical fact, namely, to the spread of Aryan civilisation towards the south, more especially to Ceylon. The characters are not real historic figures, but merely personifications of certain occurrences and situations. Sítá, in the first place, whose abduction by a giant demon, and subsequent recovery by her husband Ráma, constitute the plot of the entire poem, is but the field-furrow, to which we find divine honours paid in the songs of the Rik, and still more in the Grihya ritual. She accordingly represents Aryan husbandry, which has to be protected by Ráma—whom I regard as originally identical with Balaráma “halabhrit,” “the plough-bearer,” though the two were afterwards separated—against the attacks of the predatory aborigines. These latter appear as demons and giants; whereas those natives who were well disposed towards the Aryan civilisation are represented as monkeys,—a comparison which was doubtless not exactly intended to be flattering, and which rests on the striking ugliness of the Indian aborigines as compared with the Aryan race. Now this allegorical form of the Rámáyana certainly indicates, à priori, that this poem is later than the war-part of the Mahá-Bhárata; and we might fairly assume, further, that the historical events upon which the two works are respectively based stand to each other in a similar relation. For the colonisation of Southern India could hardly begin until the settlement of Hindustán by the Aryans had been completed, and the feuds that arose there had been fought out. It is not, however, altogether necessary to suppose the latter; and the warfare at least which forms the basis of the Mahá-Bhárata might have been waged concurrently with expeditions of other Aryan tribes to the south. Whether it was really the Kośalas, as whose chief Ráma appears in the Rámáyana, who
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effected the colonisation of the south,* as stated in the
poem; or whether the poet merely was a Kośāla, who
claimed this honour for his people and royal house, is a
point upon which it is not yet possible to form a judg-
ment. He actually represents Sītā as the daughter of
Janaka, king of the Videhas, a tribe contiguous to the
Kośalas, and renowned for his piety. The scanty know-
ledge of South India displayed in the Rāmāyana has been
urged as proving its antiquity; since in the Mahā-Bhārata
this region appears as far more advanced in civilisation,
and as enjoying ample direct communication with
the rest of India. But in this circumstance I can only see
evidence of one of two things: either that the poet did not
possess the best geographical knowledge; whereas many
generations have worked at the Mahā-Bhārata, and made
it their aim to magnify the importance of the conflict
by grouping round it as many elements as possible: or
else—and this is the point I would particularly empha-
sise—that the poet rightly apprehended and performed the
task he had set himself, and so did not mix up later con-
tions, although familiar to him, with the earlier state of
things. The whole plan of the Rāmāyana favours the
assumption that we have here to do with the work, the
poetical creation, of one man. Considering the extent
of the work, which now numbers some 24,000 slokas, this
is saying a great deal; and before epic poetry could have
attained to such a degree of perfection, it must already
have passed through many phases of development.† Still,

* It was by them also—by Bhagira-
thā, namely—that, according to the
Rāmāyana, the mouths of the Ganges were discovered. Properly, they
were the Eastern rather than the
Southern foreparts of the Aryana.
† Of these phases we have prob-
ably traces in the grantha Śūkur-
krandīyaḥ [to this Goldstücker in
his Pāṇini, p. 28, takes exception,
doubtless correctly; see I. & t., v.
27], Yamasabātyaḥ, Indrajamantyaḥ,
mentioned by Pāṇini, iv. 3, 83; and
in the Ākhyaṇas and Chānaraṭa,
which, according to Pāṇini, vi. 2, 103,
are to be variously designated ac-
cording to the different points of the
compass. The term Chānaraṭa still
remains unintelligible to me; see
I. St., i. 153. [For the rest, as
stated by the Calcutta scholiast,
this rule, vi. 2, 103, is not interpreted
in the Bhāṣya of Patanjali; it
may possibly therefore not be Pā-
ṇini's at all, but posterior to the
time of Patanjali.]—The word grantha
may have reference either to the
outward fastening (like the German
Hefi, Band) or to the inner com-
position: which of the two we have
to suppose remains still undecided,
but I am inclined to pronounce for
the former. [See above pp. 15, 99,
165.]
it is by no means implied that the poem was of these
dimensions from the first: here, too, many parts are cer-
tainly later additions; for example, all those portions in
which Rāma is represented as an incarnation of Vishṇu,
all the episodes in the first book, the whole of the seventh
book, &c. The poem was originally handed down orally,
and was not fixed in writing until afterwards, precisely
like the Mahā-Bhārata. But here we encounter the further
peculiar circumstance—which has not yet been shown to
apply, in the same way at all events, to the latter work—
namely, that the text has come down to us in several
distinct recensions, which, while they agree for the most
part as to contents, yet either follow a different arrange-
ment, or else vary throughout, and often materially, in the
expression. This is hardly to be explained save on the
theory that this fixing of the text in writing took place
independently in different localities. We possess a com-
plete edition of the text by G. Gorresio, containing the
so-called Bengali recension, and also two earlier editions
which break off with the second book, the one published
at Serampore by Carey and Marshman, the other at Bonn
by A. W. von Schlegel. The manuscripts of the Berlin
library contain, it would seem, a fourth recension.*

* See my Catalogue of these MSS., p. 119. [Two complete editions of
the text, with Rāma's Commentary,
have since appeared in India, the
one at Calcutta in 1859-60, the
other at Bombay in 1859; respecting
the latter, see my notice in J. Str.,
ii. 235-245. Gorresio's edition was
completed by the appearance in 1867
of the text, and in 1870 of the transla-
tion, of the Utarad-kāṣṭa. Hippo-
lyte Fusce's French translation
follows Gorresio's text, whereas
Griffith's metrical English version
(Benares, 1870-74, in 5 vols.) fol-
low the Bombay edition. In my
Essay, Uber das Rāmdāṇyana, 1870
(an English translation of which ap-
peared in the Indian Antiquary for
1872, also separately at Bombay in
1873), I have attempted to show
that the modifications which the
story of Rāma, as known to us
in its earliest shape in Buddhist
legends, underwent in the hands of
Vālmiki, rest upon an acquaintance
with the conceptions of the Trojan
cycle of legend; and I have like-
wise endeavoured to determine more
accurately the position of the work
in literary history. The conclusion
there arrived at is, that the date
of its composition is to be placed
towards the commencement of the
Christian era, and at all events in
an epoch when the operation of
Greek influence upon India had
already set in. This elicited a re-
joinder from Kashinath Trimbek
Telang (1873), entitled, Was the
Rāmdāṇyana copied from Homer; as
to which see Ind. Ant., ii. 209, i.
St., xiii. 336, 480. The same writer
afterwards, in the Ind. Ant., iii.
124, 267, pointed out a half foika
which occurs in the Yuddha-Kīṭāga,
THE ARTIFICIAL EPIC.

Between the Rámáyana and the remaining Kávyas there exists a gap similar to that between the Mahá-Bhárata and the extant Puráṇas. Towards filling up this blank we might perhaps employ the titles of the Kávyas found in the Kávi language in the island of Bali, most of which certainly come from Sanskrit originals. In any case, the emigration of Hindús to Java, whence they subsequently passed over to Bali, must have taken place at a time when the Káya literature was particularly flourishing; otherwise we could not well explain the peculiar use they have made of the terms kávi and kávyā. Of the surviving Kávyas, the most independent in character, and on that account ranking next to the Rámáyana—passably pure, too, in respect of form—are two works* bearing the name of Kálidása, namely, the Rághu-vaśiśa and the Kusumá-samhāra (both extant in Kávi also). The other Kávyas, on the contrary, uniformly follow, as regards their subject, the Mahá-Bhárata or the Rámáyana; and they are also plainly enough distinguished from the two just mentioned by their language and form of exposition. This latter abandons more and more the epic domain and passes into the erotic, lyrical, or didactic-descriptive field; while the language is more and more overlaid with turgid bombast,

and also twice in Patanjali's Mahá-
bhāṣya. But the verse contains a
general reflection (eti jivanād
dandvo narāga varahastād epi), and
need not therefore have been de-

erived from the Rámáyana. In it-
self, consequently, it proves nothing
as to the priority of the poem to
Patanjali, and this all the less, as it
is expressly cited by Vālmiki himself
merely as a quotation. On this and
some other kindred points see my
(1875).]

* They have been edited by

Stenzler, text with translation and

repeatedly in India since, with or

without the commentary of Malli-

nātha. To the seven books of the

Kumará-samhāra, which were the

only ones previously known, ten

others have recently been added;

on the critical questions connected

with these, see, e.g., Z. D. M. G.,

xxvii. 174-182 (1873). From the

astrological data contained in both

works, H. Jacob has shown, in the

Monatsber. der Berl. Acad., 1873, p.

556, that the date of their com-

position cannot be placed earlier

than about the middle of the 4th

century a.d. The Rághu-vaśiśa was

most probably composed in honour

of a Bhoja prince; see my Essay on

the Rám. Térp. Up., p. 279, J. Ind.,

i. 312].

463 ff.
until at length, in its latest phases, this artificial epic resolves itself into a wretched jingle of words. A pretended elegance of form, and the performance of difficult tricks and feats of expression, constitute the main aim of the poet; while the subject has become a purely subordinate consideration, and merely serves as the material which enables him to display his expertise in manipulating the language.

Next to the epic, as the second phase in the development of Sanskrit poetry, comes the Drama. The name for it is Nāṭaka, and the player is styled Naṭa, literally 'dancer.' Etymology thus points us to the fact that the drama has developed out of dancing, which was probably accompanied, at first, with music and song only, but in course of time also with pantomimic representations, processions, and dialogue. We find dancing repeatedly mentioned in the songs of the Rīk (e.g., in i. 10. 1, 92. 4, &c.), but with special frequency in the Atharva-Sāṁhitā and the Yajus, though everywhere still under the root-form

202 Six of these artificial epics are specially entitled Mahākāvyas. These are, in addition to the Ragahvasana and Kunḍara-samhita:—
(1) the Bhāṭṭi-kāvya, in 22 sarga, composed in Valabhi under king Śrī-Dharmasa, (xxii. 35), in the 6th or 7th cent. therefore; it deals with the story of Rāma, and is written with a special reference to grammar;
(2) the Māyika-śrī or Śrīgañña-bāḍha of Māla, the son of Dattaka, in 22 sarga (Suprabhadra, grandfather of the poet, is described as the minister of a king Śrī-Dharmasa-nabha), and (3) the Kirtirājīmysa of Bhiravi, in 18 sarga,—both prior to Hākyuntha (end of the 10th cent.), see J. St., viii. 193, 195, 196: (4) the Nāthakāvyas of Śrī-Harasa, in 22 sarga, of the 12th cent. (see Bühler in the Journal Bombay Br. R. A. S., x. 35). The Rādhyavānīghaṇṭa of Kavirāja, in any case later than the 10th cent. (see J. St., i. 371), enjoys a high esteem; it handles, in the self-same words, at once the story of the Rāmāyaṇa and that of the Māhā-Βhārata, and, like the Nāloṣṭa, in 4 sarga, which it's even ascribed to Kālidāsa (edited so long ago as 1839 by Ferd. Banary), is one of the most characteristically artificial pieces of this class of poetry. All these works have been frequently published in India; and to them are to be added many other similar productions. —The Pāṣcāk कौम नाव is Rāma-bāḍha, which relates to the story of Rāma, and is reputed to be by Kālidāsa, also merits special mention here. Of this Paul Goldschmidt has already published two chapters (Göttingen, 1873); and Siegfried Goldschmidt is engaged on an edition of the entire text.

*With various kinds of musical accompaniment, according to the Vēḷī. Śamh. xxx., where we meet with quite a number of musicians and dancers, as well as with the name Sālīha itself, which, at a later time, at all events, belongs specially to actors; see J. St., i. 76: 83. According to the scholiast on Kādy., xxii. 4. 3, by those "वर्णमयासर्वा"
nrīt. The prakritized form nāt occurs for the first time in Pāṇini, who, besides, informs us of the existence of distinct Naṭa-sūtras,* or manuals for the use of nāṭas, one of which was attributed to Śūlālin, and another to Kṛṣṇāva, their adherents being styled Śūlālinas and Kṛṣṇāvinas respectively. The former of these names finds an analogue, at least, in the patronymic Śūlāli, which occurs in the thirteenth kāṇḍa of the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa; and it may also, perhaps, be connected with the words Śūlūsha and Kuśālava, both of which denote ‘actor’(?).†. The latter name, on the contrary, is a very surprising one in this connection, being otherwise only known to us as the name of one of the old heroes who belong in common to the Hindūs and the Parsis.‡ Beyond this allusion we have no vestige of either of these works. Pāṇini further cites § the word nāṭyam in the sense of ‘nāṭānām dharmam ādhnayo vā.’ In both cases, we have probably to understand by the term the art of dancing, and not dramatic art.—It has been uniformly held hitherto that the Indian drama arose, after the manner of our modern drama in the Middle Ages, out of religious solemnities and spectacles (so-called ‘mysteries’), and also that dancing originally subserved religious purposes. But in support of this latter assumption, I have not met with one single instance in the Śrauta- or Grihya-Sūtras with which I am acquainted (though of the latter, I confess, I have only a very super-

*pamḍḍaṇyaṇuḥ," as the text has it, we have to understand specially teachers of dancing, music, and singing. "In the man who dances and sings, women take delight," Sat., iii. 2. 4. 6.

* The two rules in question, iv. 3. 110, 111, according to the Calcutta scholiast, are not explained in the Bhāṣya of Patanjali; possibly, therefore, they may not be Pāṇini’s at all, but posterior to the time of Patanjali. [The Sālāliṇī nāṭāḥ are mentioned in the Bhāṣya to iv. 2. 66; in the Anuṇḍa-sūtra, the Sālāliṇāḥ are cited as a ritual school; see I. S., xiii. 429.]

† These terms are probably derived from śīla, and refer to the corrupt, loose morals of those so designated; and the same must apply to Śūlāla, if this be a cognate word. The derivation from Kuśā and Lava, the two sons of Rāma, at the beginning of the Rāmayana, has manifestly been invented in order to escape the odium of the name ‘kuśa-śāra.’

‡ Ought we here to understand the name literally, as, perhaps, a kind of mocking epithet to express poverty, with at the same time, possibly, a direct ironical reference to the renowned Kṛṣṇāva of old? §§ iv. 3. 123: this rule, also, is not explained in the Bhāṣya; perhaps therefore it is not Pāṇini’s, but later than Patanjali.
ficial knowledge). The religious significance of dancing is thus, for the older period at least, still questionable; and since it is from dancing that the drama has evidently sprung, the original connection of the latter with religious solemnities and spectacles becomes doubtful also. Besides, there is the fact that it is precisely the most ancient dramas that draw their subjects from civil life; while the most modern, on the contrary, almost exclusively serve religious purposes. Thus the contrary, rather, would seem to be the case, namely, that the employment of dancing* and of the drama at religious solemnities was only the growth of a later age. This does not imply, however, that dancing was excluded from those great sacrificial festivals which were 'now and then celebrated by princes'; but only that it did not itself constitute part of the sacred rite or religious ceremony, and could only, and did only, find a place in the intervals: The name applied to the stage-manager in the dramas themselves, 'Sutra-dhara,' is referred, and no

---

220 Even now I am acquainted with but little from these sources bearing on this point. Amongst other things, at the pitrimāska we find dancing, music, and song, which represent the three forms of śāla or art (Śākh. Br. 29, 5), prescribed for the whole day, Kāy. 21, 3, 11. But a Sūnāka might not participate in any such performance, either actively or passively, Pād. ii. 7. On the day preceding the departure of a bride, four or eight married women (un-widowed) performed a dance in her house, Śākh. Gri. i. 11.

* It is known in the Megha-dūta, v. 35, 36.

421 Through the unexpected light shed by the Mahābhāṣya of Patanjali on the then flourishing condition of theatrical representation, this question has recently taken a form very favourable to the view of which Lassen is the principal exponent, and which regards the drama as having originated in religious spectacles resembling our mysteries. The particulars there given regarding the performance of a Kuśasvādha and Valākāndha by so-called sukhikāna—(comp. perhaps the sukhikānas in Ṛāvali, 151, though these are explained as indraśikānas—'jugglers,' cf. sohā, sobhanagarasaka, I. St. iii. 153)—lead us directly to this conclusion; see I. St. xiii. 354, 487 ff. "But between the dramatic representations known in the Bāh-āṣya, which bear more or less the character of religious festival-plays, and the earliest real dramas that have actually come down to us, we must of course suppose a very considerable interval of time, during which the drama gradually rose to the degree of perfection exhibited in these extant pieces; and here I am still disposed to assign a certain influence to the witnessing of Greek plays. The Indian drama, after having acquitted itself brilliantly in the most varied fields—notably too as a drama of civil life—finally reverted in its closing phases to essentially the same class of subjects with which it had started—to representations from the story of the gods."—Ibid. pp. 491, 492.
THE DRAMA.

doubt rightly, to the original sense of ' (measuring) line-holder,' 'carpenter;'; since it appears to have been one of the duties of the architect at these sacrificial celebrations, over and above the erection of the buildings for the reception of those taking part in the sacrifice, likewise to conduct the various arrangements that were to serve for their amusement. (See Lassen, I, A.K., ii. 503.) Whether the nātas and nartakas mentioned on such occasions are to be understood as dancers or actors, is at least doubtful; but in the absence of any distinct indication that the latter are intended, I hold in the meantime to the etymological significance of the word; and it is only where the two appear together (e.g., in Rāmāy. i. 12. 7 Gorr.) that nāta has certainly to be taken in the sense of 'actor.' Buddhist legend seems, indeed, in one instance—in the story of the life of Mandgalyānā and Upatishya, two disciples of Buddha—to refer to the representation of dramas in the presence of these individuals.† But here a question at once arises as to the age of the work in which this reference occurs; this is the main point to be settled before we can base any conclusion upon it. Lassen, it is true, says that "in the oldest Buddhistic writings the witnessing of plays is spoken of as something usual;" but the sole authority he adduces is the passage from the Dulva indicated in the note. The Dulva, however, that is, the Vinaya-Piṭaka, cannot, as is well known, be classed amongst the "oldest Buddhistic writings;" it contains pieces of widely different dates, in part, too, of extremely questionable antiquity. In the Lalita-Vistara, apropos of the testing of Buddha in the

* And therefore has probably nothing to do with the Nāṭa-ūttras mentioned above† For another application of the word by the Buddhista, see Lassen, I. A.K., ii. 31. Of a marionette theatre, at all events, we must not think, though the Javanese puppet-shows might tempt us to do so.

† Csoma Körösí, who gives an account of this in As. Rec. xx. 50, uses these phrases: "They meet on the occasion of a festival at Raja-grīka: their behaviour during the several exhibitions of spectacles— their mutual addresses after the shows are over." By 'spectacle' must we here necessarily understand 'dramatic spectacle,' drama * 11 [Precisely the same thing applies to the word strīka, which properly only signifies 'merry-making' in the Sūtras of the Southern Buddhists, where the witnessing of such exhibitions (strīka-dāsana) is mentioned among the reproaches directed by Bhagavant against the worldly ways of the Brahmanas; see Burnouf, Lotus de la Bonne Loi, p. 465; J. St., iii 152-154.]
various arts and sciences (Foucaux, p. 150), nātya must, undoubtedly, be taken in the sense of 'mimetic art'—and so Foucaux translates it; but this does not suppose the existence of distinct dramas. The date, moreover, of this particular work is by no means to be regarded as settled; and, in any case, for the time of Buddha himself, this examination-legend carries no weight whatever.

With respect, now, to the surviving dramas, it has hitherto been usual to follow what is supposed to be the tradition, and to assign the most ancient of them, the Mrichhakatī and Kālidāsa's pieces, to the first century B.C.; while the pieces next following—those of Bhavabhūti—belong to a time so late as the eighth century A.D. Between Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti there would thus be a gap of some eight or nine centuries—a period from which, according to this view, not one single work of this class has come down to us. Now this is in itself in the highest degree improbable; and were it so, then surely at the very least there ought to be discernible in the dramas of the younger epoch a very different spirit, a very different manner of treatment, from that exhibited in their predecessors of an age eight or nine hundred years earlier. But this is by no means the case; and thus we are compelled at once to reject this pretended tradition, and to refer those soi-disant older pieces to pretty much the same period as those of Bhavabhūti. Moreover, when we come to examine the matter more closely, we find that, so far as Kālidāsa is concerned, Indian tradition does not really furnish any ground whatever for the view hitherto accepted: we only find that the tradition has been radically misused. The tradition is to the effect that Kālidāsa lived at the court of Vikramāditya, and it is contained in a memorial verse which says that Dhanvantari, Kāshapanaka, Amarasīhha, Śāṅku, Vetalabhaṭṭa, Ghaṭakarpara, Kālidāsa, Varāhamihira, and Vararuci† were the 'nine gems' of Vikrama's

* I have here copied Holtzmann's words, referring to Amara, in his excellent little treatise, Uber den griechischen Ursprung des indischen Thierkreises, Karlsruhe, 1844, p. 26.

† This is obviously the Vṛṇasīhha who is mentioned by the Hindustānī thronoiler as the author of the Vīkrama-charitra (Journ. Asiat. Soc. 1844, p. 356). [This recension—
scribed to Vararuci—of the Sīkṣāsana-dvātraśākhā is actually extant; see Auffrecht, Cat. of Sansk.
court. Now it is upon this one verse—a mere waif and stray, that has come, like Schiller's 'Mädchen aus der Fremde,' from nobody knows where,* and which is, in any case, of the most questionable authority—that the assumption rests that Kālidāsa flourished in the year 56 B.C.† For people were not satisfied with hastily accepting as genuine coin the tradition here presented—and this notwithstanding the fact that they at the same time impugned to some extent the trustworthiness of the verse embodying it—thay at once rushed to the conclusion that the Vikrama here named must be the Vikramāditya, whose era, still current in our own day, commences with the year 56 B.C. But then, we know of a good many different Vikramas and Vikramādityas‡ and, besides, a tradition which is found in some modern works.§ and which ought surely, in the first instance, to have been shown to be baseless before any such conclusion was adopted, states expressly (whether correctly or not is a question by itself) that king Bhoja, the ruler of Mālava, who dwelt at Dhāra and Ujjainī, was the Vikrama at whose court the 'nine gems' flourished; and, according to an inscription,|| this king Bhoja lived

* It is alleged to be taken from the Vikrama-charitra; but Roth, in his analysis of this work in the Journ. Asiatic., Octob. 1845, p. 278 ff., says nothing of it. [And in fact it occurs neither there nor in any of the other recensions of the Siṅhāsana-dvāradhāka to which I have access. It is, however, found embodied both in the Jyotirliṅga-dhāraṇī, of about the sixteenth century (22. 10, see Z. D. M. G., xxii. 723, 1863), and in a Singhālīse, MS. of the so-called Navarata (with Singhālīse commentary) cited in Westermann's Catal.; Cod. Or. Bibl. Reg. Hauhn., p. 14 (1846).]

† Partly on erroneous grounds. It was asserted, namely, that the word Ghaṭakarpāra in the verse was only the name of a work, not of a person: this, however, is not the case, as several poems besides, are found ascribed to him.

‡ 'Sun of might' is quite a general title, and not a name.

§ See, for instance, also Hsüen-chieh's Sanskrit Anthology, pp. 483, 484.

|| See Lassen, Zeitsch. für die Kunde des Morgen., vii. 294 ff.; Colbeck, H. 462. According to Reinaud in the Journ. Asiatic., Sept. 1844, p. 250, Bhoja is mentioned some years earlier by Albrūni, who wrote in A.D. 1031, as his contemporary; and Obhi alludes to him earlier still, in A.D. 1018, as then reigning; see Rénaud, Mémo. sur l'Inde, p. 261. According to a later Hindoué chronicler, he lived 542 years after Vikramāditya—see Journ. Asiatic., Mai, 1844, p. 354, which would make the date of the latter about A.D. 476. Upon what this very precise statement rests is unfortunately uncertain; the Vikrama-charitra does not fix in this definite way the interval of time between Bhoja and Vikrama. Roth, at all events, in his analysis of the work (Journ. Asiatic., Sept. 1854, p. 281) merely says, "bien des années après (la mort de Vikramāditya) Bhoja parvint au
about 1040–1090 A.D. On the other hand, there exists no positive ground whatever for the opinion that the Vikrama of the verse is the Vikramāditya whose era begins in B.C. 56. Nay, the case is stronger still; for up to the present time we have absolutely no authentic evidence to show whether the era of Vikramāditya dates from the year of his birth, from some achievement, or from the year of his death, or whether, in fine, it may not have been simply introduced by him for astronomical reasons!† “To assign him to the first year of his era might be quite as great a mistake as we should commit in placing Pope Gregory XIII. in the year one of the Gregorian Calendar, or even Julius Cæsar in the first year of the Julian period to which his name has been given, i.e. in the year 4713 B.C.” (Holtzmann, op. cit., p. 19).

souscrṿm pouṿṛ. “The text has simply: “budda saraha pata.” Nor does any definite statement of the kind occur in any of the various other recensions of the Śiśuṣana-dvātriṇik śa, although a considerable interval is here regularly assumed to have elapsed between the rule of Vikrama at Avanti and that of Bhoja at Dīlārā.]—To suppose two Bhojas, as Reinaud does, l. c., hind ‘Mém. sur l’Inde,’ pp. 113, 114, is altogether arbitrary. We might determine the uncertain date of Vikramāditya by the certain date of Bhoja, but we cannot reverse the process. The date 5044 of Yudhisthira’s era is, J. As., l. c., p. 357; assigned to the accession of Vikramāditya; but it does not appear whether this is the actual tradition of the Hindustāni chronicler, or merely an addition on the part of the translator. Even in the former case, it would still only prove that the chronicler, or the tradition he followed, mixed up the common assertion as to the date of Vikrama with the special statement above referred to. [To the statements of the Hindustāni chronicler, Mir CHER I Ali Afsa, no great importance, probably, need be attached. They rest substantially on the recension attributed to Varsuvachi of the Śiśuṣana-dvātriṇik śa, which, however, in the MS. before me (Trin. Coll., Camb.,) yields no definite chronological data. — After all, the assumption of several Bhojas has since turned out to be fully warranted; see, e.g., Rājendraśīla Mitra in Journ. A. S. Beng. 1863, p. 91 ff., and my J. As., i. 312.] * See Colebrooke, ii. 475; Lassen, J. A.K., ii. 49, 50, 398; Reinaud, ‘Mém. sur l’Inde,’ pp. 68 ff., 79 ff.; Bertrand in the Journ. Asiat., Mai, 1844, p. 357.

† We first meet with it in the astronomer Vardha-Mihira in the fifth or sixth century, though even this is not altogether certain, and, as in the case of Brahmagupta in the seventh century, it might possibly be the era of Śālavahana (beg. A.D. 75). Lassen does, in fact, suppose the latter (J. A.K., i. 505), but see Colebrooke, ii. 475.—Ablānī gives particulars (v. Reinaud, Journ. Asiat., Sept. 1844, pp. 282–284) as to the origin of the Śaka era; but regarding the basis of the Saka era of Vikrama he does not enlarge. [Even yet these two questions, which are of such capital importance for Indian chronology, are in an altogether unsatisfactory state. According to Kera, Introd. to his edition of the
The dramas of Kālidāsa—that one of the ‘nine gems’ with whom we are here more immediately concerned—furnish in their contents nothing that directly enables us to determine their date. Still, the mention of the Greek female slaves in attendance upon the king points at least to a time not especially early; while the form in which the popular dialects appear, and which, as compared with that of the inscriptions of Piyadasi, is extraordinarily degraded, not unfrequently coinciding with the present form of these vernaculars, brings us down to a period at any rate several centuries after Christ. But whether the tradition is right in placing Kālidāsa at the court of Bhoja in the middle of the eleventh century appears to me very questionable; for this reason in particular, that it assigns to the same court other poets also, whose works, compared with those of Kālidāsa, are so bad, that they absolutely must belong to a later stage than his—for example, Dāmodara Misra, author of the Hanuman-nātaka. Moreover, Kālidāsa has allotted to him such a large number of works, in part too of wholly diverse character, that we cannot but admit the existence of several authors of this name; and, in point of fact, it is a name that has continued in constant use down to the present time. Nay, one even of the three dramas that are ascribed to Kālidāsa would seem, from its style, to belong to a different author from

Brihat-Samhitā of Varsha-Mihira, 5 ff. (1866), the use of the so-called Sāmaṇera era is not demonstrable for early times at all, while astronomers only begin to employ it after the year 1000 or so. According to Westergaard, Om de indo-europ. Keserhous (1867), p. 164, the grant of Dantidurga, dated Saka 675, Sguer 311 (A.D. 754), is the earliest certain instance of its occurrence; see also Burnell, Elem. of South. Ind. Pal., p. 55. Others, on the contrary, have no hesitation in at once referring, wherever possible, every Sāmaṇera- or Sāmaṇera-dated inscription to the Sāmaṇera era. Thus, e.g., Cunningham in his Archæol. Survey of India, iii. 37, 39, directly assigns an inscription dated Sāmaṇera 5 to the year A.D. 52: Dowson, too, has recently taken the same view, J. R. A. S., vii. 382 (1875). According to Eggeling (Trübner’s Amer. and Or. Lit. Rec., special number, 1875, p. 35), one of the inscriptions found in Sir Walter Elliot’s copies of grants—dates as far back as the year Saka 169 (A.D. 247). Burnell, however, declares it to be a forgery of the tenth century. Ferguson, too, On the Saka, Samaṇer, and Gupta Eras, pp. 11-16, is of opinion that the so-called Sāmaṇera era goes no farther back than the tenth century. For the present, therefore, unfortunately, where there is nothing else to guide us, it must generally remain an open question which era we have to do with in a particular inscription, and what date consequently the inscription bears.
the other two. And this view is further favoured by the circumstance, that in the introduction to this play Dhāvaka, Saumilla, and Kaviputra are named as the poet's predecessors; Dhāvaka being the name of a poet who flourished contemporaneously with king Śrī-Harsha of Kashmir, that is, according to Wilson, towards the beginning of the twelfth century A.D. There may, it is

211 In the introduction to my translation of this drama, the Mālavikāgupta, I have specially examined not only the question of its genuineness, but also that of the date of Kālidāsa. The result arrived at is, in the first place, that this drama also really belongs to him,—and in this view Shankar Paṇḍīt, in his edition of the play (Bombay, 1869), concurs. As to the second point, internal evidence, partly derived from the language, partly connected with the phase of civilization presented to us, leads me to assign the composition of Kālidāsa's three dramas to a period from the second to the fourth century of our era, the period of the Gupta princes, Chandra-gupta, &c., "whose reigns correspond best to the legendary tradition of the glory of Vikramas, and may perhaps be gathered up in it in one single focus." Lassen has expressed himself to essentially the same effect (J. A.K., ii. 457, 1158-1160); see also J. St., ii. 148, 415-417. Kern, however, with special reference to the tradition which regards Kālidāsa and Varāha-Mihira as contemporaries, has, in his preface to Varāha's Bhāhat-Śāntiḥ, p. 20, declared himself in favour of referring the 'nine gems' to the first half of the sixth century A.D. Lastly, on the ground of the astrological data in the Kumāra-sambhava and Rasauvāda, Jacoby comes to the conclusion (Monatber. der Berl. Akad., 1873, p. 556) that the author of these two poems cannot have lived before about A.D. 350; but here, of course, the preliminary question remains whether he is to be identi-
true, have been more Dhávakas than one; another MS., moreover, reads Bhásaka; 213 and besides, these introduc-
tions are possibly, in part, later additions. In the case of
the Mrichhakatí at least, this would appear to be cer-
tain, as the poet’s own death is there intimated.* This
last-mentioned drama, the Mrichhakatí—whose author,
Súdraka, is, according to Wilson, placed by tradition prior
to Vikramáditya 214 (i.e., the same Vikrama at whose
court the ‘nine gems’ flourished?)—cannot in any case
have been written before the second century A.D. For it
makes use of the word nápaka as the name of a coin; †
and this term, according to Wilson (Ariana Antiqua, p.
364), is borrowed from the coins of Kanerki, a king who,
by the evidence of those coins, is proved to have reigned
until about the year 40 A.D. (Lassen, I. A.K., ii. 413). But
a date long subsequent to this will have to be assigned to
the Mrichhakatí, since the vernacular dialects it intro-
duces appear in a most barbarous condition. Besides, we
meet with the very same flourishing state of Buddhism
which is here revealed in one of the dramas of Bhava-
bhúti, a poet whose date is fixed with tolerable certainty
for the eighth century A.D. The Rámayána and the war-
part of the Mahá-Bhárata must, to judge from the use

213 The passage exhibits a great number of various readings; see Haag, Zur Textkritik u. Erklärung von Kédidesa’s Mālakāvadhyamāstra (1852), pp. 7, 8. Hall, I. e., prefers the readings Bhásaka, Rámai, and Sáva-
míla; Haag, on the contrary, Bhása, Sávamíla, Nápaputra. In Béna’s
Haraka-charita, Introd., v. 15, Bhása is landed on account of his
drama; indeed, his name is even put before that of Kédidesa.

* Unless Súdraka-rája, the reputed author, simply was the patron
of the poet.† It is quite a common thing in India for the actual author
to substitute the name of his patron for his own.

214 In a prophetic chapter of the Skanda-Puráṇa, for instance, he is
placed in the year Kalí 3290 (i.e., A.D. 189), but at the same time only
twenty years before the Nandas

whom Chánakya is to destroy. To
Vikramáditya, on the other hand,
is assigned the date Kalí 4000, i.e.,
A.D. 899 (?); see the text in Nys-
rachandra Viyáśgára’s Marriage
of Hindoo Widows, p. 63 (Calcutta
1856), and in my Essay on the
Rámayána, p. 43.

† According to the Viyá-sáhas, quoted by Mahádhára to Váj. Sasth.
25. 9, it is a synonym of rúpá ( = rupee $). Yájnnavalkya (see
Stenzler, Introd., p. xl) and Víd-
dhasa-Gautama (see Dattaka Mímsásá,
p. 34) are also acquainted with
násakás in the sense of ‘coin.’

Both Lassen, I. A.K., ii. 575, and
Müller, A. S. L., p. 331, dispute
the conclusions drawn from the
occurrence of the word násaka, but
I cannot be persuaded of the cogency
of their objections.]
made of their heroes in the Mrichhakaṭṭi, already have been favourite reading at the time when it was composed; while, on the other hand, from the absence of allusion to the chief figures of the present Purāṇas, we may perhaps infer with Wilson that these works were not yet in existence. This latter inference, however, is in so far doubtful as the legends dealt with in these younger Purāṇas were probably, to a large extent, already contained in the older works of the same name.* The two remaining dramas of Bhavabhūti, and the whole herd of the later dramatic literature, relate to the heroic tradition of the Rāmāyana and Mahā-Bhārata, or else to the history of Krishṇa; and the later the pieces are, the more do they resemble the so-called ‘mysteries’ of the Middle Ages. The comedies, which, together with a few other pieces, move in the sphere of civil life, form of course an exception to this. A peculiar class of dramas are the philosophical ones, in which abstractions and systems appear as the dramatis personae. One very special peculiarity of the Hindū drama is that women, and persons of inferior rank, station, or caste, are introduced as speaking, not in Sāṃskṛt, but in the popular dialects. This feature is of great importance for the criticism of the individual pieces; the conclusions resulting from it have already been adverted to in the course of the discussion.

* Besides, the slaying of Śumbha and Nifrogba by Devī, which forms the subject of the Devī-Maḥāmyna, v.–x., in the Mārkand.-Purāṇa, is referred to in the Mrichhakaṭṭi, p. 205.22 (ed. Stener).—Whether, ied. 104.18, Karṇaṅka is to be referred to the jackal of this name in the Pañcaratrastra is uncertain.—At page 126.9 Stener reads gullaka, but Wilson (Hindū Theatre, i. 134) reads mulaka, and considers it not impossible that by it, we have to understand the Arabic mulak!—In regard to the state of manners depicted, the Mrichhakaṭṭa is closely related to the Daśa-kumdra, although the latter work, written in the eleventh century [rather in the sixth, see below, p. 215], belongs certainly to a later stage. Ought the Śūdraka who is mentioned in this work, p. 118, ed. Wilson, to be identified, perhaps, with the reputed author of the Mrichhakaṭṭa? For example, from the relation in which the Prakṛt of the several existing recensions of the Saktatāl stands to the rules of the Prakṛt grammarian Vararuci, Pischel has drawn special arguments in support of the view advocated by him in conjunction with Stener, that of these recensions the Bengali one is the most ancient; see Kuhn’s Beiträge zur vergl. Sprachforsch., viii. 129 ff. (1874), and my observations on the subject in J. St., xiv. 35 ff.
POSSIBLE GREEK INFLUENCE ON DRAMA.

From the foregoing exposition it appears that the drama meets us in an already finished form, and with its best productions. In almost all the prologues, too, the several works are represented as new, in contradistinction to the pieces of former poets; but of these pieces, that is, of the early beginnings of dramatic poetry, not the smallest remnant has been preserved. Consequently the conjecture that it may possibly have been the representation of Greek dramas at the courts of the Grecian kings in Bactria, in the Panjab, and in Gujarát (for so far did Greek supremacy for a time extend), which awakened the Hindú faculty of imitation, and so gave birth to the Indian drama, does not in the meantime admit of direct verification. But its historical possibility, at any rate, is undeniable, especially as the older dramas nearly all belong to the west of India. No internal connection, however, with the Greek drama exists. The fact, again, that no dramas are found either

214 See Cowell in I. St., v. 475; and as to the Kasa—vadha and Vālbandha, the note on p. 108 above.
215 Cf. the Introduction to my translation of the Mālavikā, p. xlvii, and the remarks on the Kṣemavatī in Z. D. M. G., xiv. 269; also I. St.; xiii. 492.
216 The leading work on the Indian dramas is still Wilson’s Select Specimens of the Theatre of the Hindus, 1835, 1871. The number of dramas that have been published in India is already very considerable, and is constantly being increased. Foremost amongst them still remain:—the Māchakasikā of Sudraka, the three dramas of Kālidāsa (Sakuntalā, Urvāṣī, and Mālavikā), Bhavabhūti’s three (Mālavī-vadha, Mākh-vīra-charitā, and Utarā-rāma-charitā);—the Rattadeva of King Sṛṣa-Harsabheva, composed, according to Wilson’s view, in the twelfth century, and that not by the king himself, but by the poet Dhāvakā, who lived at his court, but according to Hall, by the poet Bāgī in the beginning of the seventh century;—see Hall, Introduction to the Wśavadattā, p. 15 ff. (cf. note 212 above), I. Str., i, 356; Litz. Cent. Bl., 1872, p. 614;—the Nāgdnanda, a Buddhistic utilitarian piece ascribed to the same royal author, but considered by Cowell to belong to Dhāvakā (see, however, my notice of Boyd’s translation in Lit. C. B., 1872, p. 615);—the Vast-sapadhra of Bhātī-nildhāya, a piece pervaded by the colouring of the Krishna sect, written, according to Grill, who edited it in 1871, in the sixth, and in any case earlier than the tenth century (see Lit. C. B., 1872, p. 612);—the Viddha-śakhasājakā of Rāja-Sekhara, probably prior to the tenth century (see I. Str., i, 313);—the Mudrā-vidhāra of Viśakhadatta, a piece of political intrigue, of about the twelfth century; and lastly, the Prabodha-chandrapadaya of Kṛṣṇa-miśra, which dates, according to Goldstücker, from the end of the same century,—Two of Kālidāsa’s dramas, the Sakuntalā and Urvāṣī, are each extant in several recensions, evidently in consequence of their having enjoyed a very special popularity. Since the appearance of Pischel’s pamphlet, De Kālidāsa’s Sakuntali Recensionibus (Breslau,
in the literature of the Hindús, who emigrated to the island of Java about the year 500 A.D. (and thence subsequently to Bali), or among the Tibetan translations, is perhaps to be explained, in the former case, by the circumstance that the emigration took place from the east coast of India, where dramatic literature may not as yet have been specially cultivated (!). But in the case of the Tibetans the fact is more surprising, as the Meghadútá of Kálidása and other similar works are found among their translations.

The Lyrical branch of Sanskrit poetry divides itself, according to its subject, into the Religious and the Erotic Lyric. With respect to the former, we have already seen, when treating of the Atharva-Samhitá, that the hymns of this collection are no longer the expression of direct religious emotion, but are rather to be looked upon as the utterance of superstitious terror and uneasy apprehension, and that in part they bear the direct character of magic spells and incantations. This same character is found faithfully preserved in the later religious lyrics, throughout the Epic, the Puráñas, and the Upanishads, wherever prayers of the sort occur; and it has finally, within the last few centuries, found its classical expression in the Tantra literature. It is in particular by the heaping up of titles under which the several deities are invoked that their favour is thought to be won; and the ‘thousand-name-prayers’ form quite a special class by themselves. To this category belong also the prayers in amulet-form, to which a prodigious virtue is ascribed, and which enjoy the very highest repute even in the present day. Besides these, we also meet with prayers, to Siva especially, which

1870), in which he contends, with great confidence, for the greater authenticity of the so-called Bengáli recension, the questions connected herewith have entered upon a new stage. See a full discussion of this topic in I. St., xiv. 161 ff. To Faeschel we are also indebted for our knowledge of the Dekhan recension of the Urvadī: it appeared in the *Monátsber. der Berl. Acad.,* 1875, pp. 609–690.

* Yet the later emigrants might have taken some with them! [In this Kavi literature, moreover, we have actually extant, in the Simrashana, a subsequent version of the Kumára-samáthava, and in the Suvána-sautaka (!) a similar version of the Raghu-vánsa, i.e., works which, in their originals at least, bear the name of Kálidása; see I. St., iv. 133, 141.] Do the well-known Javanese puppet-shows owe their origin to the Indian drama?

† Whose worship appears, in the main, to have exercised the most favourable influence upon his followers.
for religious fervour and childlike trust will bear comparison with the best hymns of the Christian Church, though, it must be admitted, their number is very small.

The Erotic Lyric commences, for us, with certain of the poems attributed to Kālidāsa. One of these, the Meghadūta, belongs at all events to a period 229 when the temple worship of Śiva Mahākāla at Ujjayinī was in its prime, as was still the case at the time of the first Muhammadan conquerors. Together with other matter of a like sort, it has been admitted, and under Kālidāsa’s name, into the Tibetan Tandjur,* from which, however, no chronological deduction can be drawn, as the date of the final completion of this compilation is unknown. The subject of the Meghadūta is a message which an exile sends by a cloud to his distant love, together with the description of the route the cloud-messenger is to take—a form of exposition which has been imitated in a considerable number of similar poems. A peculiar class is composed of the sentences of Bhartrihari,

whereas it is the worship of Kṛśna that has chiefly countenanced and furthered the moral degradation of the Hindus.

229 A very definite chronological detail would be furnished by v. 14, provided Mallinātha’s assertion is warranted, to the effect that this verse is to be taken in a double sense, i.e., as referring at the same time to Dīnādgā, a violent opponent of Kālidāsa. For in that case we should in all probability have to understand by Dīnādgā the well-known Buddhist disputer of this name, who lived somewhere about the sixth century; see my discussion of this point in Z. d. M. G., xxii. 726 ff.

* Considering the scarcity of the Asiatic Researches, I here give Csoma Kőrösi’s account of the Tandjur, contained in vol. xx., 1836, in some detail. “The Bstan-Huyur is a compilation in Tibetan of all sorts of literary works” (in all some 3000), “written mostly by ancient Indian Pandits and some learned Tibetans in the first centuries after the introduction of Buddhism into Tibet, commencing with the seventh century of our era. The whole makes 225 volumes. It is divided into the Rgyud and the Mdo (Tantra and Sūtra classes, in Sanskrit). The Rgyud, mostly on tantric rituals and ceremonies, makes 57 volumes. The Mdo, on science and literature, occupies 136 volumes. One separate volume contains (56) hymns or praises on several deities or saints, and one volume is the index for the whole. —The Rgyud contains 2649 treatises of different sizes: they treat in general of the rituals and ceremonies of the mystical doctrine of the Buddhists, interspersed with many instructions, hymns, prayers, and incantations. —The Mdo treats in general of science and literature in the following order: theology, philosophy” (these two alone make 94 volumes), “logic or dialectic, philology or grammar, rhetoric, poesy, prosody, synonyms, astronomy, astrology, medicine and ethics, some hints to the mechanical arts and histories.” See further, in particular, Anton Schleifer’s paper, Ueber die logicischen und grammatischen Werke im Tandjur, in the Bulletin of the St. Petersburg Academy (read 3d September 1847).
Amaru, &c., which merely portray isolated situations, without any connection as a whole. A favourite topic is the story of the loves of Krishna and the shepherdesses, the playmates of his youth. It has already been remarked that the later Kavyas are to be ranked with the erotic poems rather than with the epic. In general, this love-poetry is of the most unbridled and extravagantly sensual description; yet examples of deep and truly romantic tenderness of feeling are not wanting. It is remarkable that, in regard to some of these poems, we encounter the same phenomenon as in the case of the Song of Solomon: a mystical interpretation is put upon them, and in one instance at least, the Gita-Govinda of Jayadeva,\(^{218}\) such a mystical reference appears really to have been intended by the poet, however incompatible this may at first sight seem with the particularly wanton exuberance of fancy which is here displayed.

Of the Ethico-Didactic Poetry—the so-called Niti-Sastras—but little has survived in a complete form (some pieces also in the Tibetan Tandjur), no doubt because the great epic, the Mahâ-Bhârata, in consequence of the character of universality which was gradually stamped upon it, is itself to be regarded as such a Niti-Sstra. Still, relics enough of the aphoristic ethical poetry have been preserved to enable us to judge that it was a very favourable form, and achieved very excellent results.\(^{220}\) Closely allied

---

\(^{218}\) Acc. to Bühler (letter Sep. 1875), Jayadeva, who does not appear in the Saravv.-kapthukh., flourished under king Lakshmanasena of Gauda, of whom there is extant an inscription of the year 1116, and whose era, still current in Mithila, begins, acc. to Ind. Ant. iv. 300, in A.D. 1170.

\(^{220}\) See Böhtlingk's critical edition of these aphorisms, Indische Sprâiche, 3 vols., 1863-65 (with 5419 vv.), 2d edition, 1870-73 (with 7613 vv.), and Aufrecht's analysis, in the Z. D. M. G., xxvii. 1 ff. (1873), of the Sûrâgadha-Padâdhi, of the fourteenth century,—an anthology of about 6000 vv. culled from 264 different authors and works. Compare also Joh. Klist, De Præcentis Clinkâya Sententiae (1873), and Dr. John Muir's Religious and Moral Sentiments from Sanskrit Writers (1875). Regarding an anthology which, both in extent and antiquity, surpasses that of Sûrâgadha, viz., the Sûdâkâ-sarâmpîta of Sridhardasa, compiled Sakti 1127 (A.D. 1205), and comprising quotations from 446 poets, see the latest number of Râj. Lala Mitra's Notices, iii. 134-149. The statement at the close of the work respecting the era of king Lakshmanasena, in whose service the poet's father was, is both in itself obscure, and does not well harmonise with other our information on the point. On account of the numerous examples it quotes we may also here mention the Sarasvati-landadibhavana, a treatise on poetics attributed to king Bhoja-deva, and therefore
to it is the literature of the ‘Beast-Fable,’ which has a very special interest for us, as it forms a substantial link of connection with the West. We have already pointed out that the oldest animal-fables known to us at present occur in the Chhandogypanshanad. Nor are these at all limited there to the representation of the gods as assuming the forms of animals, and in this shape associating with men, of which we have even earlier illustrations,* but animals are themselves introduced as the speakers and actors. In Pāṇini’s time, complete cycles of fables may possibly have already existed, but this is by no means certain as yet.† The oldest fables, out of India, are those of Babrius, for some of which at least the Indian original may be pointed out.‡ But the most ancient book

belonging probably to the eleventh century; see on it Aufricht, Catalogus, pp. 208, 209.—To this class also belongs, though its contents are almost entirely erotic, the Prakṛti anthology of Hāla, consisting properly of only 700 verses (whereas its name Sapta-dātaka), which, however, by successive recensions have grown to 1100-1200. It was the prototype of the Saptā-latī of Govardhana, a work of about the twelfth century, which in its turn seems to have served as the model for the Sattasat of the Hindī poet Bihāri Lai; see my Essay on the Saptā-dātaka of Hāla (1870), pp. 9, 12, and Z. D. M. G., xxviii. 345 ff. (1874), and also Garre in the Journ. Asiat., August 1872, p. 197 ff.

* For instance, the story of Manu and the fish, Indra’s metamorphosis into the birds māraśa and kapāśa-la, his appearance in the form of a ram, &c. In the Rāk the sun is frequently compared to a vulture or falcon hovering in the air.

† The words cited in support of this are not Pāṇini’s own, but his scholiasts (see p. 225). [But, at all events, they occur directly in the Mahābhārata; see I. St., xiii. 486.]

‡ In my paper, Ueber den Zusammenhang indischer Fabeln mit griechischen (I. St., iii. 327 ff.), as the result of special investigations bearing upon A. Wagener’s Essay on the subject (1853), I arrived at exactly the opposite conclusion; for in nearly every instance where a Greek fable was compared with the corresponding Indian one, the marks of originality appeared to me to belong to the former. In all probability the Buddhists were here the special medium of communication, since it is upon their popular form of literary exposition that the Indian fable and fairy-tale literature is specially based. Otto Keller, it is true, in his tract, Ueber die Geschicchte der griech. Fabel (1862), maintains, in opposition to my view, the Indian origin of the fables common to India and Greece, and suggests an ancient Assyrian channel of communication. His main argument for their Indian origin is derived from the circumstance that the relation existing in Greek fable between the fox and the lion has no real basis in the nature of the two animals, whereas the jackal does, as a matter of fact, stand to the lion in the relation portrayed in Indian fable. But are jackals, then, only found in India, and not also in countries inhabited by Semitic peoples? And is not the Greek animal-fable precisely
of fables extant is the Pañcaka-tantra. The original text of this work has, it is true, undergone great alteration and expansion, and cannot now be restored with certainty; but its existence in the sixth century A.D. is an ascertained fact, as it was then, by command of the celebrated Sassanian king Nūshirvān (reg. 531–579), translated into Pahlavi. From this translation, as is well known, subsequent versions into almost all the languages of Asia Minor and Europe have been derived. The recension of the extant text seems to have taken place in the Dekhan; while the epitome of it known as the Hito-padesā was probably drawn up at Palibothra, on the Ganges. The form of the Hindu collections of fables is a peculiar one, and is therefore everywhere easily recognisable, the leading incident which is narrated invariably forming a framework within which stories of the most diverse description are set.*—Allied to the fables are the

* Semitic growth if that the Indians should turn the fox of the Greek fable back again into the jackal necessarily followed from the very nature of the case. The actual state of things, namely, that the jackal prows about after the lion, had indeed early attracted their attention; see, e.g., Rīk, x. 28. 4; but there is no evidence at all that in the older period the knowledge was turned to the use to which it is put in the fable, the only characteristics mentioned of the jackal being its howling, its devouring of carrion, and its emulation to the dog. (In Satap., xii. 5. 2. 5, the jackal is, it is true, associated with the word vidagāha, and this is certainly noteworthy; but here the term simply signifies ‘burnt’ or ‘putrid.’) Kellor's views as to the high antiquity of the Indian authors he cites are unfounded.

See on this Benfey's translation (1859) of the Pañcaka-tantra, which follows Kosegarten's edition of the text (1848). Here there is a full exposition of the whole subject of the later diffusion of the materials of Indian fable throughout the West. Kielhorn and Bühler have published a new edition of the text in the Bombay Sanskrit Series (1863 ff.).

From Benfey's researches, it appears that, in this recension, the original text, which presumably rested on a Buddhistic basis, underwent very important changes, so that, curiously enough, a German translation made in the last quarter of the fifteenth century from a Latin rendering, which in its turn was based upon a Hebrew version, represents the ancient text more faithfully than its existing Sanskrit form does. Of this, for the rest, two or more other recensions are extant; see J. Str., ii. 166. For the 14th chap. of the Kallī wa Dīmaz, no Indian original had been known to exist; but quite recently a Tibetan translation of this original has been discovered by Anton Schiefner; see his Bharata's Response, St. Petersburg, 1875. On a newly discovered ancient Syriac translation of the groundwork of the Pañcaka-tantra, made, it is supposed, either from the Pahlavi or from the Sanskrit itself, see Benfey in the Augsburger Allg. Zeit. for July 12, 1871.

* Precisely the same thing takes place in the Mahā-Bharata also,
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Fairy Tales and Romances, in which the luxuriant fancy of the Hindús has in the most wonderful degree put forth all its peculiar grace and charm. These too share with the fables the characteristic form of setting just referred to, and thereby, as well as by numerous points of detail, they are sufficiently marked out as the original source of most of the Arabian, Persian, and Western fairy tales and stories; although, in the meantime, very few of the corresponding Indian texts themselves can be pointed out.

As regards the last branch of Indian poetry, namely, Geography and History, it is characteristic enough that the latter can only fittingly be considered as a branch of poetry; and that not merely on account of its form—for the poetic form belongs to science also—but on account of its subject-matter as well, and the method in which this is handled. We might perhaps have introduced it as a division of the epic poetry; but it is preferable to keep the two distinct, since the works of the class now in question studiously avoid all matter of a purely mythical description. We have already remarked that the old Purāṇas contained historical portions, which, in the existing Purāṇas, are confined to the mere nomenclature of dynasties and kings; and that here they clash violently, not only with one another, but with chronology generally. We meet with the same discrepancies in all works of the class we are now considering, and especially in its leading representative, Kālihāna’s Rāja-taramapāṇi, or history of Kashmir, which belongs to the twelfth century A.D. Here, it is

224 Here, before all, is to be mentioned Somadeva’s Katākh-carita-śālgara, of the twelfth century, edited by Herrn. Brockhaus (1839-66). Of the Vṛikṣṭ-kathā of Gupādhya, belonging to about the sixth century—a work which is supposed to have been written in the Pañjāchi Māhātā, and which is the basis of the work of Somadeva,—a recast by Kāhemāmkara has recently been discovered by Burnell and Bühler, see Ind. Antiq., i. 302 ff. (Kāhemāmkara is also called Kāhemendra; according to Bühler (letter from Kashmir, pub. in l. St., xiv. 402 ff.) he lived under king Ananta (1028-1080), and wrote 1020-1040).—The Dake-kumdra-charita of Dāpatīn, belonging to about the sixth century, was edited by Wilson in 1846, and by Bühler in 1873; Subandhu’s Vāgasa-oddātā (seventh century?) was edited by Hall, with an excellent critical introduction, in 1859 (Bih. Jud.): Bāṇa’s Kādambari, of about the same date, appeared at Calcutta in 1850. For an account of these last three works see my I. St., i. 303—386.
true, we have to do with something more than mere bald data; but then, as a set-off to this, we have also to do with a poet, one who is more poet than historian, and who, for the rest, appeals to a host of predecessors. It is only where the authors of these works treat of contemporary subjects that their statements possess a decided value; though, of course, precisely with respect to these, their judgment is in the highest degree biased. But exceptions likewise appear to exist, and in particular, in some princely houses, family records, kept by the domestic priests, appear to have been preserved, which, in the main, seem to be passably trustworthy. 226—As for Geography, we repeatedly

* Only the family pedigree must not enter into the question, for these genealogical tables go back almost regularly to the heroic families of the epic.

226 Certain statements in the astrological treatise Gṛhya Śapthād, cap. Yuga Purāṇa, in which the relations of the Yavanas with India are touched upon (see Kern, Pref., to Brāhma-Sapthād, p. 33 ff.), appear to have a real historical significance. Bāgā’s Harsha-charitā, too, seems to be a work embodying some good information; see Hall, Pref. to the Śāṅkavā-dattā, p. 12 ff. (1859). And the same remark applies to the Viṣṇumālā-charitā by Bilana of Kashmir, in 18 sūtras, composed about A.D. 1055, just edited with a very valuable introduction by Bühler. This work supplies most important and authentic information, not only regarding the poet’s native country, and the chief cities of India visited by him in the course of prolonged travels, but also as to the history of the Chiholiya dynasty, whose then representative, Tribhuvana-malla, the work is intended to exalt. In Bühler’s opinion, we may hope for some further accessions to our historical knowledge from the still existing libraries of the Jainas, and, I might add, from their special literature also, which is peculiarly rich in legendary works (charitras). The Śatrunjaya-mālātīmya of Dharmarāja, in 14 sūtras, composed in Valabhi, under king Sīlādeva, at the end of the sixth century, yields, it is true, but scant historical material, and consists for the most part merely of popular tales and legends; see my paper on it (1855), p. 12 ff. (Bühler, l.c., p. 18, places this work as late as the thirteenth century; similarly, Lassen, I. A.R., iv. 767, but see my Essay on the Bhagavata, i. 369.) Still, a great variety of information has been preserved by the Jainas, which deserves attention; for example, respecting the ancient kings Višnu-mālā, and Śīlādeva-thāna, though, to be sure, they, too, have become almost wholly mythical figures. The Viṣṇu-charitā of Ananta, lately analysed by H. Jacob in f. St., xiv. 97 ff., describes the feud between the descendants of these two kings; introducing a third legendary personage, Śāṅkara, who, aided by the Mālāva king, the son of Viṣṇumālā, succeeds in ousting the son of Śīlādeva-thāna from Pratihārā. It is written in a fresh and graphic style, but, to all appearance, it has only a very slight really historical nucleus; indeed, it expressly claims to be an imitation of the Rāmāyana! The Śīlādeva-dvaitādīlā, too, a work extant in several recensions, of which one, the Viṣṇu-charitā (see above, p. 200), is attributed to Vararaṇa, is almost solely, as the Vēlidā-paśu-
find, in the various Purāṇas, jejune enumerations of mountains, rivers, peoples, and the like. But modern works, also, upon this subject are quoted: these, however, are known only by name.—A leading source, besides, for history and geography, is supplied by the exceedingly numerous inscriptions and grants, which, indeed, being often of very considerable extent, might almost pass as a special branch of the literature. They are usually drawn up in prose, though mostly with an admixture of verse. Of coins the number is comparatively small; yet they have furnished surprisingly rich information regarding a period previously quite unknown in its details, the period of the Grecian kings of Bactria.

From this general view of Sanskrit poetry, we now turn to the second division of Sanskrit literature, to the works of Science and Art.

chaukastk is exclusively, made up of matter of the fairy-tale description. The stories in the Bhūja-prabandha of king Bhōja and his court of poets, are mere fanciful inventions. —Bühler, in his letter from Kashmir (I. St., xiv. 404, 405), states that he has now also discovered the Nīlā-mata which was used by Kalhana, as also the Tarangini of Kāshemendra and Heindrājā; for the Rāja-tarangini itself there is thus the prospect of important corrections.

Of special interest, in this regard, are the sections styled Karva-sidhāga in the astrological texts; see Kern, Pref. to Brāh. Saṃhitā, p. 32, and in I. St., x. 209 ff. Cunningham’s otherwise most meritorious work, Ancient Geography of India (1871), has unfortunately taken no account of these.

On metal plates, first men-
We give the precedence to the Science of Language, and take Grammar first.

We have already had frequent occasion to allude to the early beginnings and gradual development of grammatical science. It grew up in connection with the study and recitation of the Vedic texts; and those works which were specially devoted to it, protected by the sacredness of their subject, have, in part, survived. But, on the other hand, we have no records of the earlier stages of that grammatical study which was directed to and embraced the entire range of the language;* and we pass at once into the magnificent edifice which bears the name of Pāṇini as its architect, and which justly commands the wonder and admiration of every one who enters.† Pāṇini's grammar is distinguished above all similar works of other countries, partly by its thoroughly exhaustive investigation of the roots of the language, and the formation of words; partly by its sharp precision of expression, which indicates with an enigmatical succinctness whether forms come under the same or different rules. This is rendered possible by the employment of an algebraic terminology of arbitrary contrivance, the several parts of which stand to each other in the closest harmony, and which, by the very fact of its sufficing for all the phenomena which the language presents, bespeaks at once the marvellous ingenuity of its inventor, and his profound penetration of the entire material of the language. It is not, indeed, to be assumed that Pāṇini was altogether the inventor of this method; for, in the first place, he directly presupposes, for example, a collection of primary affixes (Uṣṭ-dāśi); and, in the second place, for various grammatical elements there occur in his work two sets of technical terms, the one of which is peculiar to himself, while the other, as testified by his

---

228 The general assertion in the Mahābhāṣya to i. 1 f. 448 (ḥāsa- dasaḥ śāstaksā bhāṣaṇaḥ) which describes Vedic usage to Sūtras in general, is explained by Kātyāyaṇa in the sense that, not the adhisāstra- śāstra, for example, but only the adhisāstra-śāstra are here meant, since these latter belong to the Veda as śāstra; see I. St., xiii. 453.

* Only in Yāsaka's Nirukti are beginnings of the kind preserved; yet here etymology and the investigation of roots and of the formation of words are still in a very crude stage.

† E.g., of Père Pern as long ago as 1743, in the Lettres Édifiantes, 26 224 (Paris).
commentators, is taken from the Eastern grammarians. But at any rate, it seems to have been he who generalised the method, and extended it to the entire stock of the language. Of those of his predecessors whom he mentions directly by name, and whose names recur in part in Yāska's Nīrūkti, the Prātiṣākhya-Sūtras, or the Aranyakas, some may possibly have worked before him in this field; in particular, Śākaṭāyana perhaps, whose grammar is supposed (Wilson, Mack. Coll., i. 160) to be still in existence, although nothing definite is known about it.

The question now arises, When did Pāṇini live? Böhl ingk, to whom we owe an excellent edition of the grammar, has attempted to fix his date for the middle of the fourth century B.C., but the attempt seems to be a failure. Of the reasons adduced, only one has any approach to plausibility, which is to the effect that in the Kathā-sarit-ságara, a collection of popular tales belonging to the twelfth century, Pāṇini is stated to have been the disciple of one Varsha, who lived at Pāṭaliputra in the reign of Nanda, the father of Chandragupta (Σανδρόκουρτος). But not only is the authority of such a work extremely questionable in reference to a period fifteen centuries earlier; the assertion is, besides, directly contradicted, both as to time and place, by a statement of the Buddhist Hiuan Thsang, who travelled through India in the first half of the seventh century. For Hiuan Thsang, as reported by Reinaud (Mém. sur l'Inde, p. 88), speaks of a double existence of Pāṇini, the earlier one belonging to mythical times, while the second is put by him 500 years after Buddha's

* See Böhl ingk in the Introduction to his Pāṇinī, p. xii., and in his tract, Über den ·Accent im Sanskrit, p. 64.

125 In Benfey's Orient und Occident, ii. 691-706 (1863), and iii. 181, 182 (1864), G. Bühler has given an account of a commentary (chintā-mani-sūtī) on the Sahādūdayaśāstra of Śākaṭāyana, according to which (p. 703) Pāṇini's work would appear to be simply "an improved, completed, and in part remodelled edition of that of Śākaṭāyana. The author of this commentary, Yakshavarman, himself a Jaina, in his Introduction describes Śākaṭāyana also as such—namely, as mahā-brāhma-samghadhitapati"; see also I. St., xiii. 396, 397. In Burnell's opinion, Yadhavārha, p. xii., many of Śākaṭāyana's rules are, on the contrary, based upon Pāṇini, or even on the Vartaṅkas, nay, even on the further interpretations in the Mahabhadāsaka. Might not these contradictions be explained by supposing that the existing form of the work combines both old and new constituents?
The text of Hiuan Thang is unfortunately not yet accessible; it seems to be much more important than the description of Fa Hian’s travels, and to enter considerably more into detail. [This blank has since been filled up by Stamm, Jullien’s translation of the biography and memoirs of Hiuan Thang (1857 ff., 3 vols.).] From this it now appears that the above statement, communicated from the text by Riccard, is not quite exact. The real existence of Pāṇini is not there placed 500 years after Buddha at all: all that is said is, that at that date there still existed in his birthplace a statue erected in his honour (see Šukla, i. 127); whereas he himself passed as belonging ‘dans une haute antiquité.’

The true state of the case is, that with regard to Pāṇini’s date there is no direct statement at all: a legend merely is communicated of a Buddhist missionary who had taken part in the council under king Kanishka, and who came from it to Pāṇini’s birthplace. Here he intimated to a Brahman, whom he found chastiSing his son during a lesson in grammar, that the youth was Pāṇini himself, who, for his heretical tendencies in his former birth, had not yet attained emancipation, and had now been born again as his son; see J. St., v. 4.

† The commentators make Šālātūrya the residence of Pāṇini’s ancestors, and this is, in fact, the sense in which Pāṇini’s rule is to be taken. But the Chinese traveller, who obtained his information on the spot, is assuredly a better authority, especially as it has to be remarked that the rule in question (iv. 3, 94), according to the Calcutta scholar, is not explained in the Bhāṣya, and may possibly, therefore, not be Pāṇini’s at all, but posterior to the time of Patanjali. [The name Šālātūrya does not, in fact, occur in the Bhāṣya; but, on the other hand, Pāṇini is there styled Dakṣāhiputra, and the family of the Dakṣas belonged to the Vādhikas in the North-West; see J. St., xiii. 395, 367. The name Śālānti also, which is bestowed on him in later writings, and which actually occurs in the Bhāṣya; though it does not clearly appear that he is meant by it, leads us to the Vādhikas; see J. St., xiii. 395, 375, 429.] Hiuan Thang expressly describes Pāṇini as belonging to the Gandhāras (द्योसपेश).]
DATE OF PANINI.

India, rather than to the east, results pretty plainly from the geographical data contained in his work; still he refers often enough to the eastern parts of India as well, and, though born in the former district, he may perhaps have settled subsequently in the latter. Of the two remaining arguments by means of which Böhtlingk seeks to determine Pāṇini’s date, the one, based on the posteriority of Amara-sīnha, “who himself lived towards the middle of the first century B.C.,” fails to the ground when the utter nullity of this latter assumption is exposed. The other is drawn from the Rāja-taramgini, a rather doubtful source, belonging to the same period as the Kathā-sarit-sāgara, and rests, moreover, upon a confusion of the Northern and Southern Buddhist eras, consequently upon a very insecure foundation. In that work it is related that the Mahābhāṣya, or great commentary on Pāṇini, which is ascribed to Patanjali, was, by the command of king Abhimanyu, introduced into his dominions by Chandra, who had himself composed a grammar. Now the Northern Buddhists agree in stating that Kanishka, the immediate predecessor of Abhimanyu, lived 400 years after Buddha’s death. If, therefore, with the Southern Buddhists, we place this event in the year B.C. 544, then, of course, the date to be assigned to Kanishka would be B.C. 144, and to Abhimanyu B.C. 120, or thereabouts. But upon the evidence of coins, which are at all events a sure authority, Kanishka (Kanerki) reigned until A.D. 40 (Lassen, J. A.K., ii. 413); and Abhimanyu himself therefore must have reigned 150 years later than the date derived from the previous supposition—according to Lassen (l. c.), till A.D. 65. Consequently, even admitting Böhtlingk’s further reasoning, we should still have to fix Pāṇini’s date, not for B.C. 350 or thereabouts, as his result gives, but 160 years later at any rate. But in view of

* The circumstance that the only two works containing legends concerning him and the commentary upon his grammar—the Kathā-sarit-sāgara and the Rāja-taramgini—were both written in Kashmir, also tells in favour of this view. [On the geographical data in Pāṇini, see Bhāṣākara in Ind. Antiq., i., 21 (1872), also J. St., xiii. 302, 366.]

† As Böhtlingk, op. cit., p. xvi., xviii., supposes; see also Reinaud, Mém. sur l’Inde, p. 79.

‡ Of these Böhtlingk could not avail himself, as they only came to our knowledge some years after his edition of Pāṇini appeared.
Hiuan Thsang's assertion, no credit whatever need be pretended to the statement in the Rāja-taramghi. If Pāṇini did not really flourish until 100 years after Kanishka, i.e., A.D. 140, it is self-evident that the commentary upon his work cannot have been in existence, and still less have been introduced into Kashmir, under Abhimanyu, Kanishka's immediate successor!—But, apart altogether from the foregoing considerations, we have, in Pāṇini's work itself, a very weighty argument which goes to show that the date to be assigned to him can by no means be so early as Böhtlingk supposes (about B.C. 350). For in it Pāṇini once mentions the Yavanas, i.e., 'Idones, Greeks,' and explains the formation of the word yavandī.
DATE OF PANINI—YAVANANI!

— to which, according to the Vārttika, the word līpi, "writing," must be supplied, and which therefore signifies "the writing of the Yavanas." In the Pañcha-tantra, Panini is said to have been killed by a lion; but, independently of the question whether the particular verse containing this allusion belongs to the original text or not, no chronological inference can be drawn from it.

...itio races that had come into collision with the Indians! At the time of the Dasa-kumāra, the name Kāla-Yavana (as well as Yavana itself), does, in point of fact, expressly designate a sea-faring people—supposed by Wilson to be the Arabs. In the legend in the Purāṇas and the Mahā-Bharata, on the contrary, no reference to the sea is traceable; and Wilson therefore (Vishnu-Pur., 565, 566) refers it to the Greeks, that is, those of Bactria. This view is perhaps confirmed by the circumstance that this Kāla-Yavana is associated with Gārgya; since it is to Garga, at least, who uniformly appears as one of the earliest Indian astronomers, that a verse is ascribed, in which the Yavanas (here unquestionably the Greeks) are highly extolled. Possibly this is the very reason why Gārgya is here associated with Kāla-Yavana.

233 For the different explanations that have been attempted of this word, see I. St., v. 5-8, 17 ff.; Bumell, Eleus. of S. Ind. Pol., p. 7, 93; the latter regards it as "not unlikely that līpi has been introduced into Indian from the Persian lips." Benfey also, in his Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft, § 48 (1869), understands by Yavandai 'Greek writing'; but he places the completion of Panini's work as early as B.C. 320. In that case, he thinks, Panini "had already had the opportunity during six years of becoming acquainted with Greek writing in his own immediate neighborhood without interruption, Alexander having, as is well known, established stragglers in India itself and in the parts adjoining"—in the vicinity of the Indus, namely, near which Panini's birthplace was. But to me it is very doubtful indeed that a space so short as six years should have sufficed to give rise to the employment by the Indians of a special term and affix to denote Greek writing— (which surely in the first years after Alexander's invasion can hardly have attracted their attention in so very prominent a way)—so that the mere expression 'the Greek' directly signified 'the writing of the Greeks,' and Panini found himself obliged to explain the formation of the term in a special rule. "The expression could only have become so very familiar through prolonged and frequent use—a thing conceivable and natural in Panini's native district, in those provinces of North-Western India which were so long occupied by the Greeks. But this of course presupposes that a lengthened period had intervened since the time of Alexander."—I. St., iv. 89 (1857).

233 Since the above was written the question of Panini's date has been frequently discussed. Max Müller first of all urged, and rightly, the real import of Hinmar Thang's account, as opposed to my argument. Apart from this, however, I still firmly adhere to the reasoning in the text; see I. St., iv. 87, v. 2 ff. To the vague external testimony we need hardly attach much importance. Panini's vocabulary itself (cf. Yavandai) can alone yield us certain information. And it was upon this path that Goldstücker proceeded in his Panini, his place in Sanskrit Literature (September 1861) — a work distinguished in an eminently
Pāṇini’s work has continued to be the basis of grammatical research and the standard of usage in the language down even to the present time. Owing to its frequent obscurity it was early commented upon, and—a circumstance to which there is no parallel elsewhere in the literature—some of these earliest interpretations have come down to us. At their head stand the Paribhāṣās, or explanations of single rules, by unknown authors; next come the Vārttikas (from vṛtti, ‘explanation’) of Kātyāyana; and after these the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali. With regard to the date of Kātyāyana, the statement of Hsuan Thsang, to the effect that 300 years after Buddha’s death, i.e., in B.C. 240,† “le docteur Kia to yan na” lived at Tāmasavāna in the Panjāb, is by Bohtlingk referred to this Kātyāyana; but when we remember that the same traveller assigns to Pāṇini’s second existence a date so late as 500 years after Buddha, such a reference of course becomes highly precarious. Besides, the statement is in
degre by truly profound investigation of this aspect of the question as well as of the literature immediately bearing upon it. The conclusion he arrives at is that Pāṇini is older than Buddha, than the Prātiṣṭhākyas, than all the Vedic texts we possess, excepting the three Samhitās of the Rik, Saṃja, and Black Yajus—older than any individual author in whatever field, with the single exception of Yāska (p. 243). In May 1861, before the separate publication of this work, which had previously (Nov. 1860) appeared as the preface to Goldstücker’s photo-lithographed edition of the Māṇava-Kalpa-Sūtra, I endeavoured—and, as I believe, successfully—in a detailed rejoinder in J. St., v. 1-176, to rebut these various deductions, point by point. For the post-Buddhistic date of Pāṇini, compare in particular the evidence adduced, pp. 136-142, which is excellently supplemented by Bühler’s paper on Śaṅkrātaṇa (1863, see note 229 above). To the mention of the ‘Yavandali’ has to be added a peculiar circumstance which Burnell has recently noticed (Elem. S. Ind. Pal., p. 96):—The denoting of numbers by the letters of the alphabet in their order (i.e. 2), to which Goldstücker (Pāṇini, p. 53) first drew attention, and which, according to the Bhāṣya, is peculiar to Pāṇini, occurs in his work only, and is “precisely similar to the Greek and Semitic notation of numerals by letters of the alphabet.” If, further, the Greek accounts of the confederation of the ‘Oiroskai and Malayai be correct; if, that is to say, their alliance first took place through fear of Alexander, whereas they had up till then lived in constant enmity, then in all probability Apišali, and a fortiori Pāṇini also, would have to be set down as subsequent to Alexander; see J. St., xiii, 375 n.

† Who there mentions several of these Paribhāṣās.
EARLY COMMENTARIES ON PANINI.

223 itself an extremely indefinite one, the "docteur" in question not being described as a grammarian at all, but simply as a descendant of the Kátya family. Even admitting, however, that the reference really is to him, it would still be in conflict with the tradition—in itself, it is true, of no particular authority—of the Kathá-sarit-ságara, which not only represents Kátyáyana as the contemporary of Páñini, but identifies him with Vararuchi, a minister of King Nanda, the father of Chandragupta (Σανδροκωμός), according to which, of course, he must have flourished about B.C. 350. As regards the age of the Mahábháshya, we have seen that the assertion of the Rája-taramgini as to its introduction into Kashmir in the reign of Abhimanyu, the successor of Kanishka, i.e., between A.D. 40 and 65, is, for the reasons above assigned, in the meantime discredited. For the present, therefore, we are without information as to the date of those interpretations, just as we are regarding the date of Páñini himself. But when once they are themselves in our hands, it will certainly be possible to gather from their contents, by means of the great number of words they contain, a tolerably clear image of the time when they originated, in the same way as we

224 It is this only that has weight; whereas no importance whatever is to be attached, as we have already seen (note 230), to the second existence of Páñini. On the various Kátyás, Kátyáyanas, at the time of the Bháshya itself, for instance, see J. St., xlii. 399.

225 The name Páత్ namjali (we should expect Páత్ namjali) is certainly somehow connected with that of the Patanjala Kápya of the land of the Madras, who appears in the Yájnavalkyaba-kájda of the Satap. Br. It occurs again (see below, p. 237) as the name of the author of the Yoga-Sútras. Páత్ namjali appears as name of one of the prior births of Buddha (No. 242), in Westergaard's Cata-

gloga, p. 39). In the Paññadvipa-sána, § 9 (Yajuj-Páత్ namjali), the Patanjalis are classed as belonging to the family of Vivasvámitra. According to later accounts, by Genardya, who is cited four times in the Bháshya, we have to understand Páత్ namjali himself; and the same applies to the name Gopikáputra; see on this J. St., v. 155, xii. 315, 323, 403.

226 By no means; see note 231.

227 On the basis of the lithographed edition of the Mahábháshya, published at Benares in 1872 by Ráma-kámastra and Bháshástra, with Káyana's commentary (of about the seventh century?), see J. St., v. 167), I have attempted in J. St., xili. 202-502, to sketch such an outline. The first section of the work, with Káyana, and Nágada's gloss, belonging to the eighteenth century, was published so long ago as 1856 by Ballantyne. A photo-lithographed issue of the entire Bháshya, prepared under Goldstücker's supervision, at the expense of the Indian Government, has recently appeared in London, in 3 vols. (vol. i., the Bháshya; vol. ii., Bháshya with Káyana's Comm.; vol. iii., Nágada-
can even now attempt, although only in broad outline, a picture of the time of Pāṇini.*  With regard to the latter, the condition of the text, in a critical point of view, forms a main difficulty.  A few of the Sūtras found in it are already notoriously acknowledged not to be Pāṇini's; and there is the further peculiar circumstance, that, according to the scholiasts of the Calcutta edition, fully a third of the entire Sūtras are not interpreted in the Mahābhāṣya at all.† The question then arises whether this is merely

bhaṭṭa's Schol. on Kālayāta). Gold- stiècker, in his Pāṇini, p. 228 ff., mainly upon the ground of the statement in the Bhāṣya "arunṣad Yavaneśa Śāketam," which he connects with an expedition of Menander (b.c. 144–120) against Ayodhya, fixed the date of the composition of the work for the period of this expedition, or specially for b.c. 140–120. The objections urged by me (I. St., v. 151) against this assumption were, in the first place, materially weakened by a remark of Kern's in his Preface to the Brīh. Saṃhitā of Vardha-Mihira, p. 37, according to which the statement in the same passage of the Bhāṣya "arunṣad Yavane Madhyamikānā" is not necessarily to be referred to the Buddhist schol. of this name, first founded by Nāgārjuna, but may possibly have reference to a tribe called Madhyamika, mentioned elsewhere. In the next place, Bhandārkar, in the Ind. Antiq., i. 399 ff., ii. 59 ff., attempted to prove that Patanjali wrote the particular section where he speaks in the above terms of Menander (who is assumed, on Goldstieber's authority, to be meant by 'Yavana') between a.d. 144 and 142, seeing that he there at the same time speaks of sacrifices as still being performed for Pushyamitra (a.d. 178–142). In my reply in I. St., xiii. 305 ff., I emphasized these points: first, that the identity of the Yavana and Menander is by no means made out; next, that it does not at all necessarily follow from the passage in question that Patanjali and Pushyamitra (this is the correct form) were contemporaries; and, lastly, that Patanjali may possibly have found these examples already current, in which case they cannot be used to prove anything with regard to him, but only with regard to his predecessors—it may be, even Pāṇini himself. And although I am now disposed, in presence of Bhandārkar's further objections, to admit the historical bearing of the statement referring to Pushyamitra (but see Böhtlingk's opposite view in Z. D. M. G., xxix. 183 ff.), still, with respect to all the examples here in question, I must lay special stress on the possibility, just mentioned, that they may belong to the class of mātrādhiśāksa illustrations (ibid., p. 315). We must for the present rest satisfied, therefore (p. 319), with placing the date of the composition of the Bhāṣya between b.c. 140 and a.d. 60,—a result which, considering the wretched state of the chronology of Indian literature generally, is, despite its indefiniteness, of no mean importance.

* See I. St., i. 141–157. [The beginning here made came to a standstill for want of the Mahābhāṣya.]

† In the case of some of these, it is remarked that they are not explained here, or else not separately. Acquaintance with the Mahābhāṣya itself will alone yield us satisfactory information on this point. [From Aufrecht's accounts in his Causal. Codd. Sansk. Bibli., Bodh., it appeared that of Pāṇini's 3983 rules only 1720 are directly discussed; and Gold-
because these particular Sūtras are clear and intelligible of themselves, or whether we may not also here and there have to suppose cases where the Sūtras did not yet form part of the text at the time when this commentary was composed. The so-called gānas, or lists of words which follow one and the same rule, and of which, uniformly, only the initial word is cited in the text itself, are for the present wholly without critical authenticity, and carry no weight, therefore, in reference to Pāṇini’s time. Some such lists must, of course, have been drawn up by Pāṇini; but whether those now extant are the same is very problematical: indeed, to some extent it is simply impossible that they can be so. Nay, such of them even as chance to be specified singly in the Mahābāshyā can, strictly speaking, prove nothing save for the time of this work itself.6 Here, too, another word of caution is necessary,—one which ought, indeed, to be superfluous, but unfortunately is not, as experience shows,—namely, that care must be taken not to attribute to words and examples occurring in the scholia, composed so recently as fifty years ago, of the Calcutta edition of Pāṇini, any validity in reference to the time of Pāṇini himself. No doubt such examples are usually derived from the Mahābāshyā; but so long as this is not actually proved to be the case, we are not at liberty at once to assume it; and besides, even when it is clear that they are actually borrowed from the Mahābāshyā, they are good only for the time of this work itself, but not for that of Pāṇini.233

6 Stücker then showed that the Bhāshya is not so much a commentary on Pāṇini as rather a defence of him against the unjust attacks of Kātyāyana, the author of the vārttikas; see I. St., xiii. 297 ff.]

* See I. St., i. 142, 143, 151. [xiii. 298, 302, 329].

233 This is not quite strictly to the purpose. Max Müller was the first to point out that Pāṇini’s Sūtras were evidently from the beginning accompanied by a definite interpretation, whether oral or written, and that a considerable proportion of the examples in the Bhāshyā must have come from this source; nay, the Bhāshyā has itself a special name for these, such examples being styled mūrdhābhāshyāḥ; see I. St., xiii. 315. Unfortunately, however, we have not the slightest clue (I. St., ii. 167) to enable us to decide, in individual instances, whether an example belongs to this class of mūrdhā, or not.—On the other hand—as results not only from the data in the Rāja-tārāṅgini, but also, in particular, from the statements at the close of the second book of Harī’s Vākyapadiya, which were first cited by Goldstücker, and have lately been published in a corrected form by Kielhorn in the Ind. Antq., iii. 285–
In addition to Panini’s system, there grew up in course of time several other grammatical systems, having their own peculiar terminology; and grammatical literature in general attained to a most remarkably rich and extensive development. The Tibetan Tandjur likewise embraces...
LEXICOGRAPHY

A tolerable number of grammatical writings, and these for the most part works that have been lost in India itself. 1874 it had reached to iv. 4. 50. The system of this grammar is of peculiar interest on this account, that a special conection appears to exist between it and the Pāli grammar of Kathakayana, particularly in regard to the terminology employed. According to Bühler’s letter from Kashmir (pub. in I. St., xiv. 402 ff.), the Kātantra is the special grammar of the Kāśmirans, and was there frequently commented upon in the 12th–16th centuries. Of older grammatical texts, he has further discovered the Pāṭhāhakas of Vṛddhi and Chandra, as also the Vṛdhaska-Sūtras and Shat-Shatāchandraḥ of the latter; likewise an Aṣṭākṣar-sūtra and Dūdā-terapragrāmi by Kābra (Jayyāḍa’s preceptor), and a very beautiful Bhairva-Maṭ of the Kāśikā. In one of these MSS. this last-named work is ascribed to Vāmana and Jayāḍitya (Jayyāḍa), whereby the earlier view as to its date again gains credit.—For a list of Sanskrit-Grammars, 1854, 1868; further, an edition recently (1873) published at Bombay of Homachandra’s (according to Bhāṣā Dājī, a.d. 1088–1173, see Jour. Bombay Br. R. A. S., ix. 224) Prakṛti Grammar, which forms the eighth book of his great treatise on Sanskrit grammar, the Sabdāvatāṇa; and lastly, Pischel’s valuable dissertation De Grammaticis Pracriticis (1874), which supplements the accounts in Lassen’s Institut. Lingus Pracriticus (Bonn, 1837) with very important material. See Schleifer’s paper on the logical and grammatical writings in the Tandjuyr, p. 25, from the Bulletin de la Classe hist. phil. de l’Acad. Imp. des Sc. de St. Petersbourg, iv., Nos. 18, 19 (1847), from which it appears that the Chandra-Vyakāraṇa-Sūtra, the Kāṭyāyaṇa-Sūtra, and the Sarvatī-Vyakāraṇa-Sūtra, in particular, are represented there.

* A Vṛddhi is cited in the Rīk-Prātiṣākhyas [and in Goldstücker’s Padma he plays a very special part. The Sangyakha, several times mentioned in the Bhāṣya, and there assigned to Dukkhyonha, is by Nāgęha—who describes it as a work in
The question now is to determine the age of Amarasinha—a question which, in the first instance, exactly coincides with the one already discussed as to the date of Kālidāsa, for, like the latter, Amara is specified by tradition among the 'nine gems' of the court of Vikrama—that Vikrama whom Indian tradition identifies with king Bhoja (A.D. 1050), but to whom European criticism has assigned the date B.C. 56, because—an era bearing this name commences with that year. The utter groundlessness of this last assumption has been already exposed in the case of Kālidāsa, though we do not here, any more than there, enter the lists in defence of the Indian tradition. This tradition is distinctly contradicted, in particular, by a temple-inscription discovered at Buddhagayā, which is dated 1005 of the era of Vikramādiya (i.e., A.D. 949), and in which Amara-deva is mentioned as one of the 'nine jewels' of Vikrama's court, and as builder of the temple in question. This inscription had been turned to special account by European criticism in support of its view; but Holtzmann's researches (op. cit., pp. 26–32) have made it not improbable that it was put there in the same age in which Amara-sinha's dictionary was written, seeing that both give expression to precisely the same form of belief, a combination, namely, of Buddhism with Vishnuism—a form of faith which cannot possibly have continued very long in vogue, resting as it does on a union of directly opposite systems. At all events, inscription and dictionary cannot lie so much as 1000 years apart,—that is a sheer impossibility. Unfortunately this inscription is not known to us in the original, and has only survived in the English translation made by Ch. Wilkins in 1785 (a time when he can hardly have been very proficient in Sanskrit!): the text itself is lost.

100,000 ślokaś—attributed to a Vyādi, meaning in all likelihood the same Vyādi who is elsewhere mentioned in the Bhāsha. Now upon the strength of this, Goldstücker sets up a direct relation of kinship between Pāṇini, who is designated Daśākhyaputra in the Bhāsha, and this (Vyādi) Daśakhyapa; only the former must be "at least two generations" prior to the latter. And on this he grounds a specific "historical argument" for the determination of Pāṇini's date; for if Vyādi, Pāṇini's descendant collateral, is cited in the Rik-Pr., then of course this work must be later than Pāṇini; see against all this L. St., v. 41, 127–133, xiii. 401.
with the stone on which it was incised. That the dictionary belongs, in any case, to a period considerably later than the first century B.C.—the date commonly assigned to it—is sufficiently indicated by data furnished by the work itself. For, in the first place, it enumerates the signs of the zodiac, which were unquestionably borrowed by the Hindūs from the Greeks; and, according to Lefronne’s investigations, the completion of the zodiac did not take place among the Greeks themselves before the first century A.D.; so that, of course, it cannot have become known to the Hindūs till one or several centuries later. Again, in the Amara-kosha, the lunar mansions are enumerated in their new order, the fixing of which was due to the fresh life infused into Indian astronomy under Greek influence, the exact date being uncertain, but hardly earlier than A.D. 400. Lastly, the word dīndra occurs here,* which, as pointed out by Prinsep, is simply the Latin denarius (see Lassen, I. A.K., ii. 261, 348). The use of the term tantra in the sense of ‘text-book’ may perhaps also be cited in this connection, as it belongs only to a definite period, which is probably the fifth or sixth century, the Hindūs who emigrated to Java having taken the word with them in this sense.†—All this, of course, yields us no direct date. If it be correct, as stated by Reinaud (Mém. sur l’Inde, p. 114), that there existed a Chinese translation of the work, “rédigée au vi⁰ siècle,” this would give us something tolerably definite to go by. But Stan. Julien does not, it would seem, in the passage cited by Reinaud as his authority, express himself in quite such definite terms; as he merely speaks of the “traduction chinoise de l’Amarakochā, qui paraît avoir été publiée ...”:† nor are the positive grounds he adduces in support of this view directly before us, so that we might test

* It also occurs in the Pañcachātra, in a legend of Buddhistic origin.—I may here also remark in passing, that the word drama, i.e., śayāya, is employed in the twelfth century by Bhūskara, as well as in inscriptions [cf. Z. D. M. G., vi. 420].

† Of special interest also is the Arabic-Persian word ʿību for elephant; cf. Kumdrilā in Jālm., i. 3.

5, cited by Colebrooke, Misc. Ess., i. 314 (339); Gildemeister in Z. D. M. G., xxvii. 697

† The meaning of paraśastra, however, is doubtful; it can signify either ‘seem’ or ‘be clear’ (according to all evidence).—In the latter sense like the Latin apparere, and the English ‘appear,’ being indeed derived from apparire.
them. Of the Tibetan translation of the work in the
Tandjur no particulars are known. How great the difficulty
is of arriving at any sort of decision in this matter is
shown by the example of one of the most celebrated of
living Indianists, H. H. Wilson. For while, in the pre-
face to the first edition of his Sanskrit Dictionary (1819),
he rather inclined to the view that Amara-sīnha flourished
in the fifth century A.D., and while again, in the second
edition of the work (1832), under the word 'Vararuchi,'
he expressly transfers the 'nine gems' to the court of
Bhoja (A.D. 1050),—in the preface (p. vi.) to his transla-
tion of the Vishnū-Purāṇa (1840), on the contrary, he
makes Amara-sīnha live "in the century prior to Chris-
tianity!"—But, independently of all that has hitherto
been advanced, the mere circumstance that the other
dictionaries we possess, besides the Amara-kosha, all
belong to the eleventh, twelfth, and following centuries,
constrains us to come to a conclusion similar to that
which was forced upon us in regard to the drama—
namely, that as the Amara-kosha is in no way specifically
distinguished in character from these other productions,
so it cannot be separated from them by a very wide inter-
val of time. (Holtzmann, p. 26.)

Besides the dictionaries, we have also to mention a class
of lexical works quite peculiar to the Hindus—namely,
the lists of roots styled Dhātu-pārāyanas or Dhātu-
pāṭhas: * though these belong rather to the province of
grammar. They are written partly in prose and partly in
ślokas. The latter is the form adopted in all the dic-
tionaries, and it supplies, of course, a strong guarantee of
the integrity of the text, the interlacing of the different
verses rendering interpolation well-nigh impossible.†

---

* For the literature of these, see Westergaard's preface to his ex-
cellent Radices Linguæ Sanscritæ (Bonn, 1841).
† See Holtzmann, op. cit., p. 17

---

262 Since the above was written, nothing new has appeared on this
question. To the editions of the
Amara-kosha then already pub-
lished, those, namely, of Colebrooks
(1808) and of Le sleur Deslong-
champs (Paris, 1839, 1845), various
new ones have since been added in
India. Of other vocabularies we
may mention the editions, by Böht-
lingk and Rieu (1847) of Hema-
ehandra's Abbhīkāna-chintāmatrā,
and by Aufrecht (London, 1861) of
Haldyudha's Abbhīdhana-ratna-mālā,
belonging to about the end of the
eleventh century. A Pāli redaction
of the Amara-kosha by Moggaliṣṭha
belongs to the close of the twelfth
century; see I. Str., ii. 330.
Lastly, as a third phase of the science of language, we have to consider Metric, Poetics, and Rhetoric.

With the beginnings of Prosody we have already become acquainted in connection with the Veda (see p. 23). The treatise ascribed to Pingala even appears as an appendage to the Veda itself, however little claim it has to such a position, specifying as it does the most highly elaborated metres, such as were only used in later times (see p. 60). The tradition which identifies Pingala with Patanjali, the author of the Mahabhashya and the Yoga-Sutra, must answer for itself; for us there exists no cogent reason for accepting it. The other existing treatises on metre are likewise all modern: they superseded the more ancient works; and the same is the case, in an equal degree, with the writings on poetics and rhetoric. Of the Alamkara-Sutra of Bharata, which is often cited as the leading authority on these subjects, only the few quoted passages would seem to have survived, although, according to one commentary, the work was itself but an extract from the Agni-Purana. A. W. von Schlegel in his Reflexions sur l'Etude des Langues Asiat., p. 111, speaks of a manuscript preserved in Paris, of the Sahitya-darpana, another leading work on this subject, as dated sake 949, i.e., A.D. 1027; and this, if correct, would naturally be of the highest importance for the age of the works therein quoted. But a priori I am firmly persuaded that this statement rests on a mistake or misunderstanding; for the oldest manuscripts with which I have had any opportunity of becoming acquainted are, as already mentioned (p. 182), not so much

243 Cf. on this I. St., viii. 153 ff.
244 See my Catal. of the Sansk. MSS. in the Berl. Lib., p. 227. (Respecting the Nitya-Sutra of Bharata fuller information was first supplied by Hall in his edition of the Sutasrupa (1865), at the close of which he has given the text of four chapters of the work (18-20, 34); see also W. Heymann's account of it in the Göttinger Ges. Anzigen, 1874, p. 36 ff.)
245 The Sahitya-darpana was only composed towards the middle of the fifteenth century in B. Bengal, on the banks of the Brahmaputra; see Jagan-mohana-darman in the preface to his edition of the drama Chandra-Kawika, p. 2. It has already been edited several times in India, amongst others by Reer in the Bibl. Indica (1851, vol. I.). Ballantyne's translation, ibid., is unfortunately not yet entirely printed, and reaches only to Rule 575; for the close of the work, however, from Rule 631, we have a translation by Pramada Dasa Mitya, which appeared in the Pundit, Nos. 4-23.
as 500 years old, and it will be difficult to find any of a yet greater age.—For the rest, in the field of rhetoric and poetics, the Hindú mind, so fertile in nice distinctions, has had free scope, and has put forth all its power, not seldom in an extremely subtle and ingenious fashion.

We now come to the consideration of Philosophy, as the second branch of the scientific Sanskrit literature. I rank it here after the science of language, not because I regard it as of later origin, but because the existing text-books of the philosophical systems seem to me to be posterior to the text-book of grammar, the Sūtra of Pāṇini, since they appear, to some extent, to presuppose the existence of Upanishads, writings which, in their extant form, manifestly belong to a very late period, comparatively speaking.

The beginnings of philosophical speculation go back, as we have already more than once seen (see especially pp. 26, 27), to a very remote age. Even in the Samhitā of the Rik, although only in its later portions, we find hymns that bespeak a high degree of reflection. Here, too, as with all other peoples, it was especially the question as to the origin of the world that more imme-

245 Dāṇḍin’s Kāṣṭādarśa, of the sixth century, and Dhanamājaya’s Dāsa-rāja, of the middle of the tenth century, have been published in the Böhl. Indica, the former edited by Premachandra Tarkavāgīśa (1863), the latter by Hall (1865). From these we learn, amongst other things, the very important fact that in Dāṇḍin’s day two definite, provincially distinguished, varieties of style (ṛiti) were already recognised, namely, the Gaṇja style and the Vaidarbara style, to which in course of time four others, the Pāṭhāl, Lātī, Āvānāki, and Māgadhī, were added; cf. my Essay on the Rāmāyaṇa, p. 76, and J. Sc., xiv. 65 ff. Ādāṇa passes for the special representative of the Pāṭhālī style; see Aufricht in Z. D. M. G., xxvii. 93; whereas the Kāmśtra Bihāra, for example, adopted the Vaidarbara-ṛiti; see Bühler, Vikramāditya-char., i. 9.

—Vāmana’s Kādyadhyāya-ṛiti has lately been edited by Cappeller (Jena, 1875), and belongs, he thinks, to the twelfth century. Mammaṭa’s Kēdayaprakāśa, several times published in India, belongs, in Bühler’s opinion, to the same date, since Mammaṭa, according to Hall (Introd. to Vāsena, p. 55), was the maternal uncle of the author of the Naishadhyya; see Bühler in Journ. Bomb. Br. R. A. S., x. 37, my J. Str., i. 356, and my Essay on Hāla’s Saptā-sataika, p. 11. Cf. here also Aufricht’s account of the Sarasvati-kapṭhābaraṇa (note 220 above).—A rich accession to the Alampūra literature also will result from Bühler’s journey to Kashmir: the works range from the ninth to the thirteenth century.
diately gave rise to philosophical contemplation. The mystery of existence, of being, and of life forces itself directly upon the soul, and along with this comes the question, how the riddle is to be solved, and what is its cause. The idea that most readily presents itself, and which is therefore, in fact, everywhere recognisable as the earliest one, is that of an eternal matter, a chaotic mass, into which order and system are gradually introduced, whether—and here we have two distinct views, each of which has its intrinsic warrant, and which must therefore have been early opposed to each other—by virtue of an indwelling capacity of development, or by impulse from without, whereby of course an object or Being existing outside of this chaotic mass isocospostulated. This point reached, the idea is then a very natural one to regard this Being, whence the impulse proceeds, as higher and more exalted than the primary chaotic matter itself; and, as speculation advances, this primary matter continues to sink to a more and more subordinate position, till at length its very existence appears as dependent upon the will of this Being, and so the idea of a creation arises. The steps of this gradation may actually be followed with tolerable distinctness in the Vedic texts. In the more ancient portions the notion everywhere still is that the worlds were but fixed, arranged (stabhita, skabhita *), by the aid of the metres (it is thus that the harmony of the universe is explained); only at a later stage is the idea developed of their sarjona, ‘emission’ or creation. As time goes on, the creative Being is conceived as more and more transcendental and supernatural, so that as a means of communication between him and the real universe intermediate grades of beings, demiurges, are required, by classifying and systematising whom speculation strives

* It is interesting that the German word schaffen is derived from this root stabh, skabh, ‘establish;’ originally therefore it had not the sense in which it is now used. The idea of the ‘establishment,’ ‘arrangement’ of the worlds may possibly therefore date from the epoch when Teutons and Indians still dwelt together: or has the same use of the word grown up independently with both peoples? Perhaps the ‘yawning gulf’ of chaos, ‘pala- mātra guṇabhirṇa,’ ‘pinnara gop,’ might also be instanced as a similar primitive notion? (The connection here supposed between schaffen and stabh, skabh, ekādive, is very questionable; the word seems rather to belong to schaben, scabere, ekādive.)
to introduce order, but naturally only with the result of producing greater confusion. We have thus three distinct views as to the origin of the world—that of its ‘development,’ that of its ‘arrangement,’ and that of its ‘creation.’ The two former agree in so far as the theory of development requires an ‘arranger’ also; they are, however, sufficiently distinguished by the circumstance that in the former this Power is regarded as the first production of the capacity of development residing in primary matter; in the latter, on the contrary, as an independent Being existing outside of it. The theory of a creation starts generally with a desire on the part of the Creator to be no longer alone, the expression of which desire is immediately followed by the emanation itself. Either it is a female being that first proceeds from the Creator, in connection with whom, by a process of begetting, he then accomplishes the further work of creation; or it is the breath of life that first of all emanates, and in its turn produces all the rest; or again, the mere expression of the desire itself involves creation, vāch or speech here appearing as its immediate source; or the process is conceived in a variety of other ways. The notion that the world is but Illusion only belongs to the latest phase of this emanation theory.—It is impossible at present to attempt even an approximate sketch of the gradual growth of these three different theories into complete philosophical systems; the Brāhmaṇas and Upanishads must first be thoroughly studied. Nor until this has been done will it be possible to decide the question whether for the beginnings of Greek philosophy any connection with Hindū speculation can be established—with reference to the five elements in particular,† a point which for the present is doubtful.‡ I have already stated generally (p. 29) the reasons which lead me to assign a comparatively late date to the existing text-books (Sūtras) of the Hindū philosophical systems.\(^{233}\)

---

* By incest therefore: the story in Megasthenes of the incest of the Indian Heracles with his daughter refers to this.

† And the doctrine of metempsycheisia.

‡ See Max Müller in Z. D. M. G., vi. 18 ff. [Cf. my review of Schlüter’s book, Aristoteles’ Metaphysik eine Tochter der Sānkhyatheorie in Lit. Cent. 1874, p. 294.]

\(^{234}\) Cf. Cowell’s note to Coleridge’s Misc. Ess., i. 354. "The Sūtras as we have them cannot be the original
Unfortunately we are not yet in possession of the treatises themselves; and for what follows I have had to depend mainly upon Colebrooke’s Essays on the subject.

The most ancient philosophical system appears to be the Sāṃkhya theory, which sets up a primordial matter as the basis of the universe, out of which the latter is by successive stages evolved. The word Sāṃkhya itself occurs first in the later Upanishads; while in the earlier Upanishads and Brāhmaṇas the doctrines afterwards belonging to the Sāṃkhya system still appear in incongruous combination with doctrines of opposite tendency, and are cited along with these under the equivalent designations of Māṇḍāsā (Jiva man, speculation), Adea (doctrine), Upanishad (sitting), &c. I am especially induced to regard the Sāṃkhya as the oldest of the existing systems by the names of those who are mentioned as its leading representatives: Kapila, Pañchiśākha, and Āsuri. The last of these names occurs very frequently in the Sātpaṭha-Brāhmaṇa as that of an important authority for sacrificial ritual and the like, and also in the lists of teachers contained in that work (namely,

form of the doctrines of the several schools. They are rather a recapitulation of a series of preceding developments which had gone on in the works of successive teachers."

Only two of them have thus far appeared in India; but of the edition of the Vedānta-Sūtra with Sāṃkhya’s commentary I have not yet been able to see a copy; only the edition of the Nyāya-Sūtra is known to me. The whole of these texts are at present being edited in India by Dr. Balantyne, with English translation. [These editions, entitled Aparāśīm of the Sāṃkhya, Vedānta, Yoga, &c., extend to all the six systems, each Sūtra being regularly followed by translation and commentary; but unfortunately only a few numbers of each have appeared.]

In the new edition of Colebrooke’s Essays (1873), these are accompanied with excellent notes by Professor Cowell. Since the above was written, much new material has been added by the labours of Roer, Balantyne, Hall, Cowell, Müller, Gough, K. M. Banerjea, Barth. St. Hilaire.

In the B.S. Indica and the Benares P pundit many highly important editions of texts have appeared, and we are now in possession of the Sūtras of all the six systems, together with their leading commentaries, three of them in translation also. See also in particular the Sāra-dārśana-sangraha of Mādhava in the B.S. Ind. (1853-58), edited by Ṣivarachandra Vidyaḍgarā and Hall’s Bibliographical Index to the Ind. Phil. Syst. (1859).

† Of the Tattvārjya and Aṣṭharvan, as also in the fourteenth book of the Nirukt, and in the Bhagavad-gītā. As regards its sense, the term is rather obscure and not very significant; can its use have been in any way influenced and determined by its association with the doctrine of Sūkṣma or has it reference purely and solely to the twenty-five principles? [The latter is really the case; see J. St., ix. 17 ff. Kapila tattv-samkhyād, Brd. Pur., iii 25. 1.]
as disciple of Yájñavalkya, and as only one or a few generations prior to Yáska). Kapila, again, can hardly be unconnected with the Kápya Pátañjala whom we find mentioned in the Yájñavalkya-kánda of the Vrihad-Árañyaka as a zealous representative of the Brahmanical learning. Kapila, too—what is not recorded of any other of these reputed authors of Sútras—was himself afterwards elevated to divine rank; and in this quality we meet with him, for example, in the Svetásvatara-panishad.* But it is above all the close connection of his tenets with Buddhism—the legends of which, moreover, uniformly speak both of him and of Pañchaśikha as long anterior to Buddhawhich proves conclusively that the system bearing his name is to be regarded as the oldest. The question as to the possible date of Kapila is thus closely linked with that of the origin of Buddhism generally, a point to which we shall revert in the sequel, in connection with our survey of the Buddhist literature. Two other leading doctors of the Sánkhya school as such appear towards the sixth century of our era, Íśvara-Krishṇa and Gauḍapáda: the former (according to Colebrooke, i. 103) is expressly stated

* In the invocations of the Pitrás which (see above, pp. 55, 56) form part of the ordinary ceremonial, Kapila, Asuri, Pañchaśikha (and with them a Veda or Beogha), uniformly occupy a very honourable place in later times; whereas notice is more rarely taken of the remaining authors of philosophical Sútras, &c. This too proves that the former are more ancient than the latter.

248 This relates, according to Wilson, to the community of the fundamental propositions of both in regard to "the eternity of matter, the principles of things, and the final extinction." (Wilson, Works, ii. 346, ed. Rost.). In opposition to this, it is true, Max Mülther expressly denies any special connection whatever between Kapila's system, as embodied in the Sútras, and Buddhist metaphysics (Chips from a German Workshop, i. 225, 1870); yet he himself immediately afterwards gives the correct explanation of this, when he says that the existing Sútras of Kapila are "of later date, posterior, not anterior, to Buddha." On the subject itself, see esp. specially I. St., iii. 132, 133.

249 In the sacred texts of the Jainas also, not only is the Saññi-tánta (Saññi-tánta, explained by the comm. as Kápya-Sútra) specified along with the four Vedas and their śútras, but in another passage the name Kávila appears along with it, the "only other Brahmanical system here mentioned being the Bhasësiya (Vaisheshika). (The order in which they are given is Bhasësiya, Budhá-śútra, Kávila, Logyça, Saññi-tánta.) So also in a similar enumeration in the Lalitavistara, after Sánkhyya Yoga, only Vaisheshika is further specified. See my paper on the Bhagavati of the Jainas, ii. 245-248.
to be the author of the existing Sāmkhya-Sūtra, while the latter embodied its doctrine in several Upanishads.\textsuperscript{250}

Connected with the Sāmkhya school, as a further development of it, is the Yoga system of Patanjali,\textsuperscript{251} whose name describes him as in all probability a descendant of the Kāśyapa Patanchala of the Viśuddha-Āranyaka. Along with him (or prior to him) Yājnavalkya, the leading authority of the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa, is also regarded as a main originator of the Yoga doctrine, but this only in later writings.* Whether Patanjali is to be identified with the

\textsuperscript{250} The Sūtras of Kapila, the so-called Sāmkhya-pravachana, are now published, with the commentary of Viśṇu-bhaikṣu in the *Bhāṣya,* edited by Hall (1854–56); a translation of Ballantyne also appeared in the same series, 1862–65. In his preface to the S. Prav., as well as in the preface some years later to his edition of Viśṇu-bhaikṣu's Sāmkhya-sūtras, Hall gives a special account, with which, however, he is himself by no means satisfied (see his note to Wilson's Viṣṇu-Pur., iii. 301), of Kapila and the leading works extant of the Sāmkhya system. He regards the Sāmkhya-pravachana as a very late production, which may have and there even "be suspected of occasional obligation to the Kārikās of Jāvaranipiṣṭa" (Sāmkhya-sūtra, Preface, p. 12). Of course this does not affect either the antiquity of Kapila himself or his "alleged connection with the Sāmkhya" (p. 20). Corwell, too (Colebrooke, *Misc. Est.* i. 354, note), regards the Sāmkhya school itself "as one of the earliest," while the Sūtras, on the contrary, are of late origin, inasmuch as they not only "refer distinctly to Vedānta texts," but also "expressly mention the Viśeṣātika in i. 25, v. 85; for the Nyāya, cf. v. 27, 86, and for the Yoga, i. 50." Besides the Viśeṣātika (i. 25), only Pañcāḥasākha (v. 32, vi. 68) and Sanandāsākha (vi. 69) are actually mentioned by name. An interesting detail is the opposition of the names Śṛgghaṇa and Pātaliputra (i. 28) as an illustration of separate locality (similarly in the Mahābhārata, see I. St., xii. 378).

\textsuperscript{251} The Yoga-Sūtra ascribed to Patanjali (likewise called Sāmkhya-pravachana-Sūtra), with extracts from Bhoja's commentary upon it, was edited, text with translation, to the extent of one-half, by Ballantyne in his *Aphorisms*; the second half appeared in the *Pancit,* No. 28–65, edited by Govinda-deva-Matrīna.—An *Arya-paśchalīti* by Śaśa (whom the editor identifies with Patanjali), in which the relation of prakṛti and purusā is elucidated in a Vaiśnavya sense, was edited by Bāladiṭrī in No. 59 of the *Pancit*; there exists also a *Sāvya* adaptation of it by Abhi-navagupta; see *Z. D. M. G.*, xxviii. 167. According to Bühler's letter (J. St., xiv. 402 ff.,) Abhinavagupta is supposed to have died in A.D. 982; but Bühler has not himself verified the date, which is stated to occur in the hymn written by Abhinava on his deathbed.

* Particularly in the twelfth book of the Mahā-Bhārata, where, with Janaśa, he is virtually described as a Buddhist teacher, the chief outward badge of these teachers being precisely the Viśeṣātika-chandra-nāma, iṣṭādhyān (M.-Bh., xii. 11898, 566). It appears, at all events, from the Yājnavalkiya-kāṇḍa that both gave a powerful impulse to the practice of religious mendicancy: in the Atharvapaniṣad, too, this is clearly shown (see p. 155).* [In the Yajña-
author of the Mahâbhâshya remains for the present a question. The word yoga in the sense of ‘union with the Supreme Being,’ ‘absorption therein by virtue of meditation,’ first occurs in the later Upanishads, especially in the tenth book of the Taittirîya-Āranyaka and in the Kâthakopanishad, where this very doctrine is itself enunciated. As there presented, it seems to rest substantially upon a dualism, that is, upon the ‘arrangement’ theory of the universe; in this sense, however, that in the Kâthakopanishad at least, purusha, primeval soul, is conceived as existing prior to avyakta, primordial matter, from the union of which two principles the mâyâ dīnâ, or spirit of life, is evolved. For the rest, its special connection with the Sâmkhya system is still, in its details, somewhat obscure, however well attested it is externally by the constant juxtaposition of ‘Sâmkhya-Yoga,’ generally as a compound. Both systems appear, in particular, to have counterenanced a confounding of their purusha, dīvya with the chief divinities of the popular religion, Rudra and Krishna, as may be gathered from the Svetâsvataropanishad, the Bhagavad-gîtâ, and many passages in the twelfth book of the Mahâ-Bhârata.* One very peculiar side of the Yoga

vakya-Sûriti, III. 110, Y. describes himself ostensibly as the author of the Āranyaka as well as of the Yoga-Sûtras.)

It is also in these and similar Upanishads, as also in Manu's Dharmasûtra (cf. Johântgen's Essay on the Law-Book of Manu, 1863), that we have to look for the earliest germs and records of the atheistic Sâmkhya and the delusive Yoga systems.

In my paper on the Svetâsvataropanishad I had to leave the point undetermined whether, for the period to which this work belongs, and specially as regards the monotheistic Yoga system it embodies, an acquaintance with the corresponding doctrines of Christianity is to be assumed or not; see I. St., i. 423. Lorimer, on the other hand, in his translation of the Bhagavad-gîtâ (Breslau, 1869), unreservedly assumes such an acquaintance in the case of this poem. From the point of view of literary chronology no conceivable objection can be brought against this; some of the points, too, which he urges are not without importance; but on the whole he has greatly over-estimated the scope of his argument: the question is still sub judice.

* More particularly with regard to the Bhagavata, Pâñcharatra, and Pâṇâṣṭa doctrines. (A Sûtra of the Pâñcharatra school, that, namely, of Śântiyo (ed. by Ballantyne in the Bibl. Indica, 1861), is apparently mentioned by Śâṅkara, Vedânta-Sûtra, Bh. ii. 2, 45. It rests, seemingly, upon the Bhagavad-gîtâ, and lays special stress upon faith in the Supreme Being (âkâśa-thœas); see on it Cowell's note in Colebrooke's Misc. Es., i. 438. On the development of the doctrine of âkâśa, Wilson surmises Christian conceptions to have had some influence; see my paper on the Râm. Têp. Up., pp. 277, 360. The
PHILOSOPHY: THE TWO MIMANSAS.

doctrine—and one which was more and more exclusively developed as time went on—is the Yoga practice; that is, the outward means, such as penances, mortifications, and the like, whereby this absorption into the supreme Godhead is sought to be attained. In the epic poems, but especially in the Atharvopanishads, we encounter it in full force: Pāṇini, too, teaches the formation of the term yogin.

The most flourishing epoch of the Śāmkhya-Yoga belongs most probably to the first centuries of our era, the influence it exercised upon the development of Gnosticism in Asia Minor being unmistakable; while further, both through this channel and afterwards directly also, it had an important influence upon the growth of the Sūfi philosophy.† Alberuni translated Patanjali’s work into Arabic at the beginning of the eleventh century, and also, it would appear, the Śāmkhya-Sūtra; though the information we have as to the contents of these works does not harmonise with the Sanskrit originals.

The doctrines of the two Mīmāṃsās appear to have been reduced to their present systematic shape at a later period than those of the Śāmkhya; and, as indicated by their respective names, in the case of the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā earlier than in the case of the Uttara-Mīmāṃsā. The essential purpose of both Mīmāṃsās is to bring the doctrines enunciated in the Brāhmaṇas or sacred revelation into harmony and accord with each other. Precepts relating to practice form the subject of the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā, which is hence also styled Kārma-Mīmāṃsā; while doctrines regarding the essence of the creative principle and its relation to the

Nārāyaṇa-Pāncharatna (edited in Bibl. Ind. by K. M. Banerjee, 1861–65) is a ritual, not a philosophical, Vaishāvya text-book.]

† See [Lassen, J. Ä. K., iii. 379 ff.] Gildemeister, Script. Arab. de relig. Ind., p. 112 ff.

† Reinsaud in the Jour. Asiat., 1844, pp. 121–124; H. M. Elliot, Bibl. Index to the Hist. of Muhammadan India, i. 300.

220 Now that the antiquity of the extent form of the Śāmkhya-Sūtras, according to Hall, has become exceedingly doubtful, the view above expressed also becomes in its turn very questionable. Besides, as we shall presently see, in both the Mīmāṃsā-Sūtras teachers are repeatedly cited who are known to us from the Vedic Sūtra literature; while nothing of the kind occurs in either of the Śāmkhya-pravachana-Sūtras. This does not of course touch the point of the higher antiquity of the doctrines in question; for the names Kapila, Patanjali, and Yājnavalkya distinctly carry us back to a far earlier time than do the names Jaimini and Bādarāyana—namely, into the closing phases of the Brāhmaṇa literature itself.
universe form the subject of the Uttara-Mīmāṃsā, which is hence also designated Brahma-Mīmāṃsā, Śāriraka-Mīmāṃsā (‘doctrine of embodied spirit’), or also Veda (‘end of the Veda’). The term ‘Mīmāṃsā’ originally denotes merely speculation in general; it occurs frequently in this sense in the Brāhmaṇas, and only became a technical expression later, as is probably the case also with Veda, a word first occurring in the later Upanishads, in the tenth book of the Taittiriya-Āranyaka, the Kāṭhakopanishad, &c.

The Kārma-Mīmāṃsā-Sūtra is ascribed to Jaimini, who is mentioned in the Purāṇas as the revealer of the Śāma Veda, though we search in vain in Vedic literature for any hint of his name. Still, of the teachers who

---

254 In the Mahābhāṣya, mīmāṃsākā, according to Kalyaṇa, is to be taken in the sense of mīmāṃsā-mādhyante; and as the term also occurs therein contradistinction to nāyikā, it might, in point of fact, refer to the subject of the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā. Still the proper word here for one specially devoted to such studies would rather seem to be sajñāka; see I. St., xii. 455, 466.

* With the exception of the two probably interpolated passages in the Gṛhya-Sūtra of the Rik (see pp. 36–58).—Nor is there anything bearing on it in the Gāṇapātha of Pāṇini—of which, indeed, for the present, only a negative use can be made, and even this only with proper caution. But as the word is irregularly formed (from Jemana we should expect Jaimani), this circumstance may here, perhaps, carry some weight. [Apparent is it is not found in the Mahābhāṣya either; see I. St., xiii. 455. On the other hand, the name Jaimini occurs in the concluding udāna of the Śāma-vīdhi-Maṇḍūkya (v. I. St., iv. 377), and here the bearer of it is described as the disciple of Vyāsa Pārśārya, and preceptor of a Pauṣhapāṇya, which answers exactly to the statement in the Vaiśeṣika-Pur., iiii. 6, 1, 4, where he appears as the teacher of Pauṣhapāṇya (cf. also Rāgguv., 18, 32, 33). The special relation of Jaimini to the Śāma Veda appears also from the statements in the Rig-Gṛhya (see note 49 above), which agree with Vaiśeṣika-Pur., iii. 4. 8, 9. Indeed, the Charaṇa-vyādha specifies a Jaiminīya recession of the Śāma; and this recession appears to be still in existence (see note 60 above). In the Pravara section of the Āsval-Śarani-S., xii. 10, the Jaiminis are classed as belonging to the Bhrigu.—All this, however, does not afford us any direct clue to the date of our Jaimini above, whose work, besides, is properly more related to the Tājura, than to the Śāma Veda. According to the Pānchatantra, the ‘Mīmāṃskrīt’ Jaimini was killed by an elephant—a statement which, considering the antiquity of this work, is always of some value; although, on the other hand; unfortunately, in consequence of the many changes its text has undergone, we have no guarantee that this particular notice formed part of the original text which found its way to Persia in the sixth century (cf. I. St., viii. 159).—There is also an astrologica [Sādakā] treatise which goes by the name of Jaimini-Sūtra; see Catal. of Shr. MHS. N. W. Prc. (1874), pp 508, 510, 514, 532.]
are cited in this Sūtra—Ātreya, Bādari, Bādarāyana, Lābukāyana (?); Aitiṣāyana—the names of the first and second, at all events, may be pointed out in the Taṅtirīya-Prātiṣākhya and the Śravadvātā-Sūtra of Kātyāyana respectively; while we meet with the family of the Aitiṣāyaṇas in the Kauśhtaki-Brahmaṇa.* Bādarāyana is the name of the author of the Brahma-Mimāṃsā-Sūtra; but it by no means follows from the mention of him here that his Sūtra is older than the Sūtra of Jaivini; for not only may the name, as a patronymic, have designated other persons besides, but in the Sūtra of the Brahmat Mīmāṃsā the case is exactly reversed, and Jaivini in his turn is mentioned there. All that results from this, as well as from the fact of each Sūtra frequently citing its own reputed author, is rather that these Sūtras were not really composed by these teachers themselves, but only by their respective schools.† The name Bādarāyana is not to be found “in Pāṇini,” as has recently been erroneously asserted;‡ but only in the gaṇa-pāṭhā to Pāṇini, not a very sure authority for the present.—As leading expounders of the Jaivini-Sūtra, we have mention of Śabara-svāmin,§ and, after him, of Kumārīla-bhaṭṭa; and the latter is said to have flourished prior to Śaṅkara.§

---

255 In the passage in question (vi. 7. 37) ought we not to read Lāmbakāyana? This is the name of a teacher who is several times mentioned in the Śāma-Sūtras; see I. St., iv. 324-373.—The apparent mention of Buddha in l. 2. 33 (bud-pha-edārā) is only apparent: here the word “buddha” has nothing whatever to do with the name ‘Buddha.’—To the above names must, however, be added Kāraṇḍaṇī (vi. 17, vii. 35) and Kāmukāyana (xi. 1. 51); the former of this is found also in Kātyāyana and in the Vedānta-Sūtra, the latter only in the gaṇa ‘Naḍa.’

* xxx. 5, where they are characterised as the scum of the Bhṛgū line, “pṛṣṭhāphād Bṛgīvyādan.”† See Colebrooke, l. 102, 103, 328, and above p. 49.

‡ By Max Müller in his otherwise most valuable contributions to our knowledge of Indian philosophy in the Z. D. M. G., vi. 9.

§ This commentary of Śabara-svāmin, which is even cited by Śaṅkara (Vedānta-Sūtra-M., iii. 3. 53), with the text of Jaivini itself, is at present still in course of publication in the Bād. Jd., ed. by Mahāśeṣandra Nyāyaratna (begun in 1863; the last part, 1871, brings it down to ix. 1. 5).—Mādhava’s Jaiminiya-nyāya-māla-viśāras, edited by Goldsücke (1865 ff.), is also still unfinished; see my J. Str., ii. 376 ff.

256 Who appears also to have borne the odd name of Tutāṭa or even Tutāṭāta. At all events, Tautāṭika, or Tautāṭita, is interpreted by the scholiast of the Prabodha-chaṇḍrodāya, 20. 9, ed. Brockhaus, to mean Kumārīla; and the same explanation is given by Aufrecht in his Catalogus, p. 247, in the case of the Tautāṭitas mentioned in Mādhava’s Sarva-darśana-samgraha.

§ See Colebrooke, i. 263 : yet the tolerably modern title bhaṭṭa is awakens some doubt as to this; it may
The *Brahma-Sūtra* belongs, as we have just seen, to Bādarāyaṇa. The notion that creation is but Illusion, and that the transcendent Brahma is alone the Real, but throning in absolute infinitude without any personal existence, is the fundamental doctrine of this system. The attempt is here made to demonstrate that this doctrine is the end and aim of the Veda itself, by bringing all Vedic passages into harmony with this monotheistic pantheism, and by refuting the various views of the Śamkhya, or atheistic, the Yoga, or theistic, and the Nyāya, or deistic schools, &c. The notice thus taken of the other systems would of itself seem to prove the posteriority of the Brahma-Sūtra; still, it is for the present uncertain whether its polemic is in fact directed against these systems in the form in which we now have them, or perhaps against the original tenets out of which these systems have sprung. The teachers’ names, at least, which are mentioned in the Brahma-Sūtra recur to a large extent in the Śrāuta-Sūtras; for example, Āśmaraṭha in Āśvalāyana;† Bādari, Kārṣṇājini and Kāśakritiṇi in Kātyāyana [see above, p. 139], and, lastly, Atreyā in the Taittirīya-Prātiśākhya. The name Audulomi belongs exclusively to the Brahma-Sūtra.\(^{257}\) The mention of Jaimini and of Bādarāyaṇa himself has been already touched upon.—Windischmann in his excellent “Śamkara” (Bonn, 1832)

not have belonged to him originally perhaps† [According to Cowell, note to Colebrooke’s *Mac. Est.*, i. 323, there actually occur in Śamkara “allusions to Kumārila-bhaṭṭa, if no direct mention of him;” the title Bhauṭṭa belongs quite specially to him: “he is emphatically designed by his title Bhaṭṭa.” For the rest, this title belongs likewise to Bhauṭṭa-Bhadākara-Mitra and Bhaṭṭottapa, and therefore is not by any means ‘tolerably modern.’] *This name itself occurs in the Bhagavad-gītā, xii. 4, but here it may be taken as an appellative rather than as a proper name.*

† We have already seen (p. 53) that the Āśmaraṭhal Kalpa is instanced by Pāṇini’s scholiast as an example of the new Kalpas, in contradistinction to the earlier ones, and so is regarded as of the same age with Pāṇini. If, as is likely, the scholiast took this illustration from the Mahābhāṣya [but this is not the case; v. I. St., xiii 455], then this statement is important. I may mention in passing that Āśmaraṭha occurs in the gene ‘Garga; Audolomi in the gene ‘Bāhu,’ Kṛṣṇājina in the gene ‘Tīka’ and ‘Upakā;’ in the latter also Kāśakritana. The Gīta-pāṭha, however, is a most uncertain authority, and for Pāṇini’s time without weight.

\(^{257}\) It is found in the Mahābhāṣya also, on Pāṇini, iv 1 85, 78; see I. St., xiii. 415.
has attempted directly to fix the age of the Brahma-Sūtra for Bādarāyana bears also the additional title of Vyāsa, whence, too, the Brahma-Sūtra is expressly styled Vyāsa-Sūtra. Now, in the Śaṅkara-vijaya—a biography of the celebrated Vedānta commentator Śaṅkara, reputed to be by one of his disciples—we find it stated (see Windischmann, p. 85; Colebrooke, i. 104) that Vyāsa was the name of the father of Śuka, one of whose disciples was Gaudapāda, the teacher of Govindanātha, who again was the preceptor of Śaṅkara; 225 so that the date of this Vyāsa might be conjecturally set down as from two to three centuries prior to Śaṅkara, that is, between 400 and 500 A.D. But the point must remain for the present undetermined, * since it is open to question whether this Vyāsa ought really to be identified with Vyāsa Bādarāyana, though this appears to me at least very probable. 226

225 See now in Aufrecht’s Catalogis, p. 255b, the passage in question from Madhava’s (?) Śaṅkara-vijaya, v. 5 (rather v. 105, according to the ed. of the work published at Bombay in 1884 with Dhanapati-sūri’s commentary), and ibid., p. 227b, the same statements from another work. The Śaṅkara-vijaya of Anandagiri, on the contrary, Aufrecht, p. 247 ff. (now also in the Bibl. Ind., edited by Jayendraṇa, 1864–1868), contains nothing of this.

* Śaṅkara, on Brahma-Sūtra, iii. 3. 32, mentions that Apaśtaratamas lived as Krūsha-Dvārāyana at the time of the transition from the Kali to the Drāpara yuga; and from the fact of his not at the same time expressly stating that this was Vyāsa Bādarāyana, author of the Brahma-Sūtra, Windischmann concludes, and justly, that in Śaṅkara’s eyes the two personages were distinct. In the Mahā-Brāhma, on the contrary, xii. 12158 ff., Śuka is expressly given as the son of Krūsha Dvārāyana (Vyāsa Pārśārya). But the episode in question is certainly one of the very latest insertions, as is clear from the allusion to the Chinese and Huns.

226 In the meantime, the name Bādarāyana is only known to occur, besides, in the closing versé of the Śama-Vidhāna-Br.; see I. St., iv. 377; and here the bearer of it appears as the disciple of Pārśārya, four steps later than Vyāsa Pārśa, and three later than Jaimini, but, on the other hand, as the teacher (?) of Tilāśī and Śātyśāpin. Besides being mentioned in Jaimini, he is also cited in the Śaṅkilya-Sūtra, in Vardā-Mīhira and Bhāṭṭotpala, an astronomer of this name is referred to; and he, in his turn, according to Aufrecht (Catalogis, p. 329b), alludes, in a passage quoted from him by Utpala, to the ‘Yavana-sūrīṭīdā,’ and, according to Kern, Pref. to Brh. Samh., p. 51, ‘exhibits many Greek words.’—The text of the Brahma-Sūtra, with Śaṅkara’s commentary, has now been published in the Bibl. Ind., edited by Noer and (from part 3) Rāma Nārāyana Vidyāratna (1854–1863) of the translation of both by K. M. Banerjea, as of that in Ballantyne’s Aphorisms, only one part has appeared (1870).
In respect of their reduction to systematic shape, the logical Sūtras of Kaṇāda and Gotama appear to rank last. But this by no means indicates that these logical inquiries are themselves of later origin—on the contrary, the other Sūtras almost uniformly begin with such—but merely that the formal development of logic into two philosophical schools took place comparatively late. Neither of the schools restricts itself to logic alone; each embraces, rather, a complete philosophical system, built up, however, upon a purely dialectical method. But as yet little has been done to elucidate the points of difference between the two in this regard. The origin of the world is in both derived from atoms, which combine by the will of an arranging Power. Whether the name of the Pitāmātras, who are described by Strabo as contentious dialecticians, is to be traced to the word pramāṇa, ‘proof,’ as Lassen supposes, is doubtful. The word tarka, ‘doubt,’ again, in the Kāthakopanishad, ought rather, from the context, to be referred to the Sāṃkhya doctrines, and should not be taken in the sense, which at a later period is its usual one, of ‘logic.’ In Manu too (see Lassen, J. A. K., i. 835), according to the traditional interpretation, tarka still denotes ‘one versed in the Māṇḍūsa logic.’ Yet Manu is also acquainted with logic as a distinct

282 In this respect, Roer in particular has done excellent service: in the copious notes to his translation of the Vaiśeṣikī-Sūtra he has throughout special regard to this very point (in Z. D. M. G., vol. xxi. xxii. 1867, 1868). Before him, Müller, with some of Ballantyne’s writings as a basis, had already taken the same line (in vols. vi. and vii. of the same Journal, 1852, 1853). The text of the Vaiśeṣikī-Sūtras, with the commentary, called Upaskāra, of Śaṅkara-māra, appeared in Bibl. Ind. in 1860, 1861, edited, with a gloss of his own, by Jaya Nārāyaṇa Tarkapaṇḍita. In the Purāṇa (Nos. 32–59) there is a complete translation of both text and commentary, with notes, by A. E. Gough.—Jaya Nārāyaṇa has also since then (1864–65) edited, in the Bibl. Ind., the Nyāyadarsana of Gotama with the commentary of Vāsāyāyaṇa (Pakṣabhāsvāmin). The earlier edition (1828) was accompanied with the commentary of Viśvanātha. The first four books have been translated by Ballantyne in his Apokriseis.

283 We find the atomic theory especially developed among the Jains, and that in a materialistic form, yet so, that the atomic matter and the vital principle are conceived to be in eternal intimate connection; see my Essay on the Bhaga-vati of the Jains, ii. 165, 176, 190, 236. We have a mythological application of it in the assumption of a prejātī Marichi; see J. Sk., ix. 9.

284 In Pāraskara, ii. 6 (“śidheśa vidheyas tarkaḥ cha vedāḥ”), tarka is equivalent to arthaśāda, māṇḍūsa.
science, as well as with the three leading methods of proof which it teaches, though not under the names that were afterwards usual. According to the most recent investigations on the subject, the terms naiyāyika and kevalanaiyāyika (Pāṇ.), i. 1. 49) would point to the Nyāya system as antecedent to Pāṇini: "these words, however, do not occur in the text of Pāṇini at all (which has merely the word kevala?), but only in his scholiast.†—Kanāda's system bears the name Vaiśeshika-Sūtra, because its adherents assert that viśeṣa, 'particularity,' is predicatable of atoms; the system of Gotama, on the other hand, is styled Nyāya-Sūtra, κατ' ἔξοχον. Which of the two is the older is still uncertain. The circumstance that the doctrines of the Vaiśeṣikas are frequently the subject of refutation in the Vedānta-Sūtra,—whereas Gotama's teaching is nowhere noticed, either in the text or in the commentaries upon it, as stated by Colebrooke (i. 352),—tells a priori in favour of the higher antiquity of the former, but whether the author of the Vedānta had these 'doctrines of Kanāda' before him in their systematised form, as has recently been assumed, is a point still requiring investigation.‡—For the rest, these two systems are at

* By Max Müller, l. c., p. 9.
† This is one of the cases of which I have already spoken (p. 225).
‡ In the Sāṃkhya-Sūtra they are even expressly mentioned by name (see p. 237); also in the sacred texts of the Jainas (v. note 249).—The circumstance that the Gotama-Sūtra does not, like the other five philosophical text-books, begin with the customary Sūtra-formula, 'astād 'taḥ', may perhaps also be regarded as a sign of later composition.
§ M. Müller, l. c., p. 9: "Whereas Kanāda's doctrines are there frequently discussed."
¶ In neither of the Sūtras are there references to older teachers whose names might supply some chronological guidance. As regards the names of their authors themselves, Kanāda or Kanābhiraj (Kanabhakshula) is mentioned by Vardhā-Miśira and Sāṃkara, while Aksaphīda, so far as we know at present, is first mentioned by Mādhava. Their patronymics, Kāṇāyaṇa and Gautama (this form is preferable to Gotama) date, it is true, from a very early time, but, beyond this, they tell us nothing: Of interest, certainly, although without decisive weight, is the identification—occurring in a late commentator (Anantāyaṇa) on the Pitṛimotha-Sūtra of Gautama, belonging to the Sāṃkha-Vedas—of this latter Gautama with Aksaphīda; see Burnell's Catalogus, p. 57.—From Cowell's preface to his edition of the Kusumāṅjali (1864) it appears that the commentary of Paṅkhila-abhinin, whom he directly identifies with Vaiśeṣika, was composed prior to Dīnanda, that is to say (see note 219 above), somewhere about the beginning of the sixth century. Uddvyotakara, who is mentioned by Subandhu in the seventh century, wrote against Dīnanda, and
present, and have been for a long time past, those most in favour in India; and it would also appear that among the philosophical writings contained in the Tibetan Tangdjar, logical works are the most numerously represented.

Besides these six systems, all of which won for themselves a general currency, and which on the whole are regarded as orthodox—however slight is the title of the Sāmkhya theory, for instance, to be so esteemed—we have frequent mention of certain heterodox views, as those of the Čārvākas, Laukāvatikas,255 Bārhaspāyās. Of this last-mentioned school there must also have existed a complete system, the Bārhaspatya-Sūtra; but of all this nothing has survived save occasional quotations, introduced with a view to their refutation, in the commentaries of the orthodox systems.

We now come to the third branch of the scientific literature, Astronomy, with its auxiliary sciences.* We have already seen (pp. 112, 113) that astronomy was cultivated to a considerable extent even in Vedic times; and we found it expressly specified by Strabo (see pp. 29, 30) as a favourite pursuit of the Brahmans. It was at the same time remarked, however, that this astronomy was still in a very elementary stage, the observations of the heavens being still wholly confined to a few fixed stars, more especially to the twenty-seven or twenty-eight lunar asterisms, and to the various phases of the moon itself.256 The circumstance that the Vedic year is a solar year of 360 days,

so did Vāhśapati-mīdra in the tenth, and Udayana, the author of the Kuṇumādjal, in the twelfth century; see also Cowell’s note to Colebrooke’s Misc. Ess., i. 282. Gaṅgāśa’s Nyāya-chintāmaṇi, the most important work of the later Nyāya literature, is also placed in the twelfth century; see Z. D. M. O., xxvii. 169. Auḷākṣa, given by Madhava as a name for the tenets of Kaṇḍāka, rests on a play upon the word kaṇḍāka, ‘crow-eater’ = nāgarī.

255 In the Mahābhāṣya there is mention of a “śārva Bāhṣapī Bāhṣapānyā;” see I. St., xiii. 343.

A Bhāguri appears among the teachers cited in the Epih-ad-devatā. The Lokyatas are also repudiated by the Buddhists, Northern as well as Southern; v. Burgouf, Lotus de la bonne Loi, pp. 409, 470. The Jainas, too, rank their system only with loyga- (laukīka) knowledge; see above, note 249.—On the Čārvākas, see the introduction of the Saṃvatsar-dārsana-saṃgraha.

* See I. St., ii. 236-237.

256 The cosmical or astronomical data met with in the Brahmāṇas are all of an extremely childish and naive description; see I. St., ix. 358 ff.
and not a lunar year, does indeed presuppose a tolerably accurate observation and computation of the sun's course; but, agreeably to what has just been stated, we can hardly imagine that this computation proceeded upon the phenomena of the nocturnal heavens, and we must rather assume it to have been based upon the phenomena of the length or shortness of the day, &c. To the elaboration of a quinquennial cycle with an intercalary month a pretty early date must be assigned, since the latter is mentioned in the Rīk-Saṃhitā. The idea of the four mundane ages, on the contrary—although its origin, from observation of the moon's phases, may possibly be of extreme antiquity—can only have attained to its complete development towards the close of the Vedic period: Megasthenes, as we know, found the Yuga system flourishing in full perfection. That the Hindū division of the moon's path into twenty-seven (or twenty-eight) lunar mansions is of Chinese origin, as asserted by Biot (Journal des Savants, 1849, 1845; see Lassen, I. AK., i. 742 ff.), can hardly be admitted. Notwithstanding the accounts of Chinese writers, the contrary might equally well be the case, and the system might possibly have been introduced into China through the medium of Buddhism, especially as Buddhist writings adhere to the ancient order of the asterisms—commencing with Kṛttikā—precisely as we find it among the Chinese.

---

237 Roth disputes this origin in his Essay, Die Lehre von den vier Welthierern (1860, Tübingen).
238 On the questions dealt with in what follows, a special discussion was raised between J. B. Biot, myself, and Whitney, in which A. Sédillot, Steinschneider, E. Burgess, and Max Müller also took part. Cf. the Journal des Savants for 1859, and Biot's posthumous Études sur l'Astronomie Indienne et Chinoise (1863); my two papers, Die Védischen Nachrichten von den Nakalhata (1860, 1862), as also I. Str., ii. 172, 173, J. St., ix. 424 ff. (1863), x. 213 ff. (1866); Whitney in Journ. Am. Or Soc., vols. vi. and viii. (1860, 1864, 1865); Burgess, ibid.; Steinschneider, in Z. D. M. G., xvii. (1863); Müller in Pref. to vol. iv. of his edition of the Rīk (1862). Sédillot, Courtois Observations sur quelques Points de l'Histoire de l'Astronomie (1863); and, lastly, Whitney in the second vol. of his Oriental and Linguistic Studies (1874). To the views expressed above I still essentially adhere; Whitney, too, inclines towards them. In favour of Chalisa having been the mother-country of the system, one circumstance, amongst others, tells with especial force, viz., that from China, India, and Babylon we have precisely the same accounts of the length of the longest day; whilst the statements, e.g., in the Bundelkhand, on this head, exhibit a total divergence; see Windischmann (Zoroastrische Studien, p. 105).
239 This assertion of Biot's has not been confirmed; the Chinese list commences with Chitrā (i.e., the autumnal equinox), or Utardhāyīdā.
SANSKRT LITERATURE.

To me, however, the most probable view is that these lunar mansions are of Chaldean origin, and that from the Chaldeans they passed to the Hindus as well as to the Chinese. For the נֵבְמָה of the Book of Kings, and the נֵבְמָה of the Book of Job,270 which the Biblical commentators erroneously refer to the zodiac, are just the Arabic مَهْسِنْ, 'mansions;' and here even Biot will hardly suppose a Chinese origin. The Indians may either have brought the knowledge of these lunar mansions with them into India, or else have obtained it at a later time through the commercial relations of the Phœncians with the Panjáb. At all events, they were known to the Indians from a very early period, and as communication with China is altogether inconceivable at a time when the Hindús were perhaps not even acquainted with the mouths of the Ganges, Chinese influence is here quite out of the question. The names of some of these asterisms occur even in the Rik-Samhitá (and that under peculiar forms); for example, the Aghás, i.e., Maghás, and the Arjanyau, i.e., Phalgunyau—a name also applied to them in the Satapatha-Brahmana—in the nuptial hymn, mandala x. 85. 13; further, Tishya in mandala v. 54. 13, which, however, is referred by Sáyana to the sun (see also x. 64. 8). The earliest complete enumeration of them, with their respective regents, is found in the Taittirifya-Sam-

270 On this point see specially I. St., l. 217.
ASTRONOMY: THE PLANETS.

bitá; a second, which exhibits considerable variation in the names, betokening a later date, occurs in the Atharva-Saṃhitá and the Taittiriya-Brahmana; the majority of the names are also given in Pāṇini. This latter list contains for the most part the names employed by the later astronomers; and it is precisely these later ones that are enumerated in the so-called Jyotisha or Vedic Calendar (along with the zodiacal signs too!). To this latter treatise an importance has hitherto been attributed to which its contents do not entitle it. Should my conjecture be confirmed that the Lagadha, Lagata, whose system it embodies, is identical with the Lāt who is mentioned by Albidrīnī as the author of the ancient Sūrya-Siddhānta [see, however, p. 258 n.], then it would fall in the fourth or fifth century of our era; and even this might almost seem too high an antiquity for this somewhat insignificant tract, which has only had a certain significance attached to it on account of its being ranked with the Veda.*

A decided advance in astronomical science was made through the discovery of the planets. The earliest mention of these occurs, perhaps, in the Taittiriya-Aranyaka, though this is still uncertain;** beyond this, they are not noticed in any other work of the Vedic period.***

* This is why it adheres to the old order of the lunar asterisms, as is done even at the present day in writings that bear upon the Veda. [According to the special examination of the various points here involved, in the introduction to my Essay on the Jyotisha (1882), a somewhat earlier term is possible; assuming, of course, as I there do, that those verses which betoken Greek influence do not really belong to the text as it originally stood. The author appears occasionally also under the name Lagadāchārya; see above, p. 61, note.]

** The passages referred to are, in fact, to be understood in a totally different sense; see J. St., ix. 363, x. 274.

*** The Maithrâyag-Up. forms the single exception, but that only in its last two books, described as kītsa; see above, notes 103, 104. On the subject itself, see further my Essay on the Jyotisha, p. 10, J. St., ix. 363, 442, x. 239, 240. — The two Rik passages which are thought by Alf. Ludwig, in his recently published Nachrichten des Rig- und Atharva- Veda über Geographie, etc., des alten Indiens, to contain an allusion to the planets (l. 105, 10, x. 55, 3), can hardly have any such reference. Neither the Sāyāyana, cited by Sāyāna to l. 105, 10, nor Sāyāna himself, has any thought of the planets here (see J. St., ix. 363 n.). For the "dischard prakāśa" of Ath. S., 19, 9, 7, the Ath. Parisîkrita offer other parallels, showing that here too the planets are not to be thought of, especially as immediately afterwards, in v. 10, the "prakāśa cānadvamandah ... ādityero ... rākum" are enumerated, where, distinctly, the allusion is only to eclipses. This particular section of the Ath. S. (19, 7) is, moreover, quite a late production; see J. St., iv. 433 u.
law-book is unacquainted with them; Yājnavalkya's Code, however—and this is significant as to the difference in age of these two works—inculcates their worship; in the dramas of Kālidāsa, in the Mrichhakāṭi and the Mahā-Bhārata, as well as the Rāmāyaṇa, they are repeatedly referred to.* Their names are peculiar, and of purely Indian origin; three of them are thereby designated as sons respectively of the Sun (Saturn), of the Earth (Mars), and of the Moon (Mercury); and the remaining two as representatives of the two oldest families of Rishis,—An-giras (Jupiter) and Bhṛigu (Venus). The last two names are probably connected with the fact that it was the adherents of the Atharva-Veda—which was likewise specially associated with the Rishis An-giras and Bhṛigu—who at this time took the lead in the cultivation of astronomy and astrology.† Besides these names others are also common; Mars, for example, is termed 'the Red;' Venus, 'the White' or 'Beaming;' Saturn, 'the Slow-travelling;' this last being the only one of the names that testifies to any real astronomical observation. To these seven planets (sun and moon being included) the Indians added two others, Rāhu and Ketu, the 'head' and 'tail' respectively of the monster who is conceived to be the cause of the solar and lunar eclipses. The name of the former, Rāhu, first occurs in the Chhāndogyopanishad, yet though here it can hardly be taken in the sense of 'planet;' the latter, on the contrary, is first mentioned in Yājnavalkya. But this number nine is not the original number,—if indeed it be to the planets that the passage of the Taīttoṭya-Āraṇyaka, above instanced, refers—as only seven (saptā svṛyād) are there mentioned. The term_for planet, graha, 'the seizer,' is evidently of astrological origin; indeed, astrology was the focus in which astronomical inquiries generally converged, and from which they drew light and animation after the practical exigencies of worship had been once for all satisfied. Whether the Hindūs discovered the planets inde-

* In Pāṇ. iv. 2. 26. śukra might be referred to the planet Śukra, but it is preferable to take it in the sense of Soma-juice.
† Whence Bhārgava came to signify 'an astrologer:' see Daśā-kumāra, ed. Wilson, p. 162. 11.

273 Cl. also Rāhu as the name of Buddha's son, who, however, also appears as Lābhuṇa; see J. St., iii. 130, 149.
pendently, or whether the knowledge came to them from without, cannot as yet be determined; but the systematic peculiarity of the nomenclature points in the meantime to the former view. 274

It was, however, Greek influence that first infused a real life into Indian astronomy. This occupies a much more important position in relation to it than has hitherto been supposed; and the fact that this is so, so inscr impress implies that Greek influence affected other branches of the literature as well, even though we may be unable at present directly to trace it elsewhere. 275 Here it is necessary to insert a few particulars as to the relations of the Greeks with the Indians.

The invasion of the Panjāb by Alexander was followed by the establishment of the Greek monarchies of Bactria, whose sway, in the period of their prime, extended, although only for a brief season, over the Panjāb as far as Gujarāt. 276 Concurrently therewith, the first Seleucid, as well as the Ptolemies, frequently maintained direct relations by means of ambassadors, with the court of Paṭaliputra; * and thus it comes that in the inscriptions

274 Still it has to be remarked that in the Atharva-Parāśaṅgaḥ, which, with the Jyotisha, represent the oldest remains of Indian astrology, the sphere of influence of the planets appears in special connection with their Greek names; see J. St., viii. 473, x. 319.


276 According to Goldstücken, the statement in the Mahābhārata as to a then recent siege of Sāketa (Oude) by a Yavana prince has reference to Menander; while the accounts in the Yuga-Purāṇa of the Gṛgī Śaṃhitā even speak of an expedition of the Yavanas as far as Paṭaliputra. But then the question arises, whether by the Yavanas it is really the Greeks who are meant (see J. Str., ii. 345), or possibly merely their Indo-Scythian or other successors, to whom the name was afterwards transferred; see J. St., xiii. 306, 307; also note 202 above.

* Thus Megasthenes was sent by Seleucus to Chandragupta (d. B.C. 291); Deimachus, again, by Antiochus, and Dionysius, and most probably Basilus also, by Ptolemy II. to "Ampavārī, Amīraghūta, son of Chandragupta. [Antiochus concluded an alliance with ξοπεύσος, Subhagāsena (?) Seleucus even gave Chandragupta his daughter to wife; Lasen, Ι. Α.Κ., ii. 208; Talboys Wheeler, History of India (1874), p. 177. In the retinue of this Greek princess there of course came to Paṭaliputra Greek damsels as her waiting-maids, and these must have found particular favour in the eyes of the Indians, especially of their princes. For not only are ωποίων: ἐνθύτεις: προτὸς μελικάριστον mentioned as an article of traffic for India, but in Indian inscriptions also we find Yavana girls
of Piyaḍasi we find mention of the names of Antigonus, Magas, Antiochus, Ptolemy, perhaps even of Alexander himself (cf. p. 179), ostensibly as vassals of the king, which is of course mere empty boasting. As the result of these embassies, the commercial intercourse between Alexandria and the west coast of India became particularly brisk; and the city of Ujjayini, Οὐζάνι, rose in consequence to a high pitch of prosperity. Philostratus, in his life of Apollonius of Tyana—a work written in the second century A.D., and based mainly on the accounts of Damis, a disciple of Apollonius, who accompanied the latter in his travels through India about the year 50 A.D.—mentions the high esteem in which Greek literature was held by the Brahmans, and that it was studied by almost all persons of the higher ranks. (Reinaud, Mém. sur l’Inde, pp. 85, 87.) This is not very high authority, it is true [cf. Lassen, I. A.K., iii. 358 ff.]; the statement may be an exaggeration, but still it accords with the data which we have now to adduce, and which can only be explained upon the supposition of a very lively intellectual interchange. For the Indian astronomers regularly speak of the Yavanas as their teachers; but whether this also applies to Pārśāra, who is reputed to be the oldest Indian astronomer, is still uncertain. To judge from the quotations, he computes by the lunar mansions, and would seem, accordingly, to stand upon an independent footing. But of Garga, who passes for the next oldest astronomer,
an oft-quoted verse has come down to us, in which he extols the Yavanas on account of their astronomical knowledge. The epic tradition, again, gives as the earliest astronomer the Asura Maya, and asserts that to him the sun-god himself imparted the knowledge of the stars. I have already elsewhere (I. St., ii. 243) expressed the conjecture that this ‘Asura Maya’ is identical with the *Ptolemaios* of the Greeks; since this latter name, as we see from the inscriptions of Piyadas, became in Indian ‘Turamaya,’ out of which the name ‘Asura Maya’ might very easily grow; and since, by the later tradition (that of the Jñána-bháskara, for instance) this Maya is distinctly assigned to Romaka-pura in the West. Lastly, of the five Siddhántas named as the earliest astronomical systems, one—the Romaka-Siddhánta—is denoted, by its very name, as of Greek origin; while a second—the Pauliśa-Siddhánta—is expressly stated by Albrūnd† to have been composed by Paulus al Yúnáí, and, is accordingly, perhaps, to be regarded as a translation of the *Eisvagóyé* of Paulus Alexandrinus. The astronomers

every occasion when it is a question of a patronymic or other similar affix, their name is introduced among those given as examples; see I. St., xiii. 410 ff. In the Atharva-Paráśisatas, also, we find Garga, Górgya, Vṛiddha-Garga cited: these latter Gargas are manifestly very closely related to the above-mentioned Garga the astronomer. See further Kero, Pref. to Varshna-Mïkira’s Břh. Samh., p. 31 ff.; I. Str., ii. 347.)

* See my *Catel. of the Sansk. MSS. in the Berl. Lib.* p. 288. In reference to the name Romaka, I may make an observation in passing. Whereas, in Mahá-Bhárata xii. 10308, the Raunyas are said to have been created from the *Romā-kāpas* (‘hair-cores’) of Virabhadra, at the destruction of Daksin’s sacrifice, at the time of Rámaýána i. 55. 3, their name must have been still unknown, since other tribes are there represented, on a like occasion, as springing from the *roma-kāpas*. Had the author, been acquainted with the name, he would scarcely have failed to make a similar use of it to that found in the Mahá-Bhárata. [Cf. my Essay on the Rámaýána, p. 23 ff.]

† Albrūnd resided a considerable time in India, in the following of Mahámod of Ghásma, and acquired there a very accurate knowledge of Sanskrit and of Indian literature, of which he has left as a valuable account, written a.d. 1031. Extracts from this highly important work were communicated by Reinsaud in the *Journ. Asiat.* for 1844, and in his *Méns. sur l’Inde* in 1849 [also by Woespe, *ibid.* 1863]: the text, promised so long ago as 1843, and most eagerly looked for ever since, has, unfortunately, not as yet appeared. [Ed. Šcäuch, of Vienna, is at present engaged in editing it; and, from his energy, we may—now at length expect that this grievous want will be speedily supplied.]

377 Such a direct connection of the Pulíśa-Siddhánta with the *Eisvagóyé* is attended with difficulty,
and astronomical works just instantiated—Garga, Maya, the Romaka-Siddhánta, and the Pauliša-Siddhánta—are, it is true, known to us only through isolated quotations; and it might still be open to doubt, perhaps, whether in their case the presence of Greek influence can really be established; although the assertion, for instance, that Pulíaśa, in opposition to Āryabhaṭa, began the day at midnight, is of itself pretty conclusive as to its Western origin. But all doubt disappears when we look at the great mass of Greek words employed in his writings by Varāha-Mihira, to whom Indian astronomers assigned, in Albriri's day, as they still do in our own, the date 504 A.D.—employed, too, in a way which clearly indicates that they had long been in current use. Nay, one of his works—the Horá-Sāstra—even bears a Greek title (from Ὠρα); and in it he not only gives the entire list of the Greek names of the zodiacal signs and planets, but he also directly employs several of the latter—namely, Ἁρα, Ἀσφυζίτις, and Κονα—side by side with the Indian names, and just as frequently as he does these. The signs of the

from the fact that the quotations from Pulíaśa do not accord with it, being rather of an astronomical than an astrological description. That the Āryaśāstra, however, was itself known in the Hindū, in some form or other, finds support in the circumstance that it alone contains nearly the whole of the technical terms adopted by Indian astronomy from the Greek; see Kerk's Preface to his edition of Varāha-Mihira's Brihat-Samh., p. 49.—Considerable interest attaches to the argument put forward by H. Jacob in his tract, De Astronomia Indicae Horā Appellatis Originibus (Bonn, 1872), to the effect that the system of the twelve 'mansion' occurs first in Firmicus Maternus (A.D. 356-354), and that consequently the Indian Horātexta, in which these are of such fundamental significance, can only have been composed at a still later date.

This, and not Āryabhaṭa, is the proper spelling of his name, as is shown by the metre in his own work (Gosita-paddo, v. 1). This was pointed out by Bhādu Dāji in J. R. A. S., i. 352 (1864).

† See Colebrooke, ii. 461 (415 ed. Cowell).

‡ These are the following: Κρύα κόδα, Τεινορι ταγών, Ιτυνα δίβων, Κυλία κύλωρ (i), Λύκα λέων, Ράθωνα παρόνα, Ιάκια ιαύδω, Κωρυία κτώνος, Ταυσιλια ταχύντα, Ακοκέα αλέκτρων, Ηρόθόνα δεράεχος, Ιθα λυός; further, Ἡλί Ηλιος, Ηίσσα Ερμή, Ἡρα Ἀρη, Κορα Κρόνος, Εὐας Ζεὺς, Ασφυζίτις Ἀφροδίτη. These names were made known so long ago as 1827 by C. M. Whish, in the first part of the Transactions of the Literary Society of Madras, and have since been frequently published; see in particular Lassen, in Zeitach. f. d. Kunde des Morgen., iv. 306, 318 (1842); lately again in my Catal. of the Sansk. MSS. in the Berl. Lib., p. 238. Horá and konda had long previously been identified by Père Pons with Ὁρα and κόνα; see Letters Edif., 26, 236, 237, Paris, 1743.
zodiac, on the contrary, he usually designates by their Sanskrit names, which are translated from the Greek. He has in constant use, too, the following technical terms, all of which are found employed in the same sense in the Eἰσαγωγή of Paulus Alexandrinus, viz., ἀρικάνα = δεκανός, λεπτά = λεπτή, ἀναρή = ἀναφή, συναρή = συναφή, δευτεράδια = δορυφορία, κεμαδρία (for krema- 

druma) = ξοματισμός, τείς = φάσις, τενά = κέντρον, ἀρχέλαμα = ἀπόκλειμα, παραφαρά = ἐπαναφορά, τρίκονα = τρίγωνον, λίβυκα = ὑπόγειον, ἴδιμενα = διάμετρον, ἀριτόμ = ἀριτόν, μεσανάρα = μεσανάρημα.

Although most of these names denote astrological relations, still, on the other hand, in the division of the heavens into zodiacal signs, decani, and degrees, they comprise all that the Hindūs lacked, and that was necessary to enable them to cultivate astronomy in a scientific spirit. And accordingly we find that they turned these Greek aids to good account; rectifying, in the first place, the order of their lunar asterisms, which was no longer in accordance with reality, so that the two which came last in the old order occupy the two first places in the new; and even, it would seem, in some points independently advancing astronomical science further than the Greeks themselves did. Their fame spread in turn to the West; and the Andubarius (or, probably, Ardubarius), whom the Chronicon Paschale† places in primeval times as the earliest Indian astronomer, is doubtless none other than Aryabhaṭa, the rival of Pulīṣa, who is likewise extolled by the Arabs under the name Arjabahr. For, during the eighth and ninth centuries, the Arabs were in astronomy the disciples of the Hindūs, from whom they borrowed the lunar mansions in their new order, and whose Siddhāntas (Sindhends) they frequently worked up and translated,—in part under the supervision of Indian astronomers themselves, whom the Khalifs of Bagdad, &c., invited to their courts. The same thing took place also

---

* See I. St., ii. 254.

† The Chronicon Paschale nominally dates from the time of Con-
stantinus (330); it underwent, however, a fresh recension under Her-
celius (610-641), and the name Andubarius may have been intro-
duced then.
in regard to Algebra and Arithmetic in particular, in both of which, it appears, the Hindús attained, quite independently, to a high degree of proficiency. It is to them also that we owe the ingenious invention of the numerical symbols, which in like manner passed from them to the

280 But cf. Colebrooke in his famous paper On the Algebra of the Hindús (1817) in Misc. Esq., i. 446, 401 ed. Cowell. Woepcke, indeed (Mém. sur la propagation des Chiffres Indiens, Paris, 1863, pp. 75-91), is of opinion that the account in the Lalita-Vistara of the problem solved by Buddhás on the occasion of his marriage-examination, relative to the number of atoms in the length of a gojana, is the basis of the ‘Areanarius’ of Archimedes (n.c. 287-212). But the age of the Lalita-Vistara is by no means so well ascertained that the reverse might not equally well be the case; see I. St., viii. 325, 326; Reinaud, Mém. sur l’Inde, p. 303.

281 The oldest known trace of these occurs, curiously, in Pingala’s Treatise on Prosody, in the last chapter of which (presumably a later addition), the permutations of longs and shorts possible in a metre with a fixed number of syllables are set forth in an enigmatical form; see I. St., viii. 425 ff., 324-326.—On geometry the Sulva-Sutrás, appertaining to the Brahita ritual, furnish highly remarkable information; see Thibaut’s Address to the Aryan Section of the London International Congress of Orientalists, in the special number of Teubner’s American and Oriental Literary Record, 1874, pp. 27, 28, according to which these Sutrás even contain attempts at squaring the circle.

* The Indian figures from 1-9 are abbreviated forms of the initial letters of the numerals themselves [cf. the similar notation of the musical tones]; the zero, too, has arisen out of the first letter of the word शून्यa, ‘empty’ [it occurs even in Pingala, i. c. It is the decimal place-value of these figures which gives them their special significance. Woepcke, in his above-quoted Mém. sur la propagation des Chiffres Indiens (Journ. Asiat., 1863), is of opinion that even prior to their adoption by the Arabs they had been obtained from India by the Neo-Pythagoreans of Alexandria, and that the so-called Gobhar figures are traceable to them. But against this it has to be remarked that the figures in question are only one of the latest stages of Indian numerical notation, and that a great many other notations preceded them. According to Edward Thomas, in the Journ. Asiat. for the same year (1863), the earliest instances of the use of these figures belong to the middle of the seventh century; whereas the employment of the older numerical symbols is demonstrable from the fourth century downwards. See also I. St., viii. 165, 256. The character of the Valabhi Plates seems to be that whose letters most closely approach the forms of the figures. Burnell has quite recently, in his Elem. S. Ind. Pat., p. 46 ff., questioned altogether the connection of the figures with the first letters of the numerals; and he supposes them, or rather the older ‘Cave Numerals,’ from which he directly derives them, to have been introduced from Alexandria, “together with Greek Astrology.” In this I cannot in the meantime agree with him; see my remarks in the Jenaer Lit. Z., 1875, No. 24, p. 419. Amongst other things, I there call special attention to the circumstance that Hermann Hankel, in his excellent work (posthumously, unfortunately), Zur Geschichte der Mathematik (1874), p. 379 ff., declares Woepcke’s opinion
Astronomy: Aryabhata.

Arabs, and from these again to European scholars. By these latter, who were the disciples of the Arabs, frequent allusion is made to the Indians, and uniformly in terms of high esteem; and one Sanskrit word even—uchha, signifying the apex of a planet’s orbit—has passed, though in a form somewhat difficult to recognize (aux, genit. augéa), into the Latin translations of Arabian astronomers (see Reinaud, p. 325).

As regards the age and order of sequence of the various Indian astronomers, of whom works or fragments of works still survive, we do not even here escape from the uncertainty which everywhere throughout Indian literature attends questions of the kind. At their head stands the Aryabhata already mentioned, of whose writings we possess at present only a few sorry scraps, though possibly fuller fragments may yet in course of time be recovered. He appears to have been a contemporary of Puliśa; and, in any case, he was indebted to Greek influence, since he reckons by the zodiacal signs. According to Albrúní, he

to the effect that the Neo-Pythagoreans were acquainted with the new figures having place-value, and with the zero, to be erroneous, and the entire passage in Boethius on which this opinion is grounded to be an interpolation of the tenth or eleventh century].

See also Wepseite, Sur l’Introduction de l’Arithmétique Indienne en Occident (Rome, 1859).

As also, according to Reinaud’s ingenious conjecture (p. 373 ff.), the name of Ujjayinī itself—through a misreading, namely, of the Arabic (ب) as Arin, Arin, whereby the ‘meridian of Ujjayinī’ became the “coupole d’Arin.”

The researches of Whitney in Journ. Am. Or. Soc., vi. 350 ff. (1860), and of Bhāsū Dājī in J. R. A. S., ii. 392 ff. (1865), have brought us full light upon this point. From these it appears that of Aryabhata there are still extant the Dāśagīti-Sātra and the Āryaśaṅkara, both of which have been already edited by Kern (1874) under the title Āryaśaṅkara, s

together with the commentary of Paramadīvāra; cf. A. Barth in the Revue Critique, 1875, pp. 241–253. According to his own account therein given, Āryabhata was born a.d. 476, lived in eastern India at Kuśumapura (Paliṭhōra), and composed this work at the early age of twenty-three.

In it he teaches, amongst other things, a quite peculiar numerical notation by means of letters.—The larger work extant under the title Ārya-Siddhānta in eighteen adhyāyas is evidently a subsequent production; see F. Hall in Journ. Am. Or. Soc., vi. 556 (1860), and Aufrecht, Catalogus, pp. 325, 326: Bentley thinks it was not composed until a.d. 1322, and Bhāsū Dājī, l. e., pp. 393, 394, believes Bentley “was here for once correct.”—Wilson, Mack. Coll., i. 119, and Lassen, J. A. K., ii. 113, speak also of a commentary by Āryabhata on the Sūrya-Siddhānta: this is doubtless to be ascribed to Lopahāryabhata (Bhāsū Dājī, p. 405). See also Kern, Pref. to Brūhi. Saṁhit., p. 59 ff.
was a native of Kusumapura, i.e., Pātaliputra, and belonged consequently to the east of India. Together with him, the authors of the following five Siddhântas are looked upon as ancient astronomers—namely, the unknown * author of the Brahma-Siddhânta or Paîdâmaha-Siddhânta; next, the author of the Saura-Siddhânta, who is called Lâṭ by Albîrûnî, and may possibly be identical with the Lagatâ; Lagadha mentioned as author of the Vedaṅga treatise Jyotisha, as well as with Lâdhâ, a writer occasionally quoted by Brahmagupta; † further, Pulîṣa, author of the Paulîṣa-Siddhânta; and lastly, Srîshepa and Vîshquandhra, to whom the Romaka-Siddhânta and the Vasishṭha-Siddhânta—works said to be based upon Aryabhata's system—are respectively attributed. Of these five Siddhântas, not one seems to have survived. There exist works, it is true, bearing the names Brahma-Siddhânta, Vasishṭha-Siddhânta, Sûrya-Siddhânta and Romaka-Siddhânta; but that these are not the ancient works so entitled appears from the fact that the quotations from the latter, preserved to us by the scholiasts, are not contained in them. 295 In point of fact, three distinct Vasishṭha-Siddhântas, and, similarly, three distinct Brahma-Siddhântas,

* Albîrûnî names Brahmagupta as the author of this Brahma-Siddhânta; but this is erroneous. Perhaps Reinsaud has misunderstood the passage (p. 332).
† Lâdhâ may very well have arisen out of Lagadha; [the form Lâta, however, see Kern, Pref. to Bṛh. Samh., p. 53, points rather to Angarâ].

295 As also upon Lâta, Vasishṭha, and Vîjyanandin, according to Bhāū Dējî, I. c., p. 408. In the latter's opinion the Romaka-Siddhânta is to be assigned to Sâke 427 (A. D. 505), and was "composed in accordance with the work of some Roman or Greek author." Bhâṭṭotpala likewise mentions, amongst others, a Yaṇavasāvara Sphujīdibhâja (or Asphâ), a name in which Bhāū Dējî looks for a Spemisippus, but Kern (Pref. to Bṛh. Samh., p. 48) for an Aphrodites.

296 See on this point Kern, Pref. to Bṛh. Samh., pp. 45-50. Up to the present only the Sûrya-Siddhânta has been published, with Rangânâtha's commentary, in the Bûd. Ind. (1854-59), ed. by Fitzedward Hall and Bâpû Dēva Śûdrâ; also a translation by the latter, ibid. (1860, 1861). Simultaneously there appeared in the Journ. Am. Or. Soc., vol. vi., a translation, nominally by Eb. Burgess, with an excellent and very thorough commentary by W. D. Whitney, who has recently (see Oriental and Linguistic Studies, ii. 350) assumed "the entire responsibility for that publication in all its parts." In his view, p. 326, the Sûrya-Siddhânta is "one of the most ancient and original of the works which present the modern astronomical science of the Hindus;" but how far the existing text "is identical in substance and extent with that of the original Sûrya-Siddhânta" is for the present doubtful. Cf. Kern, I. c., pp. 44-46.
are cited. One of these last, which expressly purports to be a recast* of an earlier work, has for its author Brahmagupta, whose date, according to Albrůně, is the year A.D. 664, which corresponds pretty closely with the date assigned to him by the modern astronomers of Ujjayini, A.D. 628. 287 To him also belongs, according to Albrůně,† a work named Ṣaṅgalaṇa, corrupted by the Arabs into Ārkand. This Ārkand, the Sindhendra (i.e., the five Siddhāntas), and the system of Arjabhār (Āryabhata) were the works which, as already remarked, were principally studied and in part translated by the Arabs, in the eighth and ninth centuries. —On the other hand, the Arabs do not mention Varāha-Mihira, although he was prior to Brahmagupta, as the latter repeatedly alludes to him, and although he gathered up the teaching of these five Siddhāntas in a work which is hence styled by the commentators Pañcāsiddhāntikā, but which he himself calls by the name Karāṇa. This work seems to have perished, 288 and only the astrological works of Varāha-Mihira have come down to us—namely, the Sāmhitā † and the Hord-Śāstra. The latter, however, is

* Albrůně gives a notice of the contents of this recast; it and the Paulliśa-Siddhānta were the only two of these Siddhāntas he was able to procure.

287 This latter date is based on his own words in the Brahmadvpa-Siddhānta, 24, 7, 8, which, as there stated, he composed 550 years after the Śaka-saṃvatsa ("pastas"), at the age of thirty. He here calls himself the son of Jīna, and he lived under Śrī-Vyāghramukha of the Śrī-Chāpa dynasty; Bhaṭṭa Dājī, i.e., p. 410. Prithūdakasvāmin, his scholiast, describes him, curiously, as Bhilli-Mālavakāchārya; see Z. D. M. G., xxv. 659; I. Sī., xli. 316. Chapa. xii. (gaṇita, arithmetica) and xxvii. (kuṭṭaka, algebra) of his work have, it is well known, been translated by Colebrooke (1817).

† Reinsud, Mém. sur l'Inde, p. 322.

288 "Yesterday I heard of a second MS. of the Pañcāsiddhāntikā."
incomplete, only one-third of it being extant.* He mentions a great number of predecessors, whose names are, in part only known to us through him; for instance, Maya and the Yavanas (frequently), Parásara, Maniśthu, Śaktipúrva, Vishnugupta, Dévasvámin, Siddhasena, Vajrin, Jivaśarman, Satya, &c. Of Áryabhaṭa no direct mention is made, possibly for the reason that he did nothing for astrology: in the Karana he would naturally be mentioned. While Áryabhaṭa still computes by the era of Yudhishṭhira, Varāha-Mihira employs the Saka-kāla, Saka-bhūpa-kāla, or Sākendra-kāla, the era of the Saka king, which is referred by his scoliast to Vikrama's era. Brahmagupta, on the contrary, reckons by the Saka-nipanta—which, according to him, took place in the year 3179 of the Kali age—that is to say, by the era of Sālivāhana. The tradition as to the date of Varāha-Mihira has already been given: as the statements of the astronomers of to-day correspond with those current in Álbandūr's time, we may reasonably take them as trustworthy, and accord-

* Namely, the Játaka portion (that relating to nativities) alone; and this in a double arrangement, as Laghu-Játaka and as Brhaj-Játaka: the former was translated by Álbandūr into Arabic. [The text of the first two chaps. was published by me, with translation, in I. St., ii. 277: the remainder was edited by Jacob in his degree dissertation (1872). It was also published at Bombay in 1867 with Bhattacharya's commentary; similarly, the Brhaj-Játaka at Benares and Bombay; Kern's Pref., p. 26. The text of the first three chaps. of the Ydīrīv appeared, with translation, in I. St., x. 161 ff. The third part of the Horś-Satra, the Vindha-palāsa, is still inedited.]

281 Kern, Preface, p. 51, remarks that, according to Utpala, he was also called Bhadatta; but Aufrecht in his Catalogus, p. 329, has Bhadanta. In the Jyotirid-dhārāra, Satya stands at the head of the sages at Vikrama's court; see Z. D. M. Ö., xxii. 722, xxiv. 400.

282 And as a matter of fact we find in Bhatotpala a quotation from this work in which he is mentioned; see Kern, J. R. A. S., xx. 383 (1863); Bhānu Dājī, l. c., 406. In another such quotation Varāha-Mihira refers to the year 427 of the Saka-kāla, and also to the Romaṇa-Siddhānta and Paulitsa; Bhānu Dājī, p. 407.

283 This name I conjecture to represent Maneto, author of the Apotelesmata, and in this Kern agrees with me (Pref. to Brh. Samh., p. 5).

284 This is also a name of Chāgaka; Dāsakum. 183, 5, ed. Wilson.
ing to these he flourished in A.D. 504. Now this is at variance, on the one hand, with the tradition which regards him as one of the ‘nine gems’ of Vikrama’s court, and which identifies the latter with king Bhoja, who reigned about A.D. 1050; and, on the other hand, also with the assertion of the astronomer Satánanda, who, in the introduction to his Bhásvatí-karaṇa, seemingly acknowledges himself to be the disciple of Mihira, and at the same time states that he composed this work Sāke 1021 (= A.D. 1099). This passage, however, is obscure, and may perhaps refer merely to the instruction drawn by the author from Mihira’s writings; otherwise we should have to admit the existence of a second Varáha-Mihira, who flourished in the middle of the eleventh century, that is, contemporaneously with Albirúni. Strange in that case that the latter should not have mentioned him!

After Varáha-Mihira and Brahmagupta various other astronomers distinguished themselves. Of these, the most eminent is Bháskara, to the question of whose age, however, a peculiar difficulty attaches. According to his own account, he was born Sāke 1036 (A.D. 1114), and completed the Siddhánta-siromani Sāke 1072 (A.D. 1150), and the Karana-kutúhala Sāke 1105 (A.D. 1183); and with this the modern astronomers agree, who assign to him the date Sāke 1072 (A.D. 1150). But Albirúni, who wrote in A.D.

203 Kern, Preface, p. 3, thinks this is perhaps his birth year: the year of his death being given by Amaraksa, ascholiast on Brahmagupta, as Sāke 509 (A.D. 587).

204 This identification fails of course. If Varáha-Mihira really was one of the ‘nine gems’ of Vikrama’s court, then this particular Vikrama must simply have reigned in the sixth century. But the preliminary question is whether he was one of these ‘gems.’ See the statements of the Jyotirvid-dhārās, l. c.

205 See, e.g., Aafricht, Catalogus, p. 327, 328.

* Moreover, Satánanda, at the close of his work—in a fragment of it in the Chambers collection (see my Cat. of the Sansk. MSS. Pari. Lók., p. 234)—seems to speak of himself as living Sāke 917 (A.D. 995). How is this contradiction to be explained? See Colebrooke, 11. 390 [341 ed. Cowell. The passage in question probably does not refer to the author’s lifetime; unfortunately it is so uncertain that I do not understand its real meaning. As, however, there is mention immediately before of Kali 4260 = A.D. 1099, exactly as in Colebrookes, this date is pretty well established.—The allusion to Mihira might possibly, as indicated by the ascholiast Balabhadrana, not refer to Varáha-Mihira at all, but merely to mihira, the sun.]

206 This also agrees with an inscription dated Sāke 1128, and relating to a grandson of Bháskara, whose Siddhánta-siromani is here...
also mentioned in terms of high honour; see Bhādā Dājī, l.c., pp. 411, 416. Again, in a passage from the Siddhānta-śiromani, which is cited by Maññavā in the Kāla-nirṛtya, and which treats of the years having three intercalary months, the year of this description which fell Saka-bēle 974 (A.D. 1052) is placed in the past; the year 1115, on the contrary (and also 1256, 1378), in the future.—Bhāskara’s Lilavati (arithmetic) and Vīja-garita (algebra) have, it is well known, been translated by Colebrooke (1817); the former also by Taylor (1816), the latter by Strachey (1818). The Gajahāyana has been translated by Roer in the Journ. As. S. Bengali, ix. 153 ff. (Lassen, J. A. E., iv. 849); of the Gomādhya there is a translation by Lancelot Wilkinson in the Bibl. Ind. (1861–62). To Wilkinson we also owe an edition of the text of the Gomādhya and Gajahāyana (1842). The Lilavati and Vīja-garita appeared in 1832, 1834, likewise at Calcutta. Bāṇḍe Dāvā Śāstrin has also issued a complete edition (1) of the Siddhānta-śiromani (Bengal, 1856). Cf. also Herm. Brodhun, Über die Algebra des Bhāskara, Leipzig, 1852, vol. iv. of the Berichte der Röm. Sachs. Ges. der Wissenschaften, pp. 1–45.

* Reinaud, it is true, reads Mahādevata with w; instead of b; but in Sanskrit this is an impossible form of name, as it gives no sense. [At the close of the Gomādhya, xiii. 61, as well as of the Karanā-kutāhala, Bhāskara calls his father, not Mahādeva, but Mohōsara (which of course is in substance identical); and he is likewise so styled by Bhāskara’s scholiast Lakhamśītāraka; see my Catal. of the Berl. Sansk. MSS., pp. 235, 237.]

237 This is really the only possible way out of the dilemma. Either, therefore, we have to think of that elder Bhāskara “who was at, the head of the commentators of Aryabhaṭa, and is repeatedly cited by Praṇādakavāmin, who was himself anterior to the author of the Śiromaṇi,” Colebrooke, ib. 470 (423 ed. Cowell); or else under Reinaud’s Bhaṣa (pp. 335, 337) there lurks not a Bhāskara at all, but perhaps a Pushpākara. It is certainly strange, however, that he should be styled and author of a Karanā-sāra. Can it be that we have here to do with an interpolation in Alibirūnī?
ASTRONOMY: LATER PERIOD.

(e.g., b-khj = bhārja, baih-hafr = balabhadra), and for the most part faithfully preserves the length of the vowels, neither of these is here done in the case of Bashkar, where, moreover, the s is changed into sh.

Bhāskara is the last star of Indian astronomy and arithmetic. After his day no further progress was made, and the astronomical science of the Hindūs became once more wholly centred in astrology, out of which it had originally sprung. In this last period, under the influence of their Moslem rulers, the Hindūs, in their turn, became the disciples of the Arabs, whose masters they had formerly been. * The same Alkindi who, in the ninth century, had written largely upon Indian astronomy and arithmetic (see Colebrooke, ii. 513; Reinaud, p. 23) now in turn became an authority in the eyes of the Hindūs, who studied and translated his writings and those of his successors. This results indisputably from the numerous Arabic-technical expressions which now appear side by side with the Greek terms dating from the earlier period. These latter, it is true, still retain their old position, and it is only for new ideas that new words are introduced, particularly in connection with the doctrine of the constellations, which had been developed by the Arabs to a high degree of perfection. Much about the same time, though in some cases perhaps rather earlier, these Arabic works were also translated into another language, namely, into Latin, for the benefit of the European astrologers of the Middle Ages; and thus it comes that in their writings a number of the very same Arabic technical terms may be pointed out which occur in Indian works. Such termini technici of Indian astrology at this period are the following: + mukārimā مقارنة conjunction, mukāzīlā ماقبل opposition, tāravī تربع quartile aspect, tasādi تسديس translations, as no Arabic texts on astrology have been printed, and the lexicons are very meagre in this respect. [Cf. now Otto Loth's meritorious paper, Al-Kindi als Astronom in die morgenländische Forschungen, 1874, pp. 263-309, published in honour of Fleischer's jubilee.]

* Thence is even taken the name for astrology itself in this period, namely, tājīka, tājīka-śāstra, which is to be traced to the Persian تازی = 'Arabic.'

† See i. Sz., ii. 263 ff. Most of these Arabic terms I know in the meantime only from medieval Latin
sexstile aspect, taṣ̌ī trīne aspect; further, hadda hadda fractio, musallaha mūsallaha perfectio, induwāra edēbar deterioratio, itthiśāla and muthiśāla and consunctio, isarapha and musarapha and menstruō disjunctio, nakta (for nakla) translato, yamayāt congregatio, manavā prohibitor, lamvālā qovālī receptor, gairikavālī qovālī incurceptor, eṣāmae sors, inthiḥa and munthahā and terminus, and several others that cannot yet be certainly identified.

The doctrine of Omens and Portents was, with the Indians, intimately linked with astrology from the earliest times. Its origin may likewise be traced back to the ancient Vedic, nay, probably to some extent even to the primitive Indo-Germanic period. It is found embodied, in particular, in the literature of the Atharva-Veda, as also in the Grihya-Sūtras of the other Vedas. A prominent place is also accorded to it in the Samhitās of Varaha-Mihira, Nārada, &c.; and it has, besides, produced an independent literature of its own. The same fate has been shared in all respects by another branch of superstition—the arts, namely, of magic and conjuration. As the religious development of the Hindūs progressed, these found a more and more fruitful soil, so that they now, in fact, reign almost supreme. On these subjects, too, general treatises exist, as well as tracts on single topics belonging to them. Many of their notions have long been naturalised in the West, through the medium of the Indian fables and fairy tales which were so popular in the Middle Ages—those, for instance, of the purse (of Fortunatus), the league-boots, the magic mirror, the magic ointment, the invisible cap, &c.

288 Cf. my paper, Zweis Vedische Texte über Omna und Portenta (1850), containing the Adibhuta-Brāhmaṇa and adhyāxiii, of the Kurāṇaka-Sūtra.

289 Some of these, the invisible cap, for instance, are probably to be traced to old mythological superstitions notions of the primitive Indo-Germanic time. In the Śaiva-Vidhāna-Brāhmaṇa (cf. Burrell, Pref p. xxv.), we have the purse of Fortu
MEDICAL SCIENCE: CHARAKA, SUSRUTA, ETC. 265

We have now to notice Medicine, as the fourth branch of the scientific literature.

The beginnings of the healing art in Vedic times have already glanced at (pp. 29, 30). Here, again, it is the Atharva-Veda that occupies a special position in relation to it, and in whose literature its oldest fragments are found—fragments, however, of a rather sorry description, and limited mostly to spells and incantations. The Indians themselves consider medicine as an Upaveda, whence they expressly entitle it Agur-Veda,—by which term they do not understand any special work, as has been supposed. They derive it, as they do the Veda itself, immediately from the gods: as the oldest of human writers upon it they mention, first, Atreyo, then Agnivesa, then Charaka, then Dhanvantari, and, lastly, his disciple Pāñini himself was acquainted with texts of this description. From what Patanjali states, besides birds and serpents, cattle and horses also formed the subject of such works. All the special data of this sort in the Mahābhāṣya point to practical observations from the life; and out of these, in courses of time, a literature of natural history could have been developed; see I. St., xiii. 459-461. The lakāhaṇa sections in the Atharvā-Parāśishṭas are either of a ceremonial or astrological-meteorological purport, while, on the other hand, the astrological Samhitā of Vardhamihi, for instance, contains much that may have been directly derived from the old viṣayā and lakāhaṇas.

392 In the Charaka-Samhitā itself Bharadvāja (Punarvasu) Kapishthala heads the list as the disciple of Indra. Of his six disciples—Agnivesa, Bhala, Jatūkaraṇa, Pardasa, Ḫirla, Kāhārapāṇi—Agnivesa first composed his tāntra, then the others theirs severally, which they thereupon recited to Atreyo. To him the narration of the text is expressly referred; for after the opening words of each adhyāya (‘āthādo... evādyādyādīmad’) there uniformly follows the phrase, ‘‘ātā ha smaha Bh-
Suśruta. The first three names belong, specially to the two divisions of the Yajus, but only to the period of the Sūtras and the school-development of this Veda. The medical works bearing these titles can in no case therefore be of older date than this. How much later they ought to be placed is a point for the determination of which we have at present only the limit of the eighth century A.D., at the close of which, according to Ibn Beithar and Al Biruni (Reinaud, p. 316), the work of Charaka, and, according to Ibn Abi Usabiah, the work of Suśruta also, were translated into Arabic. That Indian medicine had in Pāṇini's time already attained a certain degree of cultivation appears from the names of various diseases specified by him (iii. 3. 108, v. 2. 129, &c.), though nothing definite results from this. In the gana 'Kārtakaujapa' (to Pāṇini, vi. 2. 37) we find the 'Suśrutapārthavā' instanced among the last members; but it is uncertain what we have to understand by this expression. The ganas, moreover, prove nothing in regard to Pāṇini's time; and besides, it is quite possible that this particular Sūtra may not be Pāṇini's at all, but posterior to Patanjali, in whose Mahābhāshya, according to the statement of the Cutcutta scholar, it is not interpreted.

Dhanvantari is named in Manus's law-book and in the epic, but as the mythical physician of the gods, not as a human personage.

In the Pañchatantra two physicians, Śālihotra and Vātasyā-
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1. gana..." Quite as uniformly, however; it is stated in a closing verse at the end of each adhyāya that the work is a tantra composed by Agnivesa and rearranged (pratishāṃkhyāta) by Charaka.

2. The same thing applies substantially to the names mentioned in Charaka. (See last note)—Bharadvāja, Agnivesa (Hutāsava), Jatukarma, Pardāra, Harita. And amongst the names of the sages who there appear as the associates of Bharadvāja, we find, besides those of the old Rishis, special mention, amongst others, of Āśvalāyana, Badarīyāna, Kātyāyana, Bālīvāpī, &c. As medical authorities are further cited, amongst others (see the St. Petersburg Dic. Supplement, vol. vii.), Kṛṣṇa, Śāmkṛityāyana, Kāśakāyana, Krīśhātra.

3. 'Suśruta' occurs in the Bhāshya; it is, however, expressly derived from suśrut from Suśruta. Consequently neither this name nor the Kutapa-Suśruta mentioned in another passage has anything to do with the Suśruta of medical writers; see J. St.; xii. 402, 407. For the time of the author of the Vārttikas we have the fact of the three humours, āṭita, pitta, śleshma, being already ranked together, i.e., p. 462.

4. As such he appears in the verse so often mentioned already, which specifies him as one of the nine gems at Vikramā's court, together with Kālidāsa and Vasubandhu; see Jyotirlinga-dhāranā, i.e,
yana, whose names are still cited even in our own day, are repeatedly mentioned: but although this work was translated into Pahlavi in the sixth century, it does not at all follow that everything now contained in it formed part of it then, unless we actually find it in this translation (that is, in the versions derived from it).† I am not aware of any other references to medical teachers or works; I may only add, that the chapter of the Amarakosha (ii. 6) on the human body and its diseases certainly presupposes an advanced cultivation of medical science.

An approximate determination of the dates of the existing works will only be possible when these have been subjected to a critical examination both in respect of their contents and language.‡ But we may even now dis-

* This form of name points us to the time of the production of the Sūtra, to Vātsyāya. [It is found in Taitt. Ar., i. 7. 2, as patronymic of a Pañchaprāṇa.]

† This was rightly insisted upon by Bentley in opposition to Celebrooke, who had adduced, as an argument to prove the age of Vāraṇa-Mihira, the circumstance that he is mentioned in the Pañchatantra (this is the same passage which is also referred to in the Vikrama-Charitā; see Roth, Journ. Asiatic., Oct. 1845, p. 304.) [Kern, it is true, in his Pref. to the Brh. Samhitā, pp. 19, 20, pronounces very decidedly against this objection of Bentley's, but wrongly, as it seems to me; for, according to Benfey's researches, the present text of the Pañchatantra is a very late production; cf. pp. 221, 240, above.]

‡ According to Turnour, Mahārājas, p. 254, note, the medical work there named in the text, by the Sinhalese king Buddhādasé (a.d. 339), entitled Sārattā-Samgahā, is still in existence (in Sanskrit too) in Ceylon, and is used by the native medical practitioners; see on this Davids in the Transactions of the Philol. Society, 1875, pp. 76, 78.

The Tibetan Tanjūr, according to the accounts given of it, contains a considerable number of medical writings, a circumstance not without importance for their chronology, Thun, Cōma Kočéi in the Journ. As. Soc. Beng., January 1825, gives
the contents of a Tibetan work on medicine, which is put into the mouth of Śākyamuni, and, to all appearance, is a translation of Suṣruta or some similar work.

* To wit, by Vulle's and Hesseler's; by the former in an essay on Indian medicine in the periodical Janus, edited by Henschel; by the latter in the preface to his so-called translation of Suṣruta [1844–50].

206 The Charaka-Saṃhitā has rather higher pretensions to antiquity; its prose here and there reminds us of the style of the Śrāvata-Sūtras.

† From his examination of Vullers's view in the following number of Janus, ii. 453. I may remark here that Wilson's words, also quoted by Wise in the Preface to his System of Hindu Medicine (Calcutta, 1845), p. xvii, have been utterly misunderstood by Vullers. Wilson fixes “as the most modern limit of our conjecture” the ninth or tenth century, i.e., a.d., but Vullers takes it to be m.c. [cf. now Wilson's Works, iii. 273, ed. Rost.]

207 This is evidently Roth's opinion also (see Z. D. M. G., xxvi. 441, 1872). Here, after expressing a wish that Indian medicine might be thoroughly dealt with by competent scholars, he adds the remark, that “only a comparison of the principles of Indian with those of Greek medicine can enable us to judge of the origin, age, and value of the former,” and then further on (p. 448), apropos of Charaka's injunctions as to the duties of the physician to his patient, he cites some remarkably coincident expressions from the oath of the Asklepiads.

‡ Hesseler, indeed, does not perceive that they are proper names, but translates the words straight off.

§ With the single exception perhaps of Pauṭekalavata, a name which at least seems to point to the North-West, to Himaṣṭhala. [We are further pointed to the North-West of India (cf. the Kapīṣṭhala) by the name of Bharadvaja Kapīṣṭhala in the Charaka-Saṃhitā, which, moreover, assigns to the neighbourhood of the Himavant (parīkṣhe Himaṇḍa-tūbhe) that gathering of sages, out of which came the
is by Suśruta himself, as well as by other writers, expressly assigned to the city of Kāśi (Benares)—in the period, to be sure, of the mythical king Divoddasa Dhanvantari, an incarnation of Dhanvantari, the physician of the gods. And lastly, the weights and measures to be used by the physician are expressly enjoined to be either those employed in Magadha or those current in Kaliṅga; whence we may fairly presume that it was in these eastern provinces, which never came into close contact with the Greeks, that medicine received its special cultivation.

Moreover, considerable critical doubts arise as to the authenticity of the existing texts, since in the case of some of them we find several recensions cited. Thus Atri, whose work appears to have altogether perished, is also cited as laghu-Atri, bhṛihad-Atri; Æreya, similarly, as bhṛihad-Areya, vriddha-Areya, madhyama-Areya, karniṣṭha-Areya; Suśruta, also as vriddha-Suśruta; Vāgbhaṭa, also as vriddha-Vāgbhaṭa; Hārīta, also as vriddha-Hārīta; Bhōja, also, as vriddha-Bhōja—a state of things to which we have an exact parallel in the case of the astronomical Siddhāntas (see pp. 258, 259, and Colebrooke ii. 391, 392), and also of the legal literature. The number of medical works and authors is extraordinarily large. The former are either systems embracing the whole domain of the science, or highly special investigations of single topics, or, lastly, vast compilations prepared in modern times under the patronage of kings and princes. The sum of knowledge embodied in their contents appears really to be most respectable. Many of the statements on dietetics and on the origin and diagnosis of diseases bespeak a very keen observation. In surgery, too, the Indians seem to have attained a special
and in this department European surgeons might perhaps even at the present day still learn something from them, as indeed they have already borrowed from them the operation of rhinoplasty. The information, again, regarding the medicinal properties of minerals (especially precious stones and metals), of plants, and animal substances, and the chemical analysis and decomposition of these, covers certainly much that is valuable. Indeed, the branch of Materia Medica generally appears to be handled with great predilection, and this makes up to us in some measure at least for the absence of investigations in the field of natural science. On the diseases, &c., of horses and elephants also there exist very special monographs. For the rest, during the last few centuries medical science has suffered great detriment from the increasing prevalence of the notion, in itself a very ancient one, that diseases are but the result of transgressions and sins committed, and from the consequent very general substitution of fastings, alms, and gifts to the Brahman, for real remedies.—An excellent general sketch of Indian medical science is given in Dr. Wise’s work, Commentary on the Hindu System of Medicine, which appeared at Calcutta in 1845.

The influence, which has been already glanced at, of Hindu medicine upon the Arabs in the first centuries of the Hijra was one of the very highest significance; and the Khalifs of Bagdad caused a considerable number of works upon the subject to be translated.* Now, as Ara-

---

* See now as to this Wilson, Works, iii. 380 ff., ed. Rost.

---

† New ed. 1860 (London). Cf. also two, unfortunately short, papers by Wilson On the Medical and Surgical Science of the Hindus, in vol. i. of his Essays on Sanscrit Literature, collected by Dr. Rost (1864, Works, vol. iii.). Up to the present only Sushruta has been published, by Madhusudana Gupta (Calcutta 1835-36, new ed. 1868) and by Jidvandana Vidyasagara (1873). An edition of Charaka has been begun by Ganjamadhara Kaviraja (Calcutta 1868-69), but unfortunately, being weighted with a very prolix commentary by the editor, it makes but slow progress. (Part 2, 1871, breaks off at a2k 5.) It furnished the occasion for Kühn’s already mentioned monograph on Charaka, in which he communicates a few sections of the work, iii. 8 (‘How to become a doctor’) and i. 29 (‘The Bungler’) in translation. From the Bhela-Samhita (see note 301 above), Burnett, in his Mem. of S. Ind. Pol., p. 94, quotes a verse in a way (namely, as 31. 4) which clearly indicates that he had access to an entire work of this name.

* See Guddeimoester, Script. Arab. de rebus Indicis, pp. 94-97. [Wieg., following the Fihrist al-ulum in D. M. G., xi. 145 ff., 325 ff. (1857).]
han medicine constituted the chief authority and guiding principle of European physicians down to the seventeenth century, it directly follows—just as in the case of astronomy—that the Indians must have been held in high esteem by these latter; and indeed Charaka is repeatedly mentioned in the Latin translations of Avicenna (Ibn Sina), Rhazes (Al Razi), and Serapion (Ibn Serabi).*

Besides Ayur-veda, medicine, the Hindus specify three other so-called Upavedas—Dhanur-veda, Gandharva-veda, and Artha-sāstra, i.e., the Art of War, Music, and the Formative Arts or Technical Arts generally; and, like Ayur-veda, these terms designate the respective branches of literature at large, not particular works.

As teacher of the art of war, Viśvāmitra is mentioned, and the contents of his work are fully indicated; the name Bharadvāja also occurs. But of this branch of literature hardly any direct monuments seem to have been preserved.† Still, the Nīti-Sāstras and the Epic comprise many sections bearing quite specially upon the science of war; and the Agni-Purāṇa, in particular, is distinguished by its very copious treatment of the subject.‡

Music was from the very earliest times a favourite pursuit of the Hindus, as we may gather from the numerous allusions to musical instruments in the Vedic literature; but its reduction to a methodical system is, of course, of later date. Possibly the Naṭa-Sūtras mentioned in Pāṇini (see above, p. 197) may have contained something of the

---

* See Royce On the Antiquity of Hindu Medicine, 1838.
† By Madhumādana Saravatī in the Prasthāna-bheda, J. St., 1. 10, 21.
‡ Where Bharadvāja can appear in such a position, I am not at present aware; perhaps we ought to read Bharadvāja, i.e., Dṛṣṭa?
† With the exception of some works on the rearing of horses and elephants, which may perhaps be classed here, although they more properly belong to medicine.
‡ The Kāmikādīkāya Nīti-Sāstra in nineteen chapters, to which this especially applies, has been published by Rājendra Lalā Mitra in the B.B.M. Ind. (1849-51), with extracts, which, however, only reach as far as the ninth chapter, from the commentary entitled “Upādhyāya-nirāpekha;” in style and matter it reminds us of the Bṛhad-Sūmhitā of Varāha-Mihira. A work of like title and subject was taken to Java by the Hindus who emigrated thither, see J. St., iii, 145; but whether this emigration actually took place so early as the fourth century, as Rāj. L. M. supposes, is still very questionable.
‡‡ See Wilson ‘On the Art of War’ (Works, iv. 296 ff.).
kind, since music was specially associated with dancing. The earliest mention of the names of the seven notes of the musical scale occurs, so far as we know at present, in the so-called Vedângas—in the Chhandas and the Śikṣâ; and they are further mentioned in one of the Atharvopanishads (the Garbha), which is, at least, not altogether modern. As author of the Gândharva-veda, i.e., of a treatise on music, Bharata is named, and, besides him, also Isvâra, Pavana, Kalinâtha, Nârâda; but of these the only existing remains appear to be the fragments cited in

Geschichte der Musik, ii. 151 (1864).

"There being already a G and a g in the upper octaves, it was necessary to employ the equivalent Greek letter for the corresponding lowest note." The necessity for this is not, however, so very apparent; but, rather, in the selection of this term, and again in its direct employment in the sense of 'musical scale', a reminiscence of the Indian word may originally have had some influence, though Guido himself need not have been cognizant of it.

And this not merely in the Śikṣâ attributed to Pâmini, but in the whole of the tracte belonging to this category; see my Essay on the Pratijñâ-Nâtra, pp. 107-109; Haug, Accent, p. 59.

* This title is derived from the Gandharvas or celestial musicians.

This name is also written Kâlinâtha (Kapila in Laeser, I. A.K., iv. 332, is probably a mistake), by Sir W. Jones, On the Musical Modes of the Hindus in As. En., iii. 329, and by Aufrecht, Catalogus, p. 210. Bühler, however, Catalog. of MSS. from Guj., iv. 274, has the spelling given in the text. But, at any rate, instead of Pavana, we must read 'Hanumant, son of Pavana.' For Bharata, see above, p. 231.

See the data from the Nârâda-śikṣâ in Haug, Veder des Ween des Ved. Accents, p. 58. The 'gandharva Nârâda' is probably originally only Cloud personified; see J. St., i. 204, 453, ix. 4.
the scholia of the dramatic literature. Some of these writings were translated into Persian, and, perhaps even earlier, into Arabic. There are also various modern works on music. The whole subject, however, has been but little investigated.\footnote{319}

As regards the third Upaveda, \textit{Artha-Śāstra}, the Hindūs, as is well known, have achieved great distinction in the technical arts, but less in the so-called formative arts. The literature of the subject is but very scantily represented, and is for the most part modern.

Painting, in the first place, appears in a very rudimentary stage. Portrait-painting, for which perspective is not required, seems to have succeeded best, as it is frequently alluded to in the dramas.\footnote{319a} In Sculpture, on the contrary, no mean skill is discernible.\footnote{320} Among the reliefs carved upon stone are many of great beauty, especially those depicting scenes from Buddha's life, Buddha being uniformly represented in purely human shape, free from mythological disfigurement.—There exist various books of

\footnote{319} Besides Sir W. Jones, \textit{i. e.}, see also Patterson in vol. ix. of the \textit{Az. Res.}, Lassen, \textit{I. A. R.}, iv. 532, and more particularly the special notices in Aufrecht's \textit{Catalogus}, pp. 199–202. Śāṅgītadāvā, author of the Śāṅgītaratnakāra, cites as authorities Abhinavagupta, Kirtiśāhāra, Kohala, Somesvara; he there treats not only of music, especially singing, but also of dancing, gesticulation, &c.

\footnote{319a} On modern painting, see my \textit{Essay, Über Krishnas Geburtstag}, p. 341 ff. It is noteworthy that the accounts of the manner of origin of the production of likenesses at the close of Tāranātha's \textit{History of Buddhism} (Schiefner, p. 278 ff.) expressly point to the time of Asoka and Nāgārjuna as the most flourishing epoch of the Yāsaka and Nāga artists. In an address recently delivered to the St. Petersburg Academy (see the \textit{Bulletin} of 25th Nov. 1875), Schiefner communicated from the Kâgyur some 'Anecdotes of Indian Artists,' in which, among other things, special reference is made to the Yavanas as excellent painters and craftsmen. On pictorial representations of the fight between Kaśyapa and Kṛishṇa, see the data in the \\textit{Mahābhārata}, \textit{I. St.}, xiii. 354, 459; and on likenesses of the gods for sale in Pāñjīni's time, \textit{Goldsticker's Pāñjīni}, p. 228 ff.; \textit{I. St.}, v. 148, xiii. 331.

\footnote{320} Through the recent researches of Ferguson, Cunningham, and Leitner the question has been raised whether Greek influence was not here also an important factor. Highly remarkable in this regard are, for example, the parallels between an image of the sun-god in his car on a column at Buddhagayā and a well-known figure of Phoebus Apollo, as shown in Plate xxxvii. of Cunningham's \textit{Archaeological Survey of India}, vol. iii. 97 (1873). The same type is also exhibited on a coin of the Bactrian king Plato, lately described by W. S. W. Xaux in the \textit{Numismat. Chronicle}, xv. 1–5 (1875).
instructions and treatises on the subject: according to the accounts given of them, they deal for the most part with single topics, the construction of images of the gods, for example; but along with these are others on geometry and design in general.

A far higher degree of development was attained by Architecture, of which some most admirable monuments still remain: it received its chief cultivation at the hands of the Buddhists, as these required monasteries, topes (stūpas), and temples for their cult. It is not, indeed, improbable that our Western steeples owe their origin to an imitation of the Buddhist topes. But, on the other hand, in the most ancient Hindū edifices the presence of Greek influence is unmistakable. (See Benfey, Indien, pp. 300–305.) Architecture, accordingly, was often systematically

281 E.g., also in Varāha-Mihira's Bṛhat-Saṃhitā, one chapter of which, on the construction of statues of the gods, is communicated from Albârani by Reinaud in his Mém. sur l'Inde, p. 419 fl. See also I. St., xiii. 344–346.

282 In the fifth vol., which has just appeared, of his Archaeological Survey of India, p. 185 fl., Cunningham distinguishes an Indo-Persian style, the prevalence of which he assigns to the period of the Persian supremacy over the valley of the Indus (500–330), and three Indo-Greekian styles, of which the Ionian prevailed in Takshila, the Corinthian in Gandhāra, and the Doric in Kāshmīr. Rājaendra Lalā Mitra, it is true, in vol. i. of his splendid work, The Antiquities of Orissa (1875), holds out patriciologically against the idea of any Greek influence whatever on the development of Indian architecture, &c. (At p. 25, by the way, my conjecture as to the connection between the Asura Maya, Turamṣaya, and Ptolemais, see above, p. 253. I. St., ii. 234, is stated in a sadly distorted form.) Looking at his plates, however, we have a distinct suggestion of Greek art, for example, in the two fountain-nymphs in Plate xvi., No. 46; while the Bāyadore in Plate xviii., No. 59, from the temple of Bhūvanēśvara, middle of seventh century (p. 31), seems to be resting her right hand on a dolphin, beside which a Cupid (?) is crowding, and might therefore very well be an imitation of some representation of Vemā. (Cf. Rāj. L. M., p. 59.)

283 This does not mean that the Indians were not acquainted with stone-building prior to the time of Alexander—an opinion which is confuted by Cunningham, I. c., iii. 98. The painful minuteness, indeed, with which the erection of brick-altars is described in the Vedic sacrificial ritual (cf. the Śūlva-Sūtras) might lead us to suppose that such structures were still at that time rare. But, on the one hand, this would take us back to a much earlier time than we are here speaking of; and, on the other, this scrupulous minuteness of description may simply be due to the circumstance that a specifically sacred structure is here in question, in connection with which, therefore, every single detail was of direct consequence.
treated of, and we find a considerable number of such works cited, some of which, as is customary in India, purport to proceed from the gods themselves, as from Viśvakarman, Sanatkumāra, &c. In the Samhitā of Varāha-Mihira, too, there is a tolerably long, chapter devoted to architecture, though mainly in an astrological connection.

The skill of the Indians in the production of delicate woven fabrics, in the mixing of colours, the working of metals and precious stones, the preparation of essences, and in all manner of technical arts, has from early times enjoyed a world-wide celebrity: and for these subjects also we have the names of various treatises and monographs. Mention is likewise made of writings on cookery and every kind of requirement of domestic life, as dress, ornaments, the table; on games of every description, dice,* for ex-

* The art of perfumery appears to have been already taught in a special Śātra at the time of the Bhāṣya; cf. the observations in I. St., xiii. 462, on chāndanagniśāhika, Pāñ. iv. 2. 65; perhaps the Śāstra ("nāma śāstram," Cāyata) Bhāṣya to Pāñ. iv. 2. 104, belongs to this class also.

In I. St., i. 10, I have translated, doubtless incorrectly, the expression chaṭuḍahsaṇṭi-kold-kāstra (cited in the Prasthāna-bheda as part of the Artha-kāstra) by 'treatise on chess,' referring the 64 kals to the 64 squares of the chess-board; whereas, according to As. Res. i. 341 (Schleicher, Réflex. sur l'Étude des Langues Indo., p. 112), it signifies 'treatise on the 64 arts.' In the Daśakumāra, however (p. 140, ed. Wilson), the chaṭuḍahsaṇṭi-koldgama is expressly distinguished from the Artha-kāstra.

—See an enumeration of the 64 kals, from the Śiva-tantra in Rādhā-kāntadeva’s Sākta-kalpa-druma, a. v. [On the game of Chatur-salles see now my papers in the Monats-ber. der Berl. Acad., 1872, pp. 60 ff., 502 ff.; 1873, p. 705 ff.; 1874, p. 21 ff.; and also Dr. Aft. van der Lando’s beautiful work, Geschichte des Schachspiels (1874, 2 vols.).]
ample; nay, even on the art of stealing—an art which, in fact, was reduced to a regular and complete system [cf. Wilson, Dafakum., p. 69, on Karnisuta, and Hindu Theatre, i. 63]. A few of these writings have also been admitted into the Tibetan Tandjur.

From Poetry, Science, and Art, we now pass to Law, Custom, and Religious Worship, which are all three comprehended in the term 'Dharma,' and whose literature is presented to us in the Dharma-Sāstras or Smṛti-Sāstras. The connection of these works with the Grihya-Sūtras of Vedic literature has already been adverted to in the introduction (see pp. 19, 20), where, too, the conjecture is expressed that the consignment of the principles of law to writing may perhaps have been called forth by the growth of Buddhism, with the view of rigidly and securely fixing the system of caste distinctions rejected by the new faith, and of shielding the Brahmanical polity generally from innovation or decay. In the most ancient of these works, accordingly—the Law-Book of Maṇu—we encounter this Brahmanical constitution in its full perfection. The Brahman has now completely attained the goal from which, in the Brāhmaṇas, he is not very far distant, and stands as the born representative of Deity itself; while, upon the other hand, the condition of the Śūdra is one of the utmost wretchedness and hardship. The circumstance that the Vaiđehas and the Lichhavis (as Lassen, no doubt rightly, conjectures for Nichhīvis) are here numbered among the impure castes, is—as regards the former—certainly a sign that this work is long posterior to the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, where the Vaiđehas appear as the leading representatives of Brahmanism. The position allotted to this tribe, as well as to the Lichhavis, may, perhaps, further be connected with the fact that, according to Buddhist legends, the Vaiđehas, and especially
this Lâchhavi family of them, exercised a material influence upon the growth of Buddhism. The posteriority of Manu to the whole body of Vedic literature appears, besides, from many other special indications; as, for instance, from the repeated mention of the several divisions of this literature; from the connection which subsists with some passages in the Upanishads; from the completion of the Yuga system and the triad of deities; as well as, generally, from the minute and nicely elaborated distribution and regulation of the whole of life, which are here presented to us.

I have likewise already remarked, that for judicial procedure proper, for the forms of justice, the connecting link is wanting between the Dharma-Sâstras of Manu and Vedic literature. That this code, however, is not to be regarded as the earliest work of its kind, is apparent from the very nature of the case, since the degree of perfection of the judicial procedure it describes justifies the assumption that this topic had been frequently handled before. The same conclusion seems, moreover, to follow from the fact of occasional direct reference being made to the views of predecessors, from the word ‘Dharma-Sâstra’ itself being familiar,† as also from the circumstance that Patanjali, in his Mahâbâdhyya on Pâñini, is acquainted with works bearing the name of Dharma-Sûtras.‡ Whether remains of these connecting links may yet be recovered, is, for the present at least, doubtful.¶ For the domestic relations of the Hindus, on the contrary—for education, marriage, household economy; &c.—it is manifestly in the Grihya-Sûtras that we must look for the sources of the Dharma-Sâstras; and this, as I have also had frequent occasion

---

* See Stenzler in L. St., i. 244 ff.
† Yet neither circumstance is strictly conclusive, as, considering the peculiar composition of the work, the several passages in question might perhaps be later additions.
‡§ See now on this J. St., xiii. 458, 459.
¶ Allusions to judicial cases are of very rare occurrence within the range of Vedic literature; but where they do occur, they mostly agree with the precepts of Manu. So also, for example, a verse in Yâska’s Nirukti, iii. 4, concerning the disability of women to inherit, which, besides, directly appeals to ‘Manub Savyambhuvah.’ This is the first time that the latter is mentioned as a lawgiver. (See also Sâṅkh. Grib., ii. 16; Āpast., ii. 16, 1, ed. Bühler. Our Vedic phases of criminal law, see Burnell, Pref. to Sâma-vidhâna-Br., p. xv.; Lit. C Br., 1874, p. 423.)
to observe (pp. 58, 84, 102, 143), is the explanation of the circumstance that most of the names current as authors of Grihya-Sūtras are at the same time given as authors of Dharma-Sūtras.* The distinction, as a commentator remarks, is simply this, that the Grihya-Sūtras confine themselves to the points of difference of the various schools, whereas the Dharma-Sūtras embody the precepts and obligations common to all.327

* In the case of Manu, too, there would seem to have existed a Mānas Grihya-Sūtra as its bāsā (l), and the reference to the great ancestor Mānu would thus appear to be only a subsequent one (l). This surmise of mine, expressed with difficulty here, above at pp. 19, 102, and in I. Sta., i. 69, has since been generally accepted, and will, it is hoped, find full confirmation in the text of the Mānas Grihyas, which has meanwhile actually come to light. I have already pointed out one instance of agreement in language with the Yajus texts, in the word abhirātmārubātā; see I. Śūra, ii. 209, 210.] 327 In his Hist. of Anc. Sansk. Lit. (1859), Max Müller gave some account of the Dharma-Sūtra of Apastamba, which is extant under the title Sūmavāchārika-Sūtra. He also characterised three of the Dharma-Sūtras printed at Calcutta (the Gautama, Vishnu, and Vasiṣṭha) as being Dharma-Sūtras of a similar kind; expressing himself generally to the effect (p. 134) that all the metrical Dharma-Sūtras we possess are but “more modern texts of earlier Sūtra-works or Kula-dharms belonging originally to certain Vedic Dharmas.” The only authority cited by him is Stempler in I. Sta., i. 233, who, however, in his turn, refers to my own earlier account, ibid. pp. 57, 69, 143). Johntingen, in his track, Über das Gesetzbuch des Manu (1863); adopted precisely the same view (see, e.g., p. 113). Bühler, finally, in the introduction to the Digest of Hīndu Law, edited by him, jointly with R. West (vol. i., 1867), furnished us for the first time with more specific information as to these Dharma-Sūtras, which connect themselves with, and in part directly belong to, the Vedic Sūtra stage. In the appendix to this work he likewise communicated various sections on the law of inheritance from the four Dharma-Sūtras above mentioned, and that of Baudhāyana. He also published separately, in 1868, the entire Sūtra of Apastamba, with extracts from Haradatta’s commentary and an index of words (1871). This Sūtra, in point of fact, forms (see above, notes 108 and 109) two groṣṭas of the Āp. Śrāvaṇa-Sūtra; and a similar remark applies to the Sūtra of Baudhāyana. According to Bühler’s exposition, to the five Sūtras just named have to be added the small texts of this class, consisting of prose and verse intermingled, which are ascribed to Uśanas, Kaṭākya, and Budha; and, perhaps, also the Smṛtvā of Harita and Saṅkha. All the other existing Smṛtvā, on the contrary, bear a more modern character, and are either (1) metrical redactions of ancient Dharma-Sūtras, or fragments of such redactions (to these belong our Manu and Yājnavalkya, as well as the Smṛtvā of Nārada, Parāśara, Bhūṣṇapati, Sampārata),—or (2) secondary redactions of metrical Dharma-Sūtras,—or (3) metrical versions of the Grihya-Sūtras,—or lastly, (4) forgeries of the Hīndu sects. The material in vol. i. of Bühler and West’s work has been
As regards the existing text of Manu, it cannot, apparently, have been extant in its present shape even at the period to which the later portions of the Mahá-Bhárata belong. For although Manu is often cited in the epic in literal accordance with the text as we now have it, on the other hand, passages of Manu are just as often quoted there which, while they appear in our text, yet do so with considerable variations. Again, passages are there ascribed to Manu which are nowhere found in our collection, and even passages composed in a totally different metre. And, lastly, passages also occur frequently in the Mahá-Bhárata which are not attributed to Manu at all, but which may nevertheless be read verbatim in our text. Though we may doubtless here assign a large share of the blame to the writers making the quotations (we know from the commentaries how often mistakes have crept in through the habit of citing from memory), still, the fact that our text attained its present shape only after having been, perhaps repeatedly, recast, is patent from the numerous inconsistencies, additions, and repetitions it contains. In support of this conclusion, we have, further, not only the fabulous tradition to the effect that the text of Manu consisted originally of 100,000 ślokas, and was abridged, first to 12,000, and eventually to 4000 ślokas†—a tradition which at least clearly displays a reminiscence of various remodellings of the text—but also the decisive fact that in the legal commentaries, in addition to Manu, a Yājñavāla-Manu and a Bhāgavata-Manu are directly quoted,† and must therefore have been still extant at the time of these commentaries. But although we cannot determine, even approximately, the date when our text of Manu received its present shape,‡‡ there is little doubt that its contents,

† Our present text contains only 2684 ślokas.
† See Steinhal, l. c., p. 235.
‡‡ Johstgenre (pp. 86, 95) assumes as the latest limit for its composition the year n. c. 350, and as the earliest limit the fifth century. But this rests in great part, upon his further assumption (p. 79) that the Brahmāsūtras, Upanishads, &c., known to us are all of later date—an assumption which is rendered in
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compared with those of the other Dharma-Sástras, are, on
the whole, the most ancient, and that, consequently, it has
been rightly placed by general tradition* at the head of
this class of literature. The number of these other
Dharma-Sástras is considerable, amounting to fifty-six,
and is raised to a much higher figure—namely, eighty—
if we reckon the several redactions of the individual works
that have so far come to our knowledge, and which are
designated by the epithets laghu, madhyama, bhrákhat,
vriddha. When once the various texts are before us,
their relative age will admit of being determined without
great difficulty. It will be possible,† in particular, to
characterise them according to the preponderance, or the
entire absence, of one or other of the three constituent
elements which make up the substance of Indian law, that
is to say, according as they chiefly treat of domestic and
civil duties, of the administration of justice, or of the regu-
lations as to purification and penance. In Manu these
three constituents are pretty much mixed up, but upon
the whole they are discussed with equal fulness. The
code of Yájnavalkya is divided into three books, according
to the three topics, each book being of about the same
extent. The other works of the class vary.

With regard to the code of Yájnavalkya, just men-
tioned—the only one of these works which, with Manu, is
as yet generally accessible—its posteriority to Manu fol-
 lows plainly enough, not only from this methodical distri-
bution of its contents, but also from the circumstance‡ that

---

* Which those Hindus who emi-
gated to Java also took with them.
‡ See Stenzler, L. c., p. 256.
† See Stenzler, L. c., p. 256.
‡ See Stenzler in the Pref. to his
it teaches the worship of Ganesha and the planets, the execution, upon metal plates, of deeds relating to grants of land, and the organisation of monasteries—all subjects which do not occur in Manu; while polemical references to the Buddhists, which in Manu are at least doubtful, are here unmistakable. In the subjects, too, which are common to both, we note in Yajnavalkya an advance towards greater precision and stringency; and in individual instances, where the two present a substantial divergence, Yajnavalkya’s standpoint is distinctly the later one. The earliest limit we can fix for this work is somewhere about the second century A.D., seeing that the word nayaka occurs in it to denote ‘coin,’ and this term, according to Wilson’s conjecture, is taken from the coins of Kanerki, who reigned until A.D. 40. Its latest limit, on the other hand, may be fixed about the sixth or seventh century, as, according to Wilson, passages from it are found in inscriptions of the tenth century in various parts of India, and the work itself must therefore date considerably earlier. Its second book reappears literally in the Agni-Purana; whether adopted into the latter, or borrowed from it, cannot as yet be determined. Of this work also two recensions are distinguished, the one as bhūhād-Yajnavalkya, the other as vṛiddha-Yajnavalkya (see also Colebrooke, i. 103). As to its relation to the remaining

---

330 If—by the pravṛṣajñāna in viii. 363, Buddhist brahmachārīs be really meant, as asserted by Kulüka, then this particular precept—which puts the violation of their persons on the same footing with violence done to “other public women,” and punishes the offence with a small fine only—is to be taken not merely, as Talbey Wheeler takes it (Hist. of India, ii. 583), as a bitter sarcasm, but also as evidence that the work was composed at a time when the Buddhist nuns had already really deteriorated; cf. the remarks in a similar instance in regard to Pāṇini, J. St., v. 141.


* See above, p. 205; the same applies also to the Vṛiddha-Gantana law-book. [According to Jacobi, De Astrologiae Indicae Originibus, p. 14, the statement in Yajnavalkya, i. 80, that coitus must take place ‘sumadda indanu,’ rests upon an acquaintance with the Greek astrological doctrine of the ‘twelve houses’ (and, in fact, this is the sense in which the Mitākṣarā understands the passage); so that, in his opinion, Yajnavalkya cannot be placed earlier than the fourth century of our era. This interpretation, however, is not absolutely forced upon us, as sumadda might equally well refer to one of the lunar phases or mansions which from an early period were regarded as auspicious for procreation and birth; see Lit. C. Bl., 1873, p. 787.]
codes, Stenzler, from the preface to whose edition the foregoing information is taken, is of opinion that it is antece
dent to all of them \(^{322}\) and that, therefore, it marks the next stage after Manu.*

But in addition to the Dharma-Śāstras, which form the basis and chief part of the literature dealing with Law, Custom, and Worship, we have also to rank the great bulk of the epic poetry—the Mahā-Bhārata, as well as the Rāmāyaṇa—as belonging to this branch of literature, since in these works, as I remarked when discussing them, the didactic element far outweighs the epic. The Mahā-Bhārata chiefly embraces instruction as to the duties of kings and of the military class, instruction which is given elsewhere also, namely, in the Nīti-Śāstras and (apparently) in the Dhanur-
Veda; but besides this, manifold other topics of the Hindū law are there discussed and expounded. The Purāṇas, on the contrary, chiefly contain regulations as to the worship of the gods by means of prayers, vows, fastings, votive offerings, gifts, pious foundations, pilgrimages, festivals, conformably to the shape which this worship successively assumed; and in this they are extensively supported by the Upapurāṇas and the Tantras.

Within the last few centuries there has further grown up a modern system of jurisprudence, or scientific legal literature, which compares and weighs, one against another, the different views of the authors of the Dharma-Śāstras. In particular, extensive compilations have been prepared, in great measure by the authority and under the auspices of various kings and princes, with a view to meet the prac-

---

\(^{322}\) Müllcr has, it is true, claimed (see above, note 327) for the Dharma-
Śāstras of Vishnu, Gautama, and Vaśiśṭha the character of Dharma-
Śātras; and Bühlcr (pp. xxi—xxv.) expressly adds to the list the similar texts attributed to Upanas, Kasyapa, and Budda, and also, though with a reservation, those of Harita and Śaṅkha (Vaśiśṭha belongs prob-
ably to the Drākyāyaṇa school of the Sāma-Veda, see pp. 70, 85—the Veda with which Gautama is likewise associated). Still, in Bühlcr's opinion (p. xxvii.), Manu and Yājuvalkya, although only "versifications of older Sūtras," may yet very well be of higher antiquity "than some of the Sūtra works which have come down to our times."

* This, to be sure, is at variance with i. 4, 5, where twenty different Dharma-Śāstra authors are enum-
erated (amongst them Yājuval-
kya himself): these two verses are perhaps a later addition (!).
tical want of a sufficient legal code. The English themselves, also, have had a digest of this sort compiled, from which, as is well known, the commencement of Sanskrit studies dates. These compilations were mostly drawn up in the Dekhan, which from the eleventh century was the refuge and centre of literary activity generally. In Hindustán it had been substantially arrested by the inroads and ravages of the Mulamadans; and it is only within the last three centuries that it has again returned thither, especially to Káli (Benares) and Bengal. Some of the Mogul emperors, notably the great Akbar and his two successors, Jehangir and Sháh Jehán— who together reigned 1556–1656—were great patrons of Hindú literature.

This brings us to the close of our general survey of Sanskrit literature; but we have still to speak of a very peculiar branch of it, whose existence only became known some twenty or thirty years ago, namely, the Buddhistic Sanskrit works. To this end, it is necessary, in the first place, to premise some account of the origin of Buddhism itself.

284

See Coleridge's account of these in his two prefaces to the Digest of Hindu Law (1798) and the Two Treatises on the Hindu Law of Inheritance (1810), now in Cowell's edition of the Misc. Ess., i. 461 ff.; also Bühler's Introduction, l. c., p. iii. ff.
* This śūdra expression, e.g., in the following sloka of the Vyāsas: "Śem-prápte tu kalau kalau Vindhyāyādavā uttara śhístā | brāhmaṇāḥ yañurāhah iti jyotiḥ-āstra-parātvamukhāḥ." * In the Kali age the Vedas and sacrifices will have their home to the south of the Vindhyas, in the region where flows the Gódavari." Similar expressions occur in the Law-book of Atri and in the Jaganmohana.
† As well as the latter's son, Dára Šahb. 284 Cf. C. F. Köppen's excellent work, Die Religion des Buddha (1857, 1859, 2 vols.).
Of the original signification of the word *buddha*, 'awakened' (so. from error), 'enlightened,' as a complimentary title given to sages in general, I have already more than once spoken (pp. 27, 167). I have also already remarked that the Buddhist doctrine was originally of purely philosophical tenor, identical with the system afterwards denominated the Sāmkhya, and that it only gradually grew up into a religion in consequence of one of its representatives having turned with it to the people.† Buddhist tradition has itself preserved in individual traits a reminiscence of this origin of Buddha's doctrine, and of its posteriority to and dependence upon the Sāmkhya philosophy. Thus it describes Buddha as born at Kapila-vastu, 'the abode of Kapila,' and uniformly assigns to Kapila, the reputed founder of the Sāmkhya system, a far earlier date. Again, it gives Māyā-āvī as the mother of Buddha, and here we have an unmistakable reference to the Māyā of the Sāmkhya. Further, it makes Buddha, in his prior birth among the gods, bear the name Śvetaketu—a name which, in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, is borne by one of the contemporaries of Kāpya Patamchala, with whom Kapila ought probably to be connected. And, lastly, it distinctly ranks Pāñchaśikha, one of the main propagators of Kapila's doctrine, as a demigod or Gandharva. Of the names belonging to the teachers mentioned in Buddhist legend as contemporaries of Buddha, several also occur in Vedic

* The name Māgānāt, which is also applied to Buddha in particular, is likewise a general title of honour, still preserved among the Brahmins to designate Brāhmis of every kind, and is bestowed very specially on Vīshṇu or Kṛishṇa; while in the contracted form, Brāhmun, it actually supplies the place of the pronoun of the second person [*I. st., ii. 231, xill. 351, 352*].

† See *I. st.*, i. 435, 436, and above, pp.

**33** In the list of ancient sages at the beginning of the *Charaka-Sāmkhya*, we find mention, amongst others, of a "Gantamaḥ śāmkhyabh"—an expression which the modern editor interprets, "Bandhūnavīśeṣa-Gantama-uvācīvantaya!" But in truth there might perhaps actually be here an early complimentary allusion to Buddha! A "Pārīkṣhitaḥ bhikṣhur Āryaḥ" is named shortly after. 

**335** Māyā, however, belongs not to the Sāmkhya, but specially to the Vedānta doctrine.

**336** Can the legend in the Mahā-Bhārata, xii. 2056, have any connection herewith—to the effect that Śvetaketu was disowned by his father Uddālaka because of his being "śāmāya śāmāya apnumā"?—The name Śvetaketu further occurs among the prior births of Buddha, No. 370 in Westergaard's *Catalogus*, p. 40; but amongst these 339 *jātakas* pretty nearly everything appears to be mentioned!
literature, but only in its third or Sūtra stage, e.g., Kātyāyanā, Kātyāyanīputra, Kaunḍinya, Ágūvesya, Majtrāyanīputra, Vātsīputra,* Paushkaraśādī; but no names of teachers belonging to the Brāhmaṇa period are found in these legends. This is all the more significant, as Buddhism originated in the same region and districts to which we have to allot the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa, for instance—the country, namely, of the Kosalas and Videhas, among the Sākyas and Lichhavis. The Sākyas are the family of which Buddha himself came: according to the legend,‡ they had immigrated from the west, from Potala, a city on the Indus. Whether this tradition be well founded or not, I am, at all events, disposed to connect them with the Sākāyanins who are referred to in the tenth book of the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa, and also with the Sākāyanas of the Maitrāyaṇa-Upanishad, which latter work propounds precisely the Buddhistic doctrine of the vanity of the world, &c. (see above, pp. 97, 137). Among the Kosala-Videhas this doctrine, and in connection with it the practice of subsistence upon alms as Pravrājaka or Bhikṣu, had been thoroughly disseminated by Yājnavalkya and their king Janaka; and a fruitful soil had thereby been prepared for Buddhism (see pp. 137, 147, 237). The doctrines promulgated by Yājnavalkya in the Vṛihād-Aranyaka are in fact completely Buddhistic, as also are those of the later Atharvapaniṣhads belonging to the Yoga system. Nay, it would even seem as if Buddhist legend itself assigned Bud-

* To these names in -putra, which are peculiar to Buddhist legend and the script of the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa; belongs also, in the former, the name Śriputra, Śrīkāputra.

‡ See Casema Körösi, Journ. As. Soc. Br., Aug. 1833; Wilson, Arama Antiq., p. 212: "The truth of the legend may be questioned, but it not improbably intimates some connection with the Sākas or Indo-Scythians, who were masters of Pāṭalāsen subsequent to the Greek princes of Bactria." The legend may possibly have been invented in the time of Kanerki, one of these Saka kings, with a view to flatter him for the zeal he displayed on behalf of Buddhism. 338 So, too, Johstgen, Uber das Gesetzbuch des Mann, p. 112, refers the traces of Buddhistic notions exhibited in that work specially to the school of the Mānava, from which it sprang.
Buddhistic Sanskrit Literature.

dha to a period exactly coincident with that of Janaka, and consequently of Yājnavalkya also; for it specifies a king Ajātaśatru as a contemporary of Buddha, and a prince of this name appears in the Vṛihad-Āranyaka and the Kaushitaki-Upanishad as the contemporary and rival of Janaka. The other particulars given in Buddhist legend as to the princes of that epoch have, it is true, nothing analogous to them in the works just mentioned; the Ajātaśatru of the Buddhists, moreover, is styled prince of Magadha, whereas he of the Vṛihad-Āranyaka and the Kaushitaki-Upanishad appears as the sovereign of the Kāsīs. (The name Ajātaśatru occurs elsewhere also, e.g., as a title of Yuddhishṭhira.) Still, there is the further circumstance that, in the fifth kāṣaṇa of the Sātpaṭha-Brāhmaṇa, Bhadrāsena, the son of Ajātaśatru, is cursed by Ārūni, the contemporary of Janaka and Yājnavalkya (see I. St., i. 213); and, as the Buddhists likewise cite a Bhadrāsena—at least, as the sixth successor of Ajātaśatru—we might almost be tempted to suppose that the curse in question may have been called forth by the heterodox anti-brahmanical opinions of this Bhadrāsena. Nothing more precise can at present be made out; and it is possible that the two Ajātaśatrus and the two Bhadrāsenas may simply be namesakes, and nothing more—as may be the case also with the Brahmadatta of the Vṛihad-Āranyaka and the two kings of the same name of Buddhist legend.—It is, at any rate, significant enough that in these legends the name of the Kuru-Pañchālaś no longer occurs, either as a compound or separately; whilst the Pāṇḍavaś are placed in Buddha's time, and appear as a wild mountain tribe, living by marauding and plunder. Buddha's teaching was mainly fostered in the district of Magadha, which, as an extreme border province, was perhaps never completely mentioned by the Southern Buddhists; see I. St., iii. 160, 161.

The Kurus are repeatedly mentioned by the Southern Buddhists; see I. St., iii. 160, 161.

The allusion to the five Pāṇḍuśa in the introduction of the Lalita-Vistara (Foucaux, p. 26) is probably, with the whole passage in which it occurs, an interpolation, being totally irreconcilable with the other references to the Pāṇḍuvaś contained in the work.
Tradition as to Buddha's Age.

Brahmanised; so that the native inhabitants always retained a kind of influence, and now gladly seized the opportunity to rid themselves of the brahmanical hierarchy and the system of caste. The hostile allusions to these Māgadhas in the Atharva-Samhitā (see p. 147—and in the thirtieth book of the Vājasaneyi-Samhitā? pp. 111, 112) might indeed possibly refer to their anti-brahmanical tendencies in times antecedent to Buddhism: the similar allusions in the Sāma-Sūtras, on the contrary (see p. 79),31 are only to be explained as referring to the actual flourishing of Buddhism in Magadha.*

With reference to the tradition as to Buddha's age, the various Buddhist eras which commence with the date of his death exhibit the widest divergence from each other. Amongst the Northern Buddhists fourteen different accounts are found, ranging from B.C. 2422 to B.C. 546; the eras of the Southern Buddhists, on the contrary, mostly agree with each other, and all of them start from B.C. 544 or 543. This latter chronology has been recently adopted as the correct one, on the ground that it accords best with historical conditions, although even it displays a discrepancy of sixty-six years as regards the historically authenticated date of Chandragupta. But the Northern Buddhists, the Tibetans as well as the Chinese—indeed altogether of their era, which may be of later origin than this particular tradition†—agree in placing the reign of king Kanishka, Kanerki, under whom the third (or fourth) Buddhist council was held, 400 years after Buddha's death; and on the evidence of coins, this Kanishka reigned down to A.D. 40 (see Lassen, I. AK., ii. 412, 413), which would bring down the date of Buddha's death to about the year B.C. 370. Similarly, the Tibetans place Nāgārjuna—who, according to the Rāja-taramgini, was contemporaneous with Kanishka—400 years after the death of Buddha; whereas the Southern Buddhists make him live 500 years after that event. Nothing like

---

31 And on another occasion, in the Baundhāyana-Sūtra also; see note 126.
* For other points of contact in the later Vedic literature, see pp. 129, 138 [98, 99, 151]. Lassen has drawn attention, in I. AK., ii, 79, to the Buddhistic names of the mountains about Rājagriha, the capital of Magadha, found in Mahā-Bhārata, ii. 799.
† Which is met with so early as the seventh century A.D., in Humin Thang.
positive certainty, therefore, is for the present attainable.\footnotemark[342] \textit{A priori}, however, it seems probable that the council which was held in the reign of King Kanerki, and from which the existing shape of the sacred scriptures of the Northern Buddhists nominally dates, really took place 400, and not so much as 570, years after Buddha's death. It seems probable also that the Northern Buddhists, who alone possess these Scriptures complete, preserved more authentic information regarding the circumstances of the time of their redaction—and consequently also regarding the date of Nāgarjuna—than did the Southern Buddhists, to whom this redaction is unknown, and whose scriptures exist only in a more ancient form which is alleged to have been brought to Ceylon so early as B.C. 245, and to have been there committed to writing about the year B.C. 80 (Lassen, \textit{I. AK.}, ii. 435).—Of these various eras, the only one the actual employment of which at an early period can at present be proved is the Ceylonese, which, like the other Southern eras, begins in B.C. 544. Here the period indicated is the close of the fourth century A.D.; since the \textit{Dīpavallisa}, a history of Ceylon in Pāli verse, which was written at that date, appears to make use of this era, whereby naturally it becomes invested with a certain authority.

If, now, we strip the accounts of Buddha's personality of all supernatural accretion, we find that he was a king's son, who, penetrated by the nothingness of earthly things, forsook his kindred in order thenceforth to live on alms, and devote himself in the first place to contemplation, and thereafter to the instruction of his fellow-men. His doctrine was, that "men's lots in this life are conditioned and regulated by the actions of a previous existence, that no evil deed remains without punishment, and no good deed without reward. From this fate, which dominates the individual within the circle of transmigration, he can only

\footnotetext[342]{Nor have the subsequent discussions of this topic by Max Müller (1859), \textit{Hist. A. & L.}, p. 264 ff., by Westergaard (1860), \textit{Ueber Buddha's Todesjahr} (Breslau, 1862), and by Kors, \textit{Vover de Inaarteling der Zuidel Buddhiska} (1874), so far yielded any definite result; cf. my I. Str., ii. 216; \textit{Lat. C. Bl.}, 1874, p. 719.}

\footnotetext[343]{Though it is nowhere set forth in so succinct a form: it results, however, as the sum and substance of the various legends.}
escape * by directing his will towards the one thought of
liberation from this circle, by remaining true to this aim,
and striving with steadfast zeal after meritorious action
only; whereby finally, having cast aside all passions,
which are regarded as the strongest fetters in this prison-
house of existence, he attains the desired goal of complete
emancipation from re-birth.” This teaching contains, in
itself, absolutely nothing new; on the contrary, it is en-
tirely identical with the corresponding Brahmanical
doctrine; only the fashion in which Buddha proclaimed and
disseminated it was something altogether novel and un-
wonted. For while the Brāhmans taught solely in their
hermitages, and received pupils of their own caste only, he
wandered about the country with his disciples, preach-
ing his doctrine to the whole people,† and—although still
recognising the existing caste-system, and explaining its
origin, as the Brāhmans themselves did, by the dogma of
rewards and punishments for prior actions—receiving as
adherents men of every caste without distinction. To
these he assigned rank in the community according to
their age and understanding, thus abolishing within the
community itself the social distinctions that birth en-
tailed, and opening up to all men the prospect of eman-
cipation from the trammels of their birth. This of itself
sufficiently explains the enormous success that attended
his doctrine: the oppressed all turned to him as their
redeemer.‡ If by this alone he struck at the root of
the Brahmanical hierarchy, he did so not less by declar-
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* See Schmidt, Dargestellung der
Weise und der Thor, Pref., p.
xxxiii. ff.
† See Lamart, I. A.K., ii. 440,
441; Burnouf, Introd. à l’Histoire
du Bouddhisme Indien, pp. 152-
212.
‡ Under these circumstances, it
is indeed surprising that it should
have been possible to dislodge Bud-
dhism from India. The great num-
bers and influence of the Brahman
caste do not alone completely ac-
count for the fact; for, in propor-
tion to the whole people, the Bra-
hmans were after all only a very small
minority. My idea is that the strict
morality required by Buddhism of
its adherents became in the long run
irksome to the people; the original
cult, too, was probably too simple.
The Brahmans knew how to turn
both circumstances to the best ad-
vantag. Krishna-worship, as they
organised it, offered far more satis-
faction to the sensual tastes of the
people; while the various cults of
the Saṅkṣ, or female deities, most
likely all date from a time shortly
preceding the expulsion of the Bud-
dhists from India.
ing sacrificial worship—the performance of which was the exclusive privilege of the Brahmans—to be utterly unavailing and worthless, and a virtuous disposition and virtuous conduct, on the contrary, to be the only real means of attaining final deliverance. He did so, further, by the fact that, wholly penetrated by the truth of his opinions, he claimed to be in possession of the highest enlightenment, and so by implication rejected the validity of the Veda as the supreme source of knowledge. These two doctrines also were in no way new; till then, however, they had been the possession of a few anchorites; never before had they been freely and publicly proclaimed to all.

Immediately after Buddha's death, there was held, according to the tradition, a council of his disciples in Magadha, at which the Buddhist sacred scriptures were compiled. These consist of three divisions (Pitakas), the first of which—the Sutras—comprises utterances and discourses of Buddha himself, conversations with his hearers; while the Vinaya embraces rules of discipline, and the Abhidharma, dogmatic and philosophical discussions. A hundred years later, according to the tradition of the Southern, but a hundred and ten according to that of the Northern Buddhists, a second council took place at Pataliputra for the purpose of doing away with errors of discipline which had crept in. With regard to the third council, the accounts of the Northern and Southern Buddhists are at issue. (Lassen, I. AK., ii. 232.) According to the former, it was held in the seventeenth year of the reign of Asoka, a year which we have to identify with B.C. 246—which, however, is utterly at variance with the equally traditional assertion that it took place 218 years after Buddha's death, i.e., in B.C. 326. At this council the precepts of the law were restored to their ancient purity, and it was at the same time resolved to send forth missionaries to propagate the doctrines of Buddha. The Northern Buddhists, on the contrary, place the third council 400 years after Buddha's death, in the reign of Kanishka, one

---

* This name alone might suggest the Sutra, not in the 'Brahmās', but Buddha himself flourished in period.
of the Turushka (Saka) kings of Kashmir, who, as we have seen, is established, on numismatic evidence, to have reigned until A.D. 40. The sacred scriptures of the Northern Buddhists, which are alleged to have been fixed at this council, are still extant, not merely in the Sanskrit originals themselves, which have recently been recovered in Nepal,* but also in a complete Tibetan translation, bearing the name Kagyu, and consisting of one hundred volumes;† as well as, partially at least, in Chinese, Mongolian, Kalmuck, and other translations. The scriptures of the Southern Buddhists, on the contrary, are not extant in Sanskrit at all. With reference to them, it is alleged that one year after their arrangement at the third council, that of Asoka (i.e., in the year B.C. 245), they were brought by Mahendra, the apostle of Ceylon, to that island, and by him translated

* By the British Resident there, B. H. Hodgson, who presented MSS. of them to the Asiatic Societies of Calcutta, London, and Paris. The Paris collection was further enriched in 1837 with copies which the Société Asiatique caused to be made through Hodgson's agency. This led Brunouf to write his great work, Introduction à l'Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien, Paris, 1844 [followed in the end of 1852 by his not less important production, the translation of the Lotus de la Bonne Loi; see J. St., iii. 135 ff., 1864. The British Museum and the University Library in Cambridge are now also in possession of similar MSS. A catalogue, compiled by Cowell and Eggeling, of the Hodgson collection of Buddhist Sanskrit MSS. in the possession of the Royal Asiatic Society has just appeared.]

† Regarding the compass and contents of this Tibetan translation, our first (and hitherto almost our sole) information was supplied by a Hungarian traveller, Csoma Körösi, the Anquetil du Perron of this century, a man of rare vigour and energy, who resided for a very long time in Tibet, and who by his Tibetan grammar and dictionary has conquered this language for European science. Two pretty extensive works from the Kagyu have already been edited and translated: the Dungtshan in St. Petersburg by Schmidt, and the Ramp Cher Rol Pa (Lalita-Vistar) in Paris by Foucaud. [Since then L. Feer, especially, has rendered valuable service in this field by his Textes tibétains du Kanjoum (1864–71, 11 parts); also Schiefner, e.g., by his editions of the Vamsa-pramotara-ranamad (1859)—the Sanskrit text of which was subsequently edited by Foucaud (cf. also J. St., i. 210 ff.)— and of the Bharatâra Response (1875). Schiefner has further just issued a translation from the Kagyu of a group of Buddhist tales, under the title, Mahâdatypayana und König Tschanda Praditya. The ninth of these stories contains (see p. vii. 20 ff.) what is now probably the oldest version of the so-called 'Philosopher's Ride,' which here, as in the Paññāchaitra (iv. 6), is related of the king himself; whereas in an Arabian tale of the ninth century, communicated in the appendix (p. 66) and in our own medieval versions, it is told of the king's wise counsellor.
into the native Singhalese. Not until some 165 years later (i.e., in B.C. 80) were they consigned to writing in that language, having been propagated in the interval by oral transmission only. After a further period of 500 years (namely, between A.D. 410 and 432) they were at length rendered into the sacred Pali tongue (cf. Lassen, I. AK., ii. 435), in which they are now extant, and from which in turn translations into several of the languages of Farther India were subsequently made.* As to the relation of these scriptures of the Southern Buddhists to those of their Northern co-religionists, little is at present known beyond the fact that both present in common the general division into three parts (Sutra, Vinaya, Abhidharma). In extent they can hardly compare with the latter,† nor even, according to the foregoing exposition,* in authenticity. Unfortunately but little information has as yet

---

* It was not the Pali text itself, but only the oral commentary (attakhatha) belonging to it, which was translated into Singhalese. (See the following notes.) So at least it is stated in the tradition in the Mahavasa. For the rest, it is extremely doubtful how much of the present Tipitaka may have actually been in existence then. For if we compare the statements contained in the Bhabra missive—addressed by king Piyafasai to the synod of Magadh, which was then engaged in the accommodation of schisms that had sprung up—relative to the sacred texts (dhamma-paliyadati) as they then stood, a mighty difference becomes apparent! See Burnouf, Lotus, p. 724 ff.; I. St., iii. 172 ff.

† See Mahavasa, chap. xxxiii. p. 207; Turnour, Preface, p. xxxix.; Muir, Orig. Sansk. Texts, ii. 69, 70 (57) ; I. St., v. 26.

* That is to say, translated back again(!); for this sacred language must be the same that Mahendra brought with him! [Not the texts themselves, only their interpretation (attakhatha) was now rendered back again into Pali, namely, by Buddhaghosha, who came from Magadh, and resided a number of years in Ceylon.]

† The extent of the Pali Tipitaka is also very considerable; see the accounts in Hardy's Eastern Monasticism, pp. 167-170. On the earliest-mention of the name Tipitaka in a Sanskrit inscription of Buddhaghosha at Kenheri (in the Journ. Bombay Br. R. A. S., v. 14), see I. St., v. 26.

† If indeed the case be as here represented! I can in the meanwhile only report. [Unfortunately, I had trusted to Lassen’s account, in the passage cited in the text, instead of referring to Turnour himself (pp. xxxix. xxxii.) ; the true state of the case (see the preceding notes) I have set forth in I. St., iii. 254.]

* The question which of the two redactions, that of the Northern or that of the Souther Buddhists, is the more original has been warmly debated by Turnour and Hodgson. (The latter’s articles on the subject are now collected in a convenient form in his Essays on Languages, Lit. and Rel. of Nepal and Tibet, 1874.) Burnouf, also, has discussed the question in his Lotus de la Boule Loi, p. 352 ff., and has decided, in principle no doubt rightly, that both possess an equal title. Compare here I. St., iii. 176 ff., where certain
been imparted regarding their contents, &c.* Southern Buddhism, however, supplies us with copious and possibly trustworthy accounts of the first centuries of its existence, as well as of the growth of the Buddhist faith generally, a Pāli historical literature having grown up in Ceylon at a comparatively early period, one of the most important works of which—the Mahāvaṇṇa of Mahānāma, composed towards A.D. 480—has already been published, both in the original text and in an English version.

Hardy, Eastern Monachism, an Account of the Origin, Laws, &c., of the Order of Mendicants founded by Gotama Buddha, London, 1850, 444 pp. The author was twenty years a Wesleyan missionary in Ceylon, and appears to have employed this time to excellent purpose. [This was followed in 1853 by his Manual of Buddhism, also a very valuable work.]

—The study of Pāli and its literature has recently taken a great spring, particularly through the labours of V. Faustboll (Dhammapada, 1855; Five Jātakas, 1861; Dasaśravasājātaka, 1871; Ten Jātakas, 1872; The Jātaka, together with its Commentary, Pt. i., 1875), James de Alwis (Introduction to Kachchhadyana’s Grammatik, 1863; Attanagolawansa, 1866), P. Grimblo (Écrits du Parittha, 1870), L. Feer (Dakorawasutta and others of these Pāli-suttas in his Textes tirés du Kondourn, 1869 &c.), Joh. Ni-nayef (Pālamokkhasutta and Vutto, 1869; Grammaire Pâlié, 1874, Russian edition 1872), E. Kuhn (Kachchhadyanaappakaranyu Specimens, 1859, 1871; Beiträge zur Pāli-Grammatik, 1875), E. Semart (Grammaire de Kachchhadyana, 1871), R. Childers (Khuddakagattha, 1869; Dictionary of the Pāli Language, 1872–74), M. Coomara Sāmy (Suṭṭhapāta, 1874); to which may be added the grammatical writings of W. Storek (1858, 1862) and Fr. Müller (1867–69).

* Northern Buddhism has likewise found its historians. The Tibetan Tāranātha (see note 350) cites as his precursors Bhātagaṇi Indradatta, Kabemendrabhadra,
With respect now to the scriptures of the Northern Buddhists, the Sanskrit originals, namely—for it is these alone that concern us here—we must, in the first place, keep in view that, even according to the tradition, their existing text belongs only to the first century of our era; so that, even although there should be works among them dating from the two earlier councils, yet these were in any case subjected to revision at the third. In the next place, it is \textit{a priori} improbable—nor is it indeed directly alleged—that the whole of the existing works owed their origin to this third council, and amongst them there must certainly be many belonging to a later period. And lastly, we must not even assume that all the works translated in the Tibetan Kágyur were already in existence at the time when translations into Tibetan began to be made (in the seventh century); for the Kágyur was not completed all at once, but was only definitively fixed after a prolonged and gradual growth. From these considerations alone, it is abundantly plain how cautious we ought to be in making use of these works. But there is still more to be borne in mind. For even supposing the origin of the most ancient of them really to date from the first and second councils,\textsuperscript{347} still, to assume that they were recorded in writing so early as this is not only \textit{prima facie} questionable, but is, besides, distinctly opposed to analogy, since we are expressly informed that, with the Southern Buddhists, the consignment to writing only took place in the year B.C. 80, long subsequent to both councils. The main purpose of the third council under Kanishka may possibly just have been to draw up written records; had such records been already in existence, Buddhism could hardly have been split up thus early into eighteen different sects, as we are told was the case in Kanishka's time, only 400 years after Buddha's death. Why, during all the eighteen centuries that have since elapsed no such amount of schism has sprung up, evidently because a written basis was then secured. Lastly, one important point which must not be

\textsuperscript{347} The data contained in the Tibetan translations date from the seventh to the thirteenth centuries, principally from the ninth.

\textsuperscript{*} According to Csoma Körösi, the Buddhist literature as to the \textit{dhammasangaha} probably as they then stood render such a supposition extremely doubtful here, just as in the case of the Pali Tipiṭaka (see note 343).
lost sight of in estimating the authenticity of the existing Buddhist scriptures is the circumstance that the sources from which they were drawn were in a different language. True, we cannot make out with absolute certainty in what language Buddha taught and preached; but as it was to the people he addressed himself, it is in the highest degree probable that he spoke in the vernacular idiom. Again, it was in Magadha * that the first council of his disciples assembled, and it was doubtless conducted in the dialect of this country, which indeed passes as the sacred language of Buddhism. The same remark applies to the second council, as well as to the one which, according to the Southern Buddhists, is the third, both of which were likewise held in Magadha.† Mahendra, who converted Ceylon in the year following this third council, took with him to that island the Mágadhí language, afterwards called Páli:‡ this, too, is the dialect in which the inscriptions of this period, which at least bespeak Buddhist influence, are composed.\textsuperscript{345} At the last council, on the contrary, which falls some 300 years later, and at which the existing scriptures of the Northern Buddhists are alleged to have

* In the old capital (Rájgríha).
† In the new capital (Pátaiputra).
‡ That Páli could have been developed in Ceylon from an imported Sanskrit is altogether inconceivable.

\textsuperscript{345} The edicts of Piyaśasi present themselves to us in three distinct dialects. One of these, that of Dhanúli, exhibits a number of the peculiarities which distinctively belong to the Ardhamágadhí of the Jainás, and the dialect designated Mágadhí by the Prákrit grammarians. It is in it that the Bhasa missive addressed to the third council is composed—a circumstance which conclusively proves that it was then the official language of Buddhism, and, in point of fact, Mágadhí (since Dhanúli belongs geographically to this district); see J. St., iii. 180, and my Essay on the Bhagavati of the Jainás, i. 396. But then, on the other hand, this dialect displays a particularly marked divergence from Páli, the language which has come down to us officially under the name of Mágadhí, and which presents special features of resemblance to that dialect, rather, which is employed in the inscriptions of Girnar. The question has therefore been raised whether Páli is really entitled to the name Mágadhí, which in the Páli literature is applied to it, or whether it may not have received this title merely from motives of ecclesiastical policy, having reference to the significance of the land of Magadha in the history of Buddhism. Westergaard even surmises (Über die ältesten Zeitraum der indischen Geschichte, p. 87 n., 1862) that Páli is identical with the dialect of Ujjaini, the mother-tongue of Mahendra, who was born there; and Ernst Kühn (Beiträge zur Páli-Grasmatik, p. 7, 1873) adopts this opinion. But Pischel (Jahres Litt. Zeit., 1875, p. 316) and Childers (Páli Dict., Preface, p. vii.) pronounce against it.
been compiled, the language employed for this purpose was not Magadhi, but Sanskrit, although not the purest. The reason of this lies simply in the locality. For this concluding council was not held in Magadha, nor even in Hindustan at all, whose rulers were not then favourably disposed towards Buddhism, but in Kashmir, a district which—partly no doubt in consequence of its being peopled exclusively by Aryan tribes,* but partly also (see pp. 26, 45, 178) because, like the North-West of India generally, it has to be regarded as a chief seat of the cultivation of Indian grammar—had preserved its language purer than those Aryans had been able to do who, had emigrated to India, and there mingled with the native inhabitants. Those priests,† therefore, who here undertook the compilation and recording in writing of the sacred scriptures were, if not accomplished grammarians, yet in all probability sufficiently conversant with grammar to be able to write passable Sanskrit.‡

Agreeably to what has just been set forth, it is in the highest degree risky to regard, as has hitherto been done,

* The Greeks and Scythians were both too scanty in numbers, and too short a time in close contact with the natives, to exercise any influence in the way of modifying the language.

† And it was evidently priests, educated men therefore, who formed the third council. In the first two, laymen may have taken part, but the Buddhist hierarchy had had time to develop sufficiently in the interval.

‡ Burnouf thinks differently, Hist. du Bouddh., pp. 105, 106, as also Lassen, I. A.K., ii. 9, 491-493 [but see I. St., iii. 139, 179 ff.].

§ Besides the two branches of Buddhist literature discussed in the foregoing pages—the Pali texts of the Southern and the Sanskrit texts of the Northern Buddhists—there stands a third group, occupying from its original constitution, a kind of intermediate place between the other two—namely, the Ardhamagadhi texts of the Jaina. The sect of the Jaina is in all probability to be regarded as one of the schismatic sects that branched off from Buddhism in the first centuries of its existence. The legendary narratives of the personal activity of its founder, Mahavira, not only refer it exclusively to the same district which Buddhism also recognizes as its holy land, but they, moreover, display so close an affinity to the accounts of Buddha’s ministry that we cannot but recognize in the two groups of narratives merely varying forms of common reminiscences. Another indication that the Jaina sect arose in this way out of Buddhism—although by some it has even been regarded as of pre-Buddhistic origin—is afforded by the circumstance, amongst others, that its sacred texts are styled, not Sutras, but Aagras, and consequently, in contradistinction to the oldest Buddhist texts, which date from the Vedic Satra period, belong rather to the Aagna stage, that is to say, to the period when the Aagnas or Vedangas, works posterior to the Vedic Sutras,
the data yielded by a Buddhistic literature fashioned in this way as valid for the epoch of Buddha himself, which is removed from the last council by an interval of four, or, if we accept the Southern chronology, of nearly six, centuries. Oral traditions, committed to writing in a different language, after such a series of years, and moreover only extant in a mass of writings that lie several centuries apart, and of which the oldest portions have still to be critically sifted out, can only be used with extreme caution; and *a priori* the data they furnish serve, not so much to characterise the epoch about which they tell, as rather the epoch, in particular, in which they received their present shape. But however doubtful, according to

were produced. But, there is a further circumstance which is quite conclusive as to this point—namely, that the language in which these texts are composed, and which, according to the scholars, is Ardhamāgadhī, exhibits a more developed and considerably later phase than the language of the Pāli texts, to which, in its turn, the Pāli scholars expressly apply the designation Māgadhī. (At the same time, there are also dialectic differences between the two.)

See my paper on the Bhagavatī of the Jainas, pp. 441, 373, 395 ff., 416. To the eleven principal Aṅgās have to be added a large number of other writings, styled Upāṅgas, Mūla-Sūtra, Kalpa-Sūtra, &c. An enumeration of the entire set, showing a total of fifty works, consisting of about 600,000 ślokas, may be seen in Rājendra Lāla Mitrā's *Notices of Sanskrit MSS.*, iii. 67 ff., 1874. Of these texts—our knowledge of the Jainas is otherwise derived from Brahmanic sources only—all that has hitherto been published is a fragment of the fifth Aṅga or Bhagavati-Sūtra, dating perhaps from the first centuries of our era, edited by myself (1856-67). In *J. As.*, x. 254 ff. (1867), I have also given an account of the Sīrya-prajñāpati, or seventh Upāṅga-Sūtra, a commentary on which is said to have been composed by Bhadrabahuśvāmin, author of the Kalpa-Sūtra, a work seemingly written in the seventh century. Lastly, there is a translation by Stevenson (1848) of this Kalpa-Sūtra itself, which stands thirteenth in the list of the sacred texts. Cf. also S. J. Warren, *Over de godsdienstige en wijsgerige Begrippen der Jainas, 1875*. Thanks to G. Bühler's friendly exertions, the Royal Library in Berlin has lately acquired possession of nearly all these fifty sacred texts, with or without commentaries, and—in good old MSS., so that we may hope soon to be better informed regarding them—

But the Jainas have also a great significance in connection with Sanskrit literature, more especially for grammar and lexicography, as well as on account of the historical and legendary matter which they have preserved (see above, p. 214, and cf. my paper on the Satrumpāya Māhātmya, 1858). One of their most honoured names is that of Hemachandra, who flourished in the time of the Gūrjaraprinces Kumānpāda (1038–1172). Under the title Yoga-Sūtra he composed—a compendium of the Jainas doctrines in twelve prakāṣas, the first four of which, treating of their ethics, have recently been edited and translated by Ernst Windisch (*Z. d. M. G.*, xxviii., 185 ff., 1874).
this view, are the validity and authority of these writings
in reference to the subjects which they have hitherto been
taken to illustrate, they are nevertheless important, on
the other hand, for the history of the inner development
of Buddhism itself; though even here, of course, their trust-
worthiness is altogether relative. For the many marvellous
stories they recount both of Buddha himself and of
his disciples and other adherents, as well as the extravagant
mythology gradually developed in them, produce upon the
whole the impression of a wild and formless chaos of fan-
tastic inventions.

Our chief object must now, of course, be to establish, a
relative chronology and order of sequence amongst these
various writings—a task which Burnouf, whose researches
are our sole authority on the subject,* also set himself,
and which he has executed with great judgment and
tolerable conclusiveness. And, first, of the Sūtras, or
accounts of Buddha himself. Burnouf divides these into
two classes: the simple Sūtras, and the so-called Mahā-
vaipulya- or Mahāyāna-Sūtras, which he declares to be
the more modern of the two in point of language, form,
and doctrine. As far as the latter point is concerned, he
is no doubt right. For, in the first place, in the Mahā-
vaipulya-Sūtras Buddha appears almost exclusively sur-
rrounded by gods and Bodhisattvas (beings peculiar to the
Buddhistic mythology); whereas in the simple Sūtras it
is human beings who mostly form his following, with
whom gods are only now and then associated. And, in
the second place, the simple Sūtras do not exhibit any
trace of those doctrines which are not common Buddhistic
property, but belong to the Northern Buddhists only, as,
for example, the worship of Amitābha, Mañjuśrī, Avalokite-
śvara, Ādibuddha,† and the Dhyānibuddhas; and further,
do not contain any trace of mystic spells and magic
formulas, all of which are found, and in abundance, in the

---

* I cannot refrain from expressing here, in a few words at least, my sincere and profound sorrow that now, as these sheets, which I would so gladly have submitted to his judgment, are passing through the press, Eugène Burnouf has been taken from among us. His premature death is an irreparable loss to learning, as well as to all who knew him, and, which is the same thing, revered and loved him.

† The word is found in a totally different sense in those portions of the Māṇḍūkyopanishad which are due to Gaṇḍapāda.
Mahávaiipulya-Sútras only. But whether the circumstance
that the language of the lengthy poetical pieces, which
are inserted with special frequency in these last, appears
in a much more degenerated form—to wit, a medley of
Sanskrit, Prákrit, and Páli—than is the case with the
prose portions, is to be taken as a proof of the posteriority
of the Mahávaiipulya-Sútras, does not seem to be quite so
certain as yet. Do these poetical portions, then, really
agree so completely, in form and substance, with the
prose text in respect to the several points just instanced,
that they may be regarded as merely an amplification or
recapitulation of it? Or are they not rather distinguished
from it precisely in these points, so that we might regard
them as fragments of older traditions handed down in
verse, exactly like the analogous pieces which occur so
often in the Bráhmaññas? * In the latter case we should
have to regard them as proof, rather, that the Buddhist
legends, &c., were not originally composed in Sanskrit,
but in vernacular dialects. From the account of the

* We must be content with simply putting the question, as we are still
unfortunately without the Sanskrit text of even a single one of these
Sútras; the sole exception being an insignificant fragment from the
Lalita-vistara, one of the Mahávai-
pulya-Sútras, communicated by Fou-
caux at the end of his edition of the
Tibetan translation of this work.
[The entire text of the Lalita-
vistara, in twenty-seven chapters,
have since appeared in the Boll. Ind.,
edited by Rájendra Lála Mítra
(1853 ff.); the translation breaks
off at chapter iii. Foucaux pub-
lished the fourth chapter of the
Sad-dharmapuññôtika in 1852, and
Leon Foor an Avadána, named
Pratiñáhára, in 1867. Lastly, the
Káraṇa-vyuhà, a terribly inflated
Maháyána-Sútra, in honour of Ava-
lokításvara, has been edited by
Satyavrata Sámadrámi (Calc., 1873).
A translation of the Lalita-vistara,
begun by S. Lefmann in 1874, embraces, so far, the first five
chapters, and is accompanied with
very copious notes.—The conjecture
expressed above as to the poetical
portions had previously been ad-
vanced—although when I wrote I
was not aware of the fact—in the
Journ. As. Soc. Beng., 1851, p. 283,
see I. St., iii. 140. It was subse-
quently worked out in greater
detail by Rájendra L. Mítra, in a
special essay on the dialect of these
Gáthás, likewise in Journ. As. Soc.
Beng. (1854, No. 6). Here the date
of their composition is even carried
back to the period immediately suc-
ceeding Buddha’s death, see Muir,
Orig. S. Texts, ii. 115 ff. Kern,
Over de Jouretteling, p. 108 ff., does
not see in these Gáthás any peculiar
dialect, but merely later versions of
stanzas originally composed in pure
Prákrit. Lastly, Edward Múller, in
his tract, Der Dialekt der Gáthá des
Lalita-vistara (Weimar, 1874) per-
ceives in them the work of poets
who were not quite at home in
Sanskrit, and who extended to it
the laxness of their own vernac-
ular.
Chinese traveller, Fa Hian, who made a pilgrimage from China to India and back in A.D. 399-414, it would appear that the Mahávaipulya-Sútras were then already pretty widely diffused, since he mentions several of the doctrines peculiar to them as extensively studied.\footnote{339}

Of the simple Sútras, it is at least possible, in the absence of evidence, that such as are concerned solely with Buddha’s personality may be more ancient than those relating also to persons who lived some hundreds of years later; but beyond this we cannot at present determine anything. Their contents are of a somewhat multifarious description, and for the several divisions we also find special technical designations.\footnote{*} They contain either simple legends, styled Ityukta and Vyákaraṇa (corresponding to
the Itihāsa-Purāṇas in the Brāhmaṇas); or legends in the
form of parables, styled Avadāna, in which we find many
elements of the later animal-fables; 352 or further, tales of
presages and wonders, Adbhuta-dharma; or again, single
stanzas or songs of several stanzas (Geya and Gāthā) serv-
ing to corroborate previous statements; or lastly, special
instruction in, and discussion of, definite topics; denomi-
nated Upadeśa and Nidāna. All these reappear in a
similar way, only in a much more antique guise and under
different names, * in the Brāhmaṇas and Aranyakas, as
well as in the prose legends interpersed here and there
throughout the Mahā-Bhārata, which in style also (though
not in language) offer the greatest resemblance to these
Buddhistic Sūtras. Quite peculiar to these latter, † how-
ever, are the passages called Jātakas, which treat of the
prior births of Buddha and the Bodhisattvas.

Now those data in the Sūtras which have hitherto been
taken as valid for Buddha’s time, but which we can only
consider as valid, primarily, for the time when the Sūtras
were composed, are chiefly of a kind bearing upon the his-
tory of the Indian religion. For just as Buddha recog-
nised the existence of caste, so, too, he naturally recognised
the then existing Hindū Pantheon. ‡ But it must not by
any means be imagined that in Buddha’s time this Pan-
theon had attained to that phase of development which
we here find in the Sūtras, assuming that we follow the

---

352 From the Chinese translation
Stan. Julien has published quite a
collection of such stories, for the
most part very short (Les Avadānas,
Contes et Apologies Indiens, 1859).
The high importance of these, as
well as of the Buddhistic Jātaka and
other stories generally, in the lit-
erature of the fable and fairy-tale, is
shown in full relief by Benfey in the
introduction to his translation of the
Paññatātantra.

* Only Gāthā and Upadeśa (Ādeśa
at least) occur also in the Brāhma-
ṇas.

† Although connecting links are
found here and there in the Mahā-
Bhārata also, especially in the twelfth
book. Indeed, many of the Buddhist
legends stand distinctly related to
the corresponding Brahminic popular-
tales and legends, which they have
simply transformed (or conversely,
into which they have themselves
been transformed) to suit the object
in view.

‡ Lassen’s assertion (I. d K., ii.
.453) that “Buddha recognised no
gods” refers only to the circum-
stances that they too are regarded by
him as subjected to the eternal suc-
cession of existence; their existence
itself he in no way denied, for in the
doctrines put into his mouth there
is constant reference to them. [He
abolished their significance, how-
ever, as he did that of caste.]
Southern chronology and place Buddha in the sixth century B.C., that is, doubtless, in the period of the Brāhmaṇas—works in which a totally different Pantheon prevails. But if, on the other hand, he did not teach until the fourth century B.C., as must be the case if the assertion of the Tibetans and Chinese be correct, to the effect that the third council took place under Kanishka (who lived A.D. 40), four hundred years after Buddha’s death—and this view is favoured by the circumstance that of the names of teachers who are mentioned as contemporaries of Buddha, such as reappear in the Brahmanical writings all belong to the literature of the Vedic Sūtras, not to that of the Brāhmaṇas—there would at least be a greater possibility, a priori, that the Pantheon found in the Buddhist Sūtras, together with similar data, might have some validity for the time of Buddha, which on this supposition would be much nearer to them. The details of the subject are briefly these. The Yakshas, Garuḍas, Kinnaras,352 so often mentioned in these Sūtras, are still quite unknown in the Brāhmaṇas: the name Dānava, too, occurs but seldom (once as an epithet of Vyūtra, a second time as an epithet of Śūṣṇa), and never in the plural to designate the Asuras generally;353 nor are the gods ever styled Suras there.354 The names of the Nāgas and Mahoragas are never mentioned, although serpent-worship itself (sarpa-vidyā) is repeatedly referred to; the Kumbhāṇ-
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das, too, are absent. This lack of allusion in the Brāhmaṇas to any of these genii might be explained by supposing them to have been principally the divinities of the inferior classes of the people, to which classes Buddha specially addressed himself, and to whose conceptions and range of ideas he was therefore obliged to have particular regard. In this there may be a great deal of truth, but the remaining cycle of deities, also, which appears in the Buddhistic Sūtras, is completely that belonging to the epic poetry. In the Brāhmaṇas, on the contrary, the name of Kuvera, for instance, is only mentioned once (and that in the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus); Siva and Śamkara only occur along with other appellative epithets of Rudra, and are never employed alone as proper names to denote him; the name of Nārāyaṇa, again, is of extremely rare occurrence, whilst Śakra, Vāsava, Hari, Upendra, Janārdana, Pitāmaha, are totally unknown. We thus perceive that the Buddhistic Sūtras, in all of which these names are prevalent, represent precisely the same stage as the Epic literature. The

of the air? [Serpent-worship has unquestionably mythological, symbolical relations; but, on the other hand, it has also a thoroughly realistic background.] The Maithunyag- Upanishad does, indeed, mention the Suras, Yakshas, and Uragas; but this Upanishad belongs (see p. 98) altogether to the later period. It is alluded to in these Buddhistic Sūtras in contents, and probably also in age.

* A kind of dvāra with ‘vesticles as large as jara’ (?). In the later Brāhmaṇical writings they are styled Kuṣumāṇḍas. Kuṣumāṇḍas (‘gourd’?) see also Mahābhārata on Vēj. Saṁhit., xx. 14. [Cf. the Kuṣumāṇḍa-nāsītas in Ath., viii. 6. 15, xi. 9. 17, and perhaps also the śīmādevas in Rīk, vii. 21. 5, x. 99. 3; Roth on Nir., p. 47.]

† The Taittirīya-Āryayaka, which contains several of these names, cannot exactly be ranked with the Brāhmaṇa literature.

385 Also in the parallel passages in the Rīk Sūtras, and once besides in the Ath. S. (viii. 10. 25).

386 As an appellative epithet of Indra, Śakra occurs in the Rīk even, but it is there employed of other gods as well.

387 As an epithet of Indra (but not as a name for him) Vāsava occurs once in Ath. S., vi. 82. 1. In the Nirukti also, xii. 41, it appears in direct connection with him, but at the same time also with Agni; indeed, it is with Agni and not with Indra that the Vasus are chiefly associated in the Brāhmaṇas; see J. St., v. 240, 241.

† The Māra so frequently mentioned would almost appear to be a purely Buddhistic invention; in Brāhmaṇical writings I have nowhere met with him. [Minayev’s conjecture, in the introduction to his Grammaire Pāli, trad. par Stan. Guyard, p. viii., that the name Māra is directly related to Maṛya, an epithet of Abhidharma in the Avaśya, and in such a way that both “remontent à une époque antérieure à la séparation des Avantiens et des Hindous,”] is rendered extremely doubtful by the mere circumstances that nothing of the sort occurs anywhere in the Veda.
non-mention of Krishna proves nothing to the contrary, the worship of Krishna as a divinity being of altogether uncertain date: besides, it is still a question whether we have not really to understand him by the Asura Krishna who is repeatedly referred to in these Sutras (see p. 148). Although to notice other points besides the Pantheon—the lunar asterisms in the Sutras begin with Krittika, that is to say, still retain their old order, we cannot adduce this as proof that a comparatively high antiquity ought to be assigned to these writings, for the new order of the asterisms probably only dates from the fourth or fifth century A.D.; all that results from this is, that the particular passages are earlier than this last-mentioned date. As an indication, on the contrary, of a date not specially ancient, we must certainly regard the mention of the planets, as also the occurrence of the word dndra (from denarius), which Burnouf (p. 424, n.) has twice met with in the older Sutras (see Lassen, I. A.K., ii. 348).

As regards the second division of the Buddhist scriptures, the Vina-Sastra, or precepts concerning discipline and worship, these are almost entirely wanting in the Paris collection, doubtless because they are looked upon as peculiarly holy, and are therefore kept as secret as possible by the priests, being indeed specially intended for

(Gopatha-Br., i. 28, see note 166, is only an apparent exception, due probably to Buddhist influence). If, therefore, a direct connection really exists between Mdra and Agra Maihyu, it can only have come about in historic times; and for this there is nowhere any analogy.

352 Whether the Southern Buddhists are acquainted with Krishna is not yet clear. Buddha’s prior birth as Kanka has, according to the text published in Jambu’s edition, p. 104, nothing to do with Krishna; the Jataka as Mahakanka (No. 461 in Westergaard’s Catali, p. 41), can hardly have any reference to him either; but what of the Jataka as Kusuma (No. 341 in Westergaard’s Catali, p. 49)? The expression in Hardy, East. Mon., p. 41, “You are yet a youth, your hair is like that of Krishna.” (J. A.K., iii. 161), is unfortunately not before us in the original text: might not the passage simply mean, “Your hair is not black?” The fact of Krishna appearing in the Abhidhammapadipika as a name of Vishnu proves, of course, just as little for the ancient texts as the patronymics Kshiti, Kapalyana in the scholi. on Kadoli, v. 2. 4 (Senart, pp. 185, 186) which have necessarily to be referred to the epic or divine personality of Krishna.

the clergy.—Like the Buddhist mythology, the Buddhist hierarchy was a thing of gradual growth. Buddha, as we have seen, received all without distinction as disciples, and when ere long, in consequence of the great numbers, and of the practice of living constantly together, except in the winter season, some kind of distribution of rank was required, it was upon the principle of age* or merit† that this took place. As the Buddhist faith spread more and more, it became necessary to distinguish between those who devoted themselves entirely to the priestly calling, the bhikṣuṇa,† monks, and bhikṣuṇīs, nuns, on the one

* The aged were called śāśvīra, a word not un freq uently added to a proper name in the Brahmanical Sūtras to distinguish a particular person from younger namesakes: points of connection herewith are to be found in the Brāhmaṇas also. [Regarding the winter season, see Childers, Pāli Dict., s. v. uṣaya.]

† The venerable were styled arhats (ārya), also a title bestowed upon teachers in the Brāhmaṇas.

‡ When Pāṇini speaks of Bhikṣu Sūtras, and gives as their authors Pāradārya and Karmanda, teaching (iv. 3. 110, 111) that their respective adherents are to be styled Pāradāryan and Karmandian, and (iv. 2. 50) that the Sūtra of the former is called Pāradārya, the allusion must be to Brahmanical mendicants, since these names are not mentioned in Buddhist writings. By Wilson, too, in the second edition of his Dictionary, Karmandian is given as ‘beggar, religious mendicant, member of the fourth order.’ [According to the St. Peters burg Dictionary, from Amara, ii. 7, 47, and Hemachandra, 809.] But the circumstance must not be overlooked that, according to the Calcutta scholiast, neither of these two rules of Pāṇini is explained in the Mahābhāṣya, and that possibly, therefore, they may not be Pāṇini’s at all, but posterior to the time of Patañjali. [The Pāparāsya bhikṣaṇa, at least, are really mentioned in the Bhāṣya to iv. 2. 66; see I. St., xiii. 340.]—That mendicant monks must, as a matter of fact, have been particularly numerous in Pāṇini’s time is apparent from the many rules he gives for the formation of words in this connection, e.g. bhikṣuṇāka, iii. 2. 17; bhikṣuṇaka, iii. 2. 155; bhikṣu, iii. 2. 168; bhikṣaka from bhikṣa in the sense of bhikṣaṇa sāmaṇḍa, iv. 2. 33. Compare, in particular, also ii. 1. 70, where the formation of the name for female mendicants (śramaṇī, and, in the sense, pravṛtyā) is treated of, which can only refer to Buddhist female mendicants. [This last rule, which gives the epithet ‘virgin’ as a special (not as an indispensable) quality of the śramaṇī, taken in connection with iv. 1. 127, can hardly be said to throw a very favourable light on the ‘virginity’ of the class generally; cf. Manu, viii. 353, note 330 above. The words sāmaṇḍīna, v. 2. 9, and kuṇḍukāsa, iv. 4. 5, likewise exhibit a very distinct Buddhist colouring; on this see I. St., v. 140 ff. On Buddhist mendicants at the time of the Bhāṣya, see the data collected in I. St., xiii. 340 ff.].—The entire institution of the fourth order rests essentially on the Sāṁkhya doctrine, and its extension was certainly due to a large extent to Buddhism. The red or reddish-yellow garment (vaṣṭikāpraṣaṇa) and the tonsure (mukhadeya) are the principal badges of the Buddhist bhikṣuṇa; see above, pp. 78, 237. On a commentary, extant in India, on a Bhikṣu Sūtra, see I. St., i. 470.
hand, and the Buddhist laity on the other, upāsakas and upāsikās.* Within the priesthood itself, again, numerous shades of distinction in course of time grew up, until at length the existing hierarchy arose, a hierarchy which differs very essentially from the Brahmanical one, inasmuch as admission to the priestly order is still, as in Buddha's time, allowed to members of the lowest castes on the same conditions as to any one else. Among the laity the Indian castes still continue to exist wherever they existed in the past; it is only the Brahman caste, or priesthood by birth, that has been abolished, and in its place a clergy by choice of vocation substituted. The Buddhist cult, too, which now is second to none in the world for solemnity, dignity, pomp, and specialities was originally exceedingly simple, consisting mainly in the adoration of the image of Buddha and of his relics. Of the latter point we are first informed by Clemens Alexandrinus. Afterwards the same honour was paid to the relics of his most eminent disciples also, and likewise to princes who had deserved specially well of Buddhism. The story of the ashes of Menander, related by Plutarch (see Wilson, Ariana, p. 283); is doubtless to be understood in this sense.† Now this relio-worship, the building of steeples—traceable, perhaps, to the topeś (stūpas) which

* Or specially buddhadāsaka, buddhadāsikā, as we find it several times in the Mahābhārata.
† For I regard Menander, who on his coins is called Minand, as identical with Milinda, king of Sāgala (Sakala), respecting whom see Turner in the Journ. As. Soc. Beng., v. 530 ff.; Burnouf, l. c., p. 621; and Catal. MSS. Or. Bibl. Aum., p. 50. (From an article by Spiegel in the Kieler Allgemeine Monatschrift, July 1852, p. 561, which has just reached me while correcting these sheets, I see that Benfey has already identified Menander with Milinda [see the Berlin Jahrbücher für wissenschaftl. Kritik, 1842, p. 874]—Schiefner in his notice, Uber Indra's Donnerkeit, p. 4 of the separate impression, 1848, has expressed the conjecture that the Buddha Amida¬

bha, who is uniformly placed in the western country Sākyanī, may be identical with Amita, whose name appears as Amita on his coins; in the name Basili, too (in Schmidt's Deangel, p. 331), he discovers the word Sācelēs. (But Schiefner calls my attention to the circumstance, that as far back as 1852, in his Ergänzungen und Berichtigungen zu Schmidt's Ausgabe des Deangel, p. 56, to p. 256, l. 3 of the Tibetan text, he withdrew the identification of Basili with Sācelēs: his connection, too, of Amita with Amiyas, which had been questioned by Köp¬pen, ii. 28, note 4, he now regards as doubtful.) The legend of the Western origin of the Sākya I have already characterised (p. 283) as perhaps invented as a compliment to Kamishka.
owe their origin to this relic-worship—the system of monachism, the use of bells, and rosaries,* and many other details, offer such numerous features of resemblance to Christian ritual, that the question whether Christianity may not perhaps have been here the borrowing party is by no means to be summarily negatived, particularly as it is known that Buddhist missionaries penetrated at an early period, possibly even in the two centuries preceding our era, into Western countries as far as Asia Minor. This is still, however, an entirely open question, and requires investigation.**

The third division of the Buddhist sacred scriptures, the Abhidharma-Pitaka, contains philosophical, and especially metaphysical, discussions. It is hardly to be imagined that Buddha himself was not clearly cognisant of the philosophical basis of his teaching, and that he simply adopted this latter from his predecessors, so that the courage and energy pertaining to its public promulgation† constituted his sole merit. But it seems just as certain that he was not concerned to propagate a philosophical system, and that his aim was purely a practical one, to

* Afterward adopted by the Brahmans also. [The very name rosary has possibly arisen from a confusion of the two Indian words japamālā and japamālāḥ; see my paper, Über Krishna's Geburtseif, pp. 340, 341; Köppen, Die Religion des Buddha, ii. 319; and also my letter in the Indian Antiq., iv. 250.]

** See Ind. Sbr. p. 64 (1857), and the data from the Abbé Huc's Travels in Tibet in Köppen, i. 561, ii. 116. According to the interesting discovery made by Laboulaye (see Müller, Obe, iv. 185) and F. Liebrecht with regard to Barisam and Josaphat, one of the saints of the Catholic Church stands at length revealed as Bodhisattva himself—a discovery to which Reinaud's ingenious identification of Yūsaf, Yūdosa, with Bōdissat (Mém. sur l'Inde, p. 91) might alone have led; see Z. D. M. G., xxiv. 430. But neither is the contrary supposition, namely, that Christian influences may have affected the growth of Buddhist ritual and worship, as they did that of the Buddhist legends, by any means to be dismissed out of hand. Indeed, quite apart from the oft-ventilated question as to the significance of such influences in the further development of Krishnah-worship, there are legends connected with the Siva cult also, as to which it is not at all a far-fetched hypothesis that they have reference to scattered Christian missionaries; see J. St., i. 421, ii. 398; Z. D. M. G., xxvii. 166 (v. 263).—That Western influence has played a part in Tibet, finds support in a letter of Schiefsner, according to which, in a work of Deja Pandita, Galen is mentioned as the physician of the Persians, and is said to have been consulted by the first Tibetan king, along with a celebrated Indian and a celebrated Chinese physician.
awaken virtuous actions and dispositions. This is in accord with the circumstance, that, whereas the Buddhists allege of the Sūtra-Piṭaka and the Vinaya-Piṭaka that they were delivered by Buddha himself, in the case of the Abhidharma-Piṭaka, on the contrary, they start with the admission that it is the production of his disciples. According to Burnouf, the doctrines of the Abhidharma are in reality only a further development or continuation of the views here and there propounded in the Sūtras; indeed, the writings in question often merely add single words to the thoughts expressed in the Sūtras: “but in any case there exists an interval of several centuries between the two, and that difference which distinguishes a doctrine still in its earliest beginnings from a philosophy which has arrived at its furthest development.”* In the Brahma-Sūtra of Bādarāyaṇa doctrines are repeatedly combated which, on Śāmkara’s testimony, belong to two distinct schools of Buddhist philosophy, and consequently both of these, and perhaps also the other two schools which are ranked with them, belong to a period preceding the composition of this Brahma-Sūtra.—The doctrines themselves cannot be recognised with perfect distinctness, and their affinity, although undeniable, to the doctrines of the Śāmkhya system is still enveloped in some obscurity.† On this point, however, so much is clear, that, although Buddha himself may actually have been in full harmony with the doctrines of Kapila, as they then existed, yet his adherents developed these in their own fashion; in the

* Whether now, after these words of Burnouf, loc. cit., p. 522, Lassen’s view (I. A.K., ii. 458) is tenable—to the effect that “although, in the collection bearing the name of Abhidharma, there are writings of various dates, yet they must all be assigned to the period preceding the third council” (this third council in A.C. 275 being here expressly distinguished from the fourth under Kanishka)—appears to me in the very highest degree doubtful.

† Cf. for this I. St., iii. 132; Max Duncker, Geschichte der Arier, p. 234 f. (1867); Köppen, i, 214 f.—“The extinction, the ‘blowing out’ of individual existence was certainly the goal to which Buddha aspired; hardly, however, the resolving of this existence into nothing, but only its return to the same state of undisturbed, or unconsciousness which belonged to primeval matter before it attained to development at all,” Lit. C. Bl., 1857, p. 770 (I. St., ii. 132). Chadara thinks differently, Pāli Dict., s. v. vīrūda.

† Were he really to have identified with the Śākyamuni of the Mahāyāna Upaniṣad (see p. 97), we should have in this work tolerably direct evidence to the above effect.
same way as the followers of Kapila also pursued their own path, and so eventually that system arose which is now extant under the name Sāmkhya, and which differs essentially from the Buddhist philosophy.* To the four schools into which, as we have just seen, this philosophy was split up at a comparatively early period, four others were afterwards added—or perhaps these superseded the former—but neither have the doctrines of these later schools been as yet set forth with anything like sufficient certainty. The question, too, whether Buddhistic conceptions may not perhaps have exercised a direct influence on the development of Gnostic doctrines, particularly those of Basilides, Valentinian, and Bardesanes, as well as of Manes, must for the present be regarded as wholly undetermined; it is most intimately bound up with the question as to the amount of influence to be ascribed to Indian philosophy generally in the shaping of these doctrines. The main channel of communication in the case of the latter was through Alexandria; the Buddhist missionaries, on the contrary, probably mostly came from the Panjāb through Persia.

Besides the three Piṭakas, the Sanskrit manuscripts that have been procured from Nepal contain other works also, consisting, in part, of a large number of commentaries on and elucidations of the Piṭakas, in part, of a

---

* Whether vv. 9-11 of the Śopanishad are to be taken, with the commentator, as specially referring to the Buddhists, as I assume in J. St., i. 293, 299, appears to me doubtful now; the polemic may simply be directed against the Sāmkhya tenets in general.

† See F. Nève, L’Antiquité Chrétienne en Orient, p. 90, Louvain, 1852.

\[\text{special work on Tibetan and Chinese Buddhism. See on this point Lit. C.B., 1875, p. 550.}\]

\[\text{Cf. now Lassen, J. A.K., iii. 387-416; my Ind. Skiz., p. 64; Renan, Hist. des Lang. Sév., 2d ed., 1858, pp. 274, 275. That their influence upon the growth of the doctrines of Manes in particular was most important one is shown, for example, by this circumstance alone, that the formula of abjuration for those who renounced these doctrines expressly specifies Beṣāka and the Śākyamuni (seemingly a separation of 'Buddha Śākyamuni' into two)—Lassen, iii. 415.—Cf. also Beal, J. R. A. S., ii. 424 (1866).}\]
most peculiar class of writings, the so-called Tantras, which are looked upon as especially sacred, and which stand precisely upon a level with the Brahmanical works of the same name. Their contents are made up of invocations of various Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, as also of their Saktis, or female energies, with a motley admixture of Sivaistic deities; to which are added longer or shorter prayers addressed to these beings, and directions how to draw the mystic diagrams and magic circles that secure their favour and protection.  

\[264\] Cf. Emil Schlagintweit's Buddhism in Tibet (1863, with a folio atlas of twenty plates).—Recently there have also come from Nepal Sanskrit MSS. containing works of poetry; as to which see Klatt in the preface to his edition of the sentences of Chânakya, taken thencefrom (1873).
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P. 9, 36 ff. (and 64, 29 ff.). Burnell, in his preface to the Ársheya-Br. (Mangalore, 1876), p. xvi. ff., and Aufrecht, Hymnen des Rigveda (Bonn, 1877), Pref. pp. xvi., xvii., dispute the superior antiquity of the readings of the Sáma-Samhitá, as compared with those of the Rík-Samhitá.


P. 32, note 21. On the Váshkala somewhat more light has now been cast. In the first place, from a comparison of the káriká quoted in my Catal. of the Berlin Sansk. MSS., p. 314, “Sákaldnám samáná va ity ríchá 'ntyá 'hutir bhavet | Báshkaldnám tu tachhamyor ity ríchá 'ntyá- 'hutir bhavet,’ it results that the citation in the forty-eighth Atharva-pariśiśtha (see I. St., iv. 431) of the sámyuváka as the concluding verse of the Rík-Samhitá has reference to the Váshkala-recension of the latter. Next, it becomes evident that this recension stood in a special relation to the Sáňkháyana texts, since in the Sáňkh. Grih., 4. 5. 9, the same verse is cited as the concluding one of the Samhitá, and this expressly as the view of Kaushítaki. In addition to this we have the fact that the pratika of the whole section to which this verse belongs, and which forms the last khila—sámyjnána—in the vulgar recension of the Rík-Samhitá, is found cited in the Śáňkháy.-Śrauta-Sútra, 3. 6. 4, but is wanting in the parallel passage, Áśval., 2, 11. And, lastly, we shall probably also have to allot to the Váshkálas the eleven hymns—ten Áśvináti and one Áindrávarunam súktam—which, as Rud. Meyer has recently pointed out (Rigvidhána, Pracf., p. xxiv.), are cited
in the Brīhaddevatā, 3. 24, between Rīk-Śamhitā 73 and 74. For, according to Meyer, their pratīkās prove to be identical with those given by the scholiast on Śāṅkh. Sr., 9. 20. 14, for the 'trīṣātam suparnam' there mentioned in the text, which again is specified under this name in the Śāṅkh. Br. itself (18. 4) as part of the Āśvina-śastra. Probably, too, the other portions of text, which, as stated by Meyer (l. c., p. xxv. ff.), appear in the Brīhaddevatā as well as in the Rīgvidhāna, as belonging to the Rīk-Śamhitā, whereas they are found neither in the vulgate—the Śākala-Śamhitā—nor in its khila portions, will have to be assigned to the Vāśkalas. In point of fact, the sāṃjñāna khila also, to which (see above) the concluding verse of the Vāśkala-Śamhitā belongs, is mentioned in both texts (Meyer, p. xxii). An exact comparison of the Rīk-verses cited in the Śāṅkhāyana texts will probably throw full light upon this point.—In Bühler's letter from Kashmir (published in J. St., xiv. 402 ff.) the interesting information was given that he had there discovered an excellent bhūvarja-MS., some five to six hundred years old, of the Rīk-Śamhitā in the Śākala recension. This MS. is accentuated, whereas the Kashmir Vedic MSS: are not wont to be so, but the accent is denoted in a totally different manner from that customary in India, the udatta alone being marked by a perpendicular line, precisely as, according to Haug, is usual in one of the two schools of the Maitrāyani Śamhitā, and as we ourselves do; cf. my remarks in the Jenaer Lit. Zeit., 1875, p. 315. On this MS. see now the detailed report of Bühler's journey in the Journal Bomb. Br. R. A. S., 1877, extra No., pp. 35, 36.

Pp. 35, 36, note 8. See also Myriantheus, Die Āśvins (Munich, 1876), and James Darmesteter, Ormazd et Ahriman (Paris, 1877).

P. 41, note 29. See Alfred Hillebrandt, Varuna und Mitra, ein Beitrag zur Exegese des Veda (Breslau, 1877).

P. 43, note 32. Max Müller's issue of the text alone of the Rīk has now appeared in a second edition (London, 1877). Samhitā-pāṭha and pada-pāṭha are here printed on opposite pages. Respecting the latter it has to be remarked that, as in Müller's previous editions, so again in this one the so-called galitās are in no way marked, the text which a particular passage shows the first time
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it occurs being uniformly simply: repeated, without any reference to what is done in the MSS, themselves in these cases. This is all the more surprising as, after I had pointed out this defect, in my review of the last volume of his large edition in the Lit. Cent. Blatt, 17th April 1875, Müller himself, in an article which appeared in the same periodical a year and a half later (16th December 1876) fully recognised the critical importance of the galitas.—Aufrecht's edition has also been reprinted (Bonn, 1877): the preface (comp. desidératum at note 28) contains a variety of critical remarks.—Complete translations of the Rāk-Samhitā, by Alfred Ludwig (Prag, 1876) and Hermann Grassmann (Leipzig, 1876–77) have appeared.—Very meritorious, also, is the edition of the Rāk-Samhitā which is appearing in monthly numbers at Bombay, under the title 'Vedārthayatna,' with English and Mahrāthī translation, as well as with Mahrāthī commentary; the latest No. brings it to i. 100. The name of the excellent editor, Shankar Paṇḍit, is an open secret.—Lastly, there remains to be mentioned M. Haug's Vedische Rāthseifragen und Rāthseispräche (Rik, i. 164, 1876).

P. 48, note 32. Rājendra Lāla Mitra's edition, in the Bibl. Indica, of the Aitareya-Āranyaka with Sāyana's commentary, has now been completed. A MS. acquired by Bühler in Kashmir shows a number of variations; see his Report of Journey, i. e., p. 34.

P. 50, 6 (cf. p. 285). Pañchālachanda appears in a Pāli Sutta among the mahāsenāpatis of the Yakhas; for the conclusions to be drawn from this see Jenaer Lit. Zeit., 7th April 1877, p. 221.

P. 56, 3. The Sāṅkh. Gṛih. (4. 10. 3) inserts between Viśvāmitra and Vāmadeva, the two representatives of the, third and fourth maṇḍalas, the name of Jamadagni, to whom in the Anukramaṇī to the Sākala-Samhitā only the last three verses of the third maṇḍala (iii. 62, 16–18) are in this place ascribed,—but in addition to these, also five entire hymns and four separate verses in the last three maṇḍalas. Have we here also to do with a divergence of the Vāśkala school? (In Sāṅkh. Gṛih., 4. 5. 8, however, there is no trace of this variation from the vulgate; rather, the verse iii. 62. 18 appears there as the concluding verse of the third maṇḍala.)
P. 58, note 50. The Śāṅkh. Grīhya has been published, with translation and notes, by Herm. Oldenberg; see I. St., xv. 1–166. There exists also another recension of it, which is designated as Kaushitaka-Grīhya, but which, according to Oldenberg, is rather to be understood as Śāmbavya-Grīhya. Its text is ‘nowise identical’ with the Śāṅkh. Grīh., ‘but it has borrowed from the latter by far the greatest part both of its matter and form.’ The last two books of the Śāṅkh. Grīh. are not used in it, and a great deal is lacking besides.

P. 61, note 6. On the Jyotisha a very meritorious work has just appeared by G. Thibaut.

P. 62, 6, 26 ff. On the Brīhaddevatā and Rigvidhāna see R. Meyer’s edition of the latter work (Berlin, 1877).

P. 65, 25. The forty-eighth Atharva-pariśiṣṭa, see I. St., iv. 432, gives indeed the same beginning, but a different concluding verse to the Sāma-Saṃhitā, namely, the last verse but one of the first part of the vulgate; accordingly, it did not reckon the second part as belonging to the Saṃhitā at all, while for the first part also it presents the discrepancy stated.

P. 65, note 60. The Āraṇya-Saṃhitā, with Sāyana’s commentary, has been edited by Satyavrata Sāmāśramin, and that in a double form, namely, separately (Calcutta, 1873), and also in the second part of his large edition of the Sāma-Saṃhitā, p. 244 ff.

P. 66, note 61. This edition of the Sāma-Saṃhitā, in the Bibl. Indica, has now reached, in its fifth volume, as far as 2. 8. 2. 5.

Pp. 73, 74. The Talavakāra- or Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa, to which the Kenopan. belongs, has been recovered by Burnell (letter of 19th April). Also a Sāmaveda-Prātiśākhya.

Pp. 74, 75, notes 71, 72. The Ārṣheya-Brāhmaṇa and Samhitopanishad-Brāhmaṇa have also been edited by Burnell (Mangalore, 1876, 1877); the former with a lengthy introduction containing an inquiry into the Gānas, the secondary origin of the Saṃhitā from these, the chanting of the sāmans, &c. On this compare A. Barth’s detailed notice in the Revue Critique, 21st July 1877, pp. 17–27. The Ārṣheya-Brāhmaṇa has, further, just been issued a second time by Burnell, namely, in the text of the Jai-
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minīya school, which he had meanwhile recovered (Mangalore, 1878).

Pp. 99–101. According to the catalogue (1876) of M. Haug’s collection of MSS., there are now in the Royal Library at Munich, with which this collection was incorporated in the spring of 1877, not only two MSS. of the Mājrāyaṇā Samhitā, but also several more or less complete, but, unfortunately, in great part modern, copies of Āpastamba, Mānava, Bhāradvāja, Baudhāyana, Vaiśabhās, Hiranyakeśin.—The description (in notes 108, 109) of the Dharma-Sūtras as part of the Śrauta-Sūtras is not quite correct; rather both are portions, possessing an equal title, of a collective Sūtra-whole, to which in each case there also belonged a Grihya- and a Śulva-Sūtra, and which we might perhaps designate by the name of Kalpa-Sūtra.

—The North-Western origin of the Kāṭha school (cf. Kāṭha, I. St., xiii. 439) is also, in a certain measure, attested by the fact that, according to Bühler’s letter from Kashmir (dated September 1875, published in I. St., xiv. 402 ff.) on the results of his search for MSS. in that province, this school is still in the present day the prevailing one in Kashmir. The Brahmans there call themselves, it is true, chaturvedī, but they follow the rules of the Kāṭhaka-Grihya-Sūtra of Langākshi. Besides portions of all the Vedas, the Bhaṭṭas learn by heart the Paddhati of Devapāla, the commentary and prayoga to the Kāṭhaka-Grihya. ’Of these Grihyas I have acquired several MSS., among them an old one on dāvūrya. To the Kāṭhaka-Sūtra are attached a Pravarādhyāya, an Ārsha, the Chārāyaṇīya Śikṣā, and several other Pariśiṣṭas.’—Additional note in second German edition.] According to Bühler, Z. D. M. G., xxii. 327, the Dharma-Sūtra of the Kāṭhaka school is identical with the Vishṇu-Smṛiti. On this, and on the Kāṭhaka school in Kashmir generally, see now Bühler, Report of Journey, i. c., pp. 20, 36, 37.

P. 103, note 118. The Taitt. Pārśiṣṭākhya has also been edited in the Bibl. Indica by Rājendra Lāla Mitra (1872).

Pp. 117, 118. The forty-eighth Atharva-Parīśṭa specifies a recension of the Vāj. Saṃh., which begins with 1. 1, but which ends with 23, 32! See I. St., iv. 432.

P. 114. For the formula Amba ambike ‘mbālike, which differs in all three Yajus texts, Pāṇini (vi. 7. 118)
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has a fourth reading; on this and the other points of connection between Pāṇini and the vocabulary of the Yajus texts, see I. St., iv. 432.

P. 138, 23. According to Mahāvaśa, p. 9. 12, 15, the name of Buddha's wife was Bhadda- or Subhadda-Kachchānā!

P. 139, note 147. Satap.: 3. 1, 1–2. 2, is translated in Bruno Lindner's dissertation, Über die Đukhā (Leipzig, 1878); other portions in Delbrück's Altind. Wortfolge (1878).

P. 142, note 155. The Pāraskara has been edited by Stenzler (1876).

P. 150, note 158. In the forty-eighth Atharva-Pariśiṣṭa, the commencement of the Atharva-Samhitā is given just as in the published recension, but it ends there with Book xvi.; see I. St., iv. 432.

P. 151, note 156. With the doshapati compare the pāpa-mana dsura in the Nrisinhop.; see I. St., ix. 149, 150.


P. 187, 188, note 203. On Olshausen's explanation of the word Pahlav—the basis of the Indian Pahlava—from Parthava, 'Parthian,' see now also Th. Nöldeke in Z. D. M. G., xxxi. 557 ff.

P. 189, note 204. According to Kern, Over de oud-Javaansche Vertaling van't Mahabhārata (Amsterdam, 1877), p. 7 ff., the Kavi translation of the Adi-pavvan, from which he there communicates the text of the Paushyacharita, dates from the beginning of the eleventh century.

P. 189, note 205. For the criticism of the Mahā-Bhārata, Holtzmann's researches (Indische Sagen, Preface, Stuttgart, 1854) are also of great importance.


P. 195, 15. The identity of the author of the Raghuvanśa and Kumāra-sambhava with the dramatist Kālidāsa is contended for by Shankar Paṇḍit in the Transactions

P. 196, note 203. Bhāravi and Kālidāsa are mentioned together in an inscription of Pulakesi II., ‘in the Śaka year 507 (A.D. 585-6);’ at that date, therefore, they must have been already famous. See Bhāu Dājī in Journ. Bomb. Br. R. A. S., ix. 315, and J. F. Fleet in Ind. Antiq., v. 68.—On the Kashmir poets Chandraka and Meṇṭha, of about the fifth (?) century, Ratnākara of the ninth, Kamemendra and Bihana of the eleventh, Somadeva, Maṅkha, Kalana, &c., of the twelfth century, see Bühler, Report of Journey, l. c., p. 42 ff.

P. 199, note 1. For the text of these Suttas see now Grimblot, Sept suttas Pāliis (Paris, 1875), p. 89; ‘nāchham gītam vadditam pekkhām akkhaṇam . . . iti vā iti evaṃpā visūkadasassand’ (exhibitions, p. 65, spectacles, pp. 179, 215). From this it appears that the word here properly in question is not so much the general term visūka as rather, specially, pekkhā (preśāya), ‘exhibition,’ ‘spectacle,’ translated by ‘theatricals,’ pp. 65, 179, ‘représentations dramatiques,’ p. 215; comp. preśāhaka as the name of a species of drama in Bharata (Hall, Daśaratha, p. 6), and drṣṭya in the Sāhitya-darpaṇa as the name of dramatic poetry in general.

Pp. 200, 12, 205, 20. According to Hall, Vāsavad., Introd., p. 27, Bhavabhūti would have to be placed earlier than Subandhu, and if so, of course, d fortiori, earlier than Bāna: the latter, however, does not allude to him in the classic passage in the introduction to the Harsha-charita, where he enumerates his predecessors (Hall, ibid., pp. 13, 14). See also Ind. Streifen, i. 355.

P. 201, note 11. According to Lassen, I. AK., iii. 855, 1163, Bhoja died in 1053. An inscription of his in the Ind. Antiq., 1877, p. 54, is dated in the year 1022.

P. 203, note 11. According to Bühler, Ind. Antiq., v. 112 (April, 1876), a grant of King Jayabhṛṣṭa is ‘older than the year 445 A.D., and dated in the Vikrama era.’

P. 204, note 111. In Z. D. M. G., xxx. 302, Jacobi cites from the Urvāṣī a (chronometrical) datum betokening Greek influence.

P. 207, note 118. Of new publications, &c., of Indian dramas have to be mentioned: Bhaṇḍarkar’s edition of the
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Málatí-mádhava (Bombay, 1876), Cappeller’s edition of the Ratnávalí (1877, in the second edition of Böhtlingk’s Sanskrit-Chrestomathie), the Bengáli recension of the Sa- kuntalá, edited by Pischel (see Cappeller in the Jenaer Lit. Zeit., 1877, p. 121), the two latter dramas translated by Ludw. Fritze; lastly, Regnald’s translation of the Mricchhakátiká (Paris, 1876).—On the question as to the various recensions of Kálidása’s Sákuntalá—discussed in I. St., xiv. 161 ff.—see also Bühler’s Report of Journey, i. c., p. lxxxv. ff., where the first act of the Kashmír recension of this drama is printed.

P. 210, note 220. To this place also belongs Srívára’s Subháshítailávalí of the fifteenth century, containing quotations from more than 350 poets; see Bühler, Report of Journey, i. c., p. 61 ff.; further, the Subháshita-ratnákara by Krishna Shiastri Bhátavadekar (Bombay, 1872).—Here, too, have to be mentioned the four papers Zur. Kritik und Erklärung verschiedener indischer Werke, published by O. Böhtlingk in vols. vii. and viii. of the Mélanges Asiatiques of the St. Petersburg Academy (1875–76).

P. 212, note 222. Comp. Benfey’s Introduction to Bick- ell’s edition and translation of the ‘Kalilag und Damrag’ (Leipzig, 1876). It now appears doubtful whether the ancient Pahlavi version really rested upon one individual work as its basis, or whether it is not rather to be regarded as an epitome of several independent texts; see my notice of the above work in Lit. C. Br., 1876, No. 31, Bühler, Report of Journey, p. 47; Prym in the Jenaer Lit. Zeit., 1878, Art. 118.

P. 213, note 224. Read ‘recast by Kshemendra.’ It is only to Kshemendra that the statements from Bühler’s letter, given in the next sentence, refer. Bühler now places him in the second and third quarter of the eleventh century, Report of Journey, i. c., p. 45 ff.

P. 213. On the Rája-taramgini see now Bühler, Report of Journey, pp. 52–60, lxvi.–lxxii. (where an amended translation of i. 1–107 is given); and on the Nílaka-mata, of about the sixth or seventh century, ibid., p. 38 ff., Iv. ff.

P. 214, note 225. The Harsha-charita appeared at Calcutta in 1876, edited by Jívánanda.—On the Sínhasana-dvátríniśiká see now my paper in I. St., xv. 185 ff.

P. 215, note 227. In the interpretation of Indian inscrip-
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P. 221, note 233. Goldstücker’s ‘facsimile’ (comp. note 198, p. 100) edition of the Mānavakālp. is not ‘photo-lithographed,’ but lithographed from a tracing.

P. 226, note 230. Kielhorn has come forward with great vigour in defence of the Mahābhāshya, first, in a lengthy article in the Ind. Antiq., v. 241 (August 1876), next in his Essay, Kātyāyana and Patanjaji (Bombay, December 1876), which deals specially with the analysis of the work into its component parts; and, lastly, in his edition of the work itself, which exhibits the text critically sifted, in direct reference thereto (the first number, Bombay, 1878, gives the navāḥnikām). Cf., further, two articles by Bhanḍarkar, On the Relation of Kātyāyana to Pāṇini and of Patanjali to Kātyāyana in Ind. Antiq., v. 345 ff. (December 1876), and on Goldstücker’s Theory about Pāṇini’s Technical Terms (reprint of an earlier review of G.’s Pāṇini), ibid., vi. 107 ff. To this place also belongs an article on the Mahābhāshya, which was sent off by me to Bombay on 9th October 1876, but which only appeared in the Ind. Antiq., vi. 301 ff., in October 1877.

P. 226, note 230. On the antiquity of the Kāśikā see now Bühler’s Report of Journey, p. 72. The issue of the work in the Pāṇīt is perhaps by this time completed. It is to be hoped that it will appear in a separate edition.—Bühler’s information regardingVyādi, the Mahābhāshya, Kātantra, &c., is given in detail in his Report of Journey.


—Of Hemachandra’s Prākrit-Grammar Pischel has given us a new edition (Halle, 1877, text and good index of words).
tion supplied by Bühler regarding the Ālaṃkāra literature in Kashmir, see his Report of Journey, p. 64 ff. According to this, the Ālaṃkāra-śāstra of Bhaṭṭa Udbhata dates from the time of Jayāpiḍa (779–813), whose sabbhāpati the author was. Vāmana, too, in Bühler’s opinion, belongs to the same period. Ānandavardhana and Ratnākara belong to the ninth century, Mukula to the tenth, Abhinavagupta to the beginning, Rūḍraṭa to the end, of the eleventh, while Uruyaka flourished at the commencement, and Jayaratha at the close, of the twelfth century; Mammata is to be placed still later.

P. 235, note 247. Of the Sarva-darśana-saṃgraha there is now a translation, by Cowell and Gough, in the Paṇḍit, 1875 ff.

P. 237, note 250. The Sāmkhya-tattva-pradīpa has been translated by Govinda-deva-vastrīn in the Paṇḍit, Nos. 98 ff.

P. 237, note 251. Abhinavagupta was still living in A.D. 1015; Bühler, Report of Journey, p. 80.—The Saiva-śāstra in Kashmir, ibid., pp. 77–82, is divided into two groups, of which the one connects itself with the Spand-śāstra of Vasugupta (854), the other with the Praty-abhijnā-śāstra of Somānanda (ab. 900) and Utpāla (ab. 930). It is of the latter—which appears to rest upon Śaṅkara—that Abhinavagupta is the leading representative.

P. 241, note 254. The last number of this edition of Śabara-svāmin brings it down to 10. 2. 73; the edition of the Jaiminīya-nyāya-mālā-vistara has just been completed by Cowell. The Jaimini-sūtra is being published in the Bombay monthly periodical, ‘Shaḍārṣana-chintanikā,’ begun in January 1877—text and commentary with a double translation, in English and Mahrāthī.

P. 243, note 255. Vāchaspatimiśra’s Bhāmatī, a gloss on Śaṅkara’s commentary on the Vedānta-sūtra, is in course of publication in the Bibl. Ind. edited by Bālaśāstrīn,—commenced in 1876.—In the Paṇḍit for 1876, p. 113, in the Preface to his edition of Srinivāsadāsa’s Yatindramatadīpikā, Rāmamiśra-vastrīn cites a passage from Rāmānuja’s Brahmasūtra-bhāshya, in which the latter mentions the bhogavad-Bodhāyana as his predecessor therein, and as separated from him by several generations of pravṛddhāryas. As such pravṛddhāryas Rāmamiśra gives the names of Droniḍa, Guhadeva, and Brahmanandi, at the same time
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designating them by the epithets manarshi and supradhvanatama. By Śrīnivāsadāsa himself (p. 115) the teachers are mentioned in the following order: Vyāsa, Bodhāyana, Guhadeva, Bhūruchi, Brahmānandi, Dravidāchārya, Śrī-Parāśakṣaraṇātha, Yāmunamuni, Yatisvara.—Here is also to be mentioned the edition in the Paṇḍit, by Večhana-rāmaśāstrin, of two commentaries on the Vedānta-sūtra, viz., the Śaiva-bhāshya of Śrīkaṇṭha Śivāchārya (see Z. D. M. G., xxvii. 166), and the Vedānta-kaustubha-prabhā of Keśava Kāśmirabhaṭṭa.—Further, in the second edition of his Sanskrit-Chrestomathia (1877) Böhtlingk has given a new translation of the Vedānta-sūtra; and the Vidvan-manoraṇjini of Rāmatīrtha, a commentary thereon, has been published, with text with translation, in the Paṇḍit by Gough and Govinda-devasāstrin. In the same journal has also appeared the Advaita-makaranda of Lakshmīdhara.

P. 245, note 204. A translation, by Keśava-sāstrin, of the Nyāya-dārśana and of Vātsyāyana’s commentary thereon, has begun to appear in the Paṇḍit (new series, vol. ii.). The fourth book of Gaṅgeśa’s Nyāya-chintāmaṇi, with the commentary of Ruchidatta, has also been edited, ibid. (Nos. 66–93) by Bālaśāstrin.

P. 247, note 208. Of importance are the names, communicated to me from Albrūn by Ed. Sachau, of the mendāsil in Soghd and Khvārizm, the list of which begins with thurayyā, i.e., with kritika, and that under the name pārvit; by this is evidently meant pārvīt, i.e., the name which stands third in the Bundchesh, whence it necessarily follows that the list of names in the latter is the modern one, commencing with ādvint; see Jenaer Lit. Zeit., 1877 (7th April), p. 221. Some of the names here cited by Albrūn are distinctly Indian, as āśhābhaṭṭa, i.e., prakṣhāpāda, the ancient form of name, consequently, (not bhadrapadā). Here, too, presumably, as in the case of China, the Buddhists were the channel of communication.

Pp. 250, 251, note 274. The proposition laid down by H. Jacobi in Z. D. M. G., xxx. 306, that no Indian writings, which enumerate the planets in the order—Sun, Moon, Mars, &c.—can have been composed earlier than the third century a.d., has application to Yājñavalkya, as well as to the Atharva-pariśiṣṭas, which in point of fact already observe this order; see I. St., x. 317.
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P. 253, note *. The absence of mention of the Romakas in the Rámáyana may perhaps also rest upon geographical grounds, namely, on the probable origin of the poem in the east of India, in the land of the Kósalas, whereas the 'war-part' of the Mahá-Blárata was in all likelihood composed in Central, if not in Western India.


P. 256, note *. The explanation of the Indian figures from the initial letters of the numerals has recently been rudely shaken, see Bühler in Ind. Ant., vi. 48,—through the deciphering, namely, of the ancient 'Nágari numerals' by Pándít Bhagvánílal Indraji, ibid., p. 42 ff. These, it appears, turn out to be other letters, yet the derivation of the later figures from them can hardly be called in question. What principle underlies these ancient numerals is, for the rest, still obscure: the zero has not yet a place among them; there are letter-symbols for 4–10 (1–3 being merely represented by strokes) for the tens up to 90, and for the hundreds up to 1000. Comp. pp. 222, note 223, and 257, note 226.

P. 260, note *. The remainder of the Yátrak has now been edited by Kern in K. S., xiv. and xv.

P. 266 ff. In complete opposition to the former dreams about the high antiquity of Indian medicine, Haas has recently, in Z. D. M. G., xxx. 617 ff. and xxxi. 647 ff., characterised even the most ancient of the Indian medical texts as quite modern productions, to be traced to Arabian sources. In the accounts given by the Arabs themselves of the high repute in which Indian medicine stood with them, and of the translation of works of the kind, which are specified by name, from Sanskrit into Arabic, he recognises hardly any value. As regards the latter point, however, there exists absolutely no ground for throwing doubt, upon statements of so definite a character made by the old Arab chroniclers; while, with respect to the former point, the language of Suérut, Charaka, &c., is distinctly
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opposed to the assignment to them of so late a date. At the same time, every real proof of the presence of Greek (or even Arabian) conceptions in the works in question, will have to be thankfully received. But the early existence of medical knowledge in India would in no way be prejudiced thereby, as its beginnings are well attested by evidence from the Vedio period, especially from the Atharavaveda.

P. 270, note 810. Charaka, as Bühler informs me, has now also been printed at Bombay, edited by Dr. Anna Mureshvar Kunte, Grant Medical College.

P. 271, note 815. The Kavi translation of the Kāman-daki-nīti probably belongs, at the earliest, to about the same date as the translation of the Mahā-Bhārata; see remark above to note 201. — Progress has been made with the printing of Nirapeksha's commentary in the Bibl. Indica.

P. 273, note 339. On modern Indian music, see now the numerous writings of Sourindro Mohun Tagore, Calcutta, 1875 ff., cf. Jenaer Lit. Zeit., 1877, p. 487. — It is possible that the investigation of the gānas of the Sāma-veda, in case these are still in actual use and could be observed, might yield some practical result for the ancient laubhika music also.

P. 274, note 831. For such representations of Venus, supported on the tail of a dolphin, or with a dolphin and Cupid behind her, see J. J. Bernouilli, Aphrodite (Leipzig, 1873), pp. 245, 370, 405. See also numerous representations of the kind in the Musée de Sculpture par le Comte F. de Clarac (Paris, 1836–37), vol. iv., pl. 593, 607, 610, 612, 615, 620, 622, 626–628, 634.

P. 278, note 837. Bühler has also published a translation of Āpastamba; it is now being reprinted in the series of 'Sacred Books of the East' which is appearing under Max Müller's direction.—Gautama has been edited by Stenzler (London, 1876), and is also comprised in Jivānanda's large collection 'Dharmashastrasamgraha' (Calcutta, 1876), which, all inaccuracies notwithstanding, is yet a very meritorious publication, on account of the abundance of material it contains. It embraces 27 large and small Sruti-texts, namely, 3 Atris, 2 Vishnus, 2 Hārtas, Yājnavalkya, 2 Uśanas, Aṅgiras, Yama, Āpa
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stamba, Saṃvarta, Kātyāyana, Brhaspati, 2 Pardāq̆, 2 Vyasas, Sāṅkha, Līkha, Daksā, 2 Gautamas, and 2 Vasishṭhas.—Nārada’s Smṛiti has been translated by Jolly (London, 1876); see also his papers, *Über die rechtliche Stellung der Frauen bei den Indern* (Munich, 1876), and *Über das indische Schuldrecht* (Munich, 1877). P. 280, note 223. The Aruṇa-Smṛiti, Bühler informs me, is quite a late production, probably a section of a Purāṇa.

P. 281. As Yājnavalkya enumerates the planets in their Greek order (f. 295) the earliest date we can assign to this work is the third century A.D. (see remark above to p. 251, note 274, following Jacobi).

P. 284, 5. See remark on Pañcalalachanda above, note to p. 50.

P. 288. E. Senart, in his ingenious work, *La Légende du Bouddha* (Paris, 1875), traces the various legends that are narrated of Buddha (and in part, identically, of Krishna also) to ancient solar myths which were only subsequently applied to Buddha; comp. my detailed notice and partial rejoinder in the *Jenaer Lit. Zeit.* 1876 (29th April), p. 282 ff.

P. 291, note 1. Schiefner’s ‘Indische Erzählungen,’ from the Kagyü, in vols. vii. and viii. of the *Mélanges Asiatiques* of the St. Petersburg Academy, embrace already forty-seven such legends.

P. 292, note 345. Whether the Buddhaghosha of this inscription is, as Stevenson assumes (p. 13), to be identified with the well-known B. must still appear very doubtful, as the princes mentioned in the rest of these inscriptions belong to a far older period; see Bhandarkar in the *Transactions of the London Congress of Orientalists* (1876), p. 306 ff.

P. 293, note *. Sept suttas Pāli, tirés du Dighanikāya, from the papers of Paul Grimblot, were published by his widow in 1876 (Paris), text with translation.—The second part of Fausböll’s edition of the Jātaka appeared in 1877.—The Mahāparinibbāna-sutta was edited in 1874 by Childers in the *Journal R. A. S.*, vols. vii. and viii.; a separate impression of it has just appeared. The same journal also contains an edition of the Pātimokkha by Dickson. An edition of the whole Vinaya-piṭaka by Herm. Oldenberg is in the press.

P. 297, note 346. A collected edition of the sacred Aṅgas
of the Jains was published last year (1877) at Calcutta by Dhanapatisinhaji: the text is accompanied with the commentary of Abhayadeva and a bathā explanation by Bhagvān Vijaya.

P. 300, note 360. On this compare also S. Beal, The Buddhist Tripitaka as it is known in China and Japan (Devonport, 1876).

P. 303, note 6. On possible points of connection between the Avesta and Buddhism see Jenaer Lit. Zeit., 1877, p. 221.

P. 305, note 4. In Gautama the word bhikhu appears expressly as the name of the third of the four dharma: in place of it Manu has yati.

Berlin, 24th May 1878.
Aksharapada, 85. 245.
akshara, 'syllable,' 15. 16.
— philos., 161.
Agastya, 53. 275 (archit.).
Agui, 31. 40. 63. 159. 178. 303.
— chayanam, 120. (274).
— Puruṣa, 191. 231. 271. 275. 281. 318.
— raksya, 118. 120.
Agniśeṣu, 265. 266. 269 (med.).
Agniśvāmin, 79.
eguna, 190.
egahā, 248.
Āgga, 25. 216 (s. Veddāsya). 296. 297. 326, 327 (Jain.).
Āgga, 147.
Āgirī, 158.
Āgīrī, 31. 53. 153. 158. 160. 162.
— 250. 325 (Sūrītī). — (Jupiter) 250.
Āgīrī, 124. 148 ff.
Ājātaśatru, 51. 127. 138. 286 (his six teachers).
— comm., 82.
ātikṛṣṭha, 111.
ātikṛṣṭhakā, 292.
Ātri, 31. 38. 53. 102. 103. 140 Ved.
— 102. 283. 325 (jur.).
— 269 med.
— daughter of, 38. 140.
— bṛhā, 269 (med.).
— bā (= bāhā, 269 (med.).
Athravan, 151 (as pirajāpati). 153.
— (bṛhāsapti and bhāgavatī). 158.
164.
Athravana-Purāṇikśa, 249. 251. 253. 265.
— the forty-eighth Ath. Pur., 313. 316. 317. 318.
Atharva-Purāṇikśa, Greek order of the planets in the Ath. Purāṇikśa, 323.
— Paippa, 158. 169.
— Pratīkṣha, 146. 151.
— Veda, 2. 22. 29. 145 ff. 249. 265.
— śīkṣa, 164.
— śākhā, 164. 167.
Atharvaśīrṣa, 154. 166. 169. 170.
Atharva-Samhitā, 11. 208. 318.
Atharvāgīrī, 11. 72. 93. 121.
— 127. 149. 150 (veda sing.).
Atharvāsya, 113. 124. 148. 149.
Atharvaprashāsada, 28. 153 ff. 239.
— etāḥ 'taḥ, 245. 265.
Adiśrutiśīla, 301 (Buddh.).
Adhikāṭa-Bṛdhāmaṇa, 69. 152.
adarsa, 171.
Adhikāṭa-Mahāyana, 323.
adhiradhatu, 121.
adhikāṭa, 121.
adhikāṭa, 8.
adhikāṭa, 121.
Adhikāṭa-Mahāyana, 168.
adhyāya, 14. 31. 32. 107. 117.
adhyāya, 66.
adhyāya, 14. 50. 149.
adhyāyas (pl.), 3. 80. 86. 87. 121.
Amanta, 141 (comm.).
Anantadeva, 101.
Anantayaevan, 85. 245.
anapho, 255 (Greek).
Anukramanīya, 24. 32. 33. 61. 64. 65.
— 74. 85. 87. 88. 90. 103. 104.
— 107. 143. 144. 145. 152.
Anupada-Sūtra, 80. 81. 84. 88. 95.
Anubhākaṇṇa, 12. 82.
anubhākaṇṭha, 82.
anubhūta-prakāśa, 97.
anubhūtisvarupākāra, 226.
sanskrit index.

asulaamba, 68.
asvala, 31. 33. 38. 94. 107. 109.
124. 145.
  — *kutuvalampa*, 32. 61.
asvakirti, 122. 127.
asakshama, 121. 122. 127.
asato, 84.
asahdra, 78.
Andhaka-Vrishchikas, 185.
Andhoemat, 108.
asvakhyas, 57. 176.
asvakhyas, 122.
Apantasamana, 243.
Aparashaknas, 125.
Abhayadova, 327.
Abhidhara-Kelma, 153.
Abhidharma (Buddha), 290. 291.
  — 307 ff.
Abhidhama-chintaman, 230.
  — ratnasiddha, 230.
Abhinavagupta, 237. 273. 327.
Abhinirmatra, 278.
Abhinirakrama-Sutra, 300.
Abhinivesa, 219. 220. 223.
abhaya-jna-pakse, 45.
Abhir, 3.
abhyanikhe, 122.
Amaravaksa, 220. 229 ff. 267.
Amaracandra, 190.
Amaradeva, 228.
Amarasinha, 200. 219. 227 ff.
Amarapala, 210.
Amila, 308.
Ami, 298. 306.
Amravadaha, 251.
Amritadandapanishad, 154. 165. 171.
Amuk, 114. 134. 317.
agama, 66.
agoya, 111.
Ayodhy, 89. 178. 224.
Arupa, 133. *ya*, 93.
  — Saqrati, 280. 326.
Arden, 92 (and plur.).
Arkalana, 33.
arsana, Arjuna (and Indra), 37. 90.
  114. 115. 134. 135. 136. 137. 185.
  186.
arsyavas, 248.
ardha, 73 (indubited place).
ardhamahadhau, 295. 296. 297.
ardhat, 78. 138. 305.
Aryaghatradstra, 231. 322.
Avadana, 299. 301 (Buddh.).
Avalokitivara, 258. 299.
avaka, 238.
avagamottari, 227.
avagatipat, 119.
Aesika, 179. 273. 290. 291.
Ajsaghoosha, 161. 162.
Ajsapati, 71. 120.
atmadhama, 51. 114. 126.
  — okada, 118.
Ajas, 53. 129.
Ajasadasa, 133.
adhasa, 31. 32. 42. 43. 89.
adhasasr, 118.
asru, 302 (asru formed from).
  — language of the A., 180.
  — Krisna, 148. 304.
  — Maya, 253. 274.
abhirajana, 258.
agh, 36.
aguna, 66. 76. 79. 80. 139.
Ahobalasari, 101.
adhik, 128.
adhikara, 254.
adhikara, 122. 193.
  — vidar, 45.
Agramadatra, 161.
Agnuvedya, 102. 285.
Agnavigyanana, 49. 53. 102.
dagunas parvam, 60.
Aingrasa, 71. 148. 153.
Aingrasakala, 153.
dakruya, 73. 77. 81. 121.
Adapra, 68. 125.
dapan, 171.
dasana, 97. 156. 161 ff.
  — (mahak), 238.
Atmagnosadhanaparishad, 166. 167.
  169.
Atmananda, 42.
Atmaparamit, 158. 162.
Atreyas, 87-89. 91. 92. 102. 103.
Taittiriya, 153. Aik., 241. 242. (phil.).
265. 269. (med.).
  — ksetra, 269. (med.).
  — byulasa, 269. (med.).
  — sundaraparvam, 269. (med.).
  — vishvapara, 269. (med.).
  — (bhikshu), 284.
Atharvaya, 128. 149.
  — Gyaya, 152.
Atharvapariskas, 82. 149.
Atmaharinsvaradopanishad, 154. 170.
aditya, 131.
aditya, 131.
Adityadipa, 259.
Adisnād, 268.
Adā, 73, 131, 149, 235, 302.
Amara-gāti, 51, 243.
— janana, 51.
— tirtha, 42, 51.
— vana, 163.
— vardhana, 322.
Anandavādli, 94, 154, 156, 157.
Anantarāya, 55.
Andhras, 94.
Aparanabaka, 83, 89 ff. 100, 101, 102.
— 317, 325.
— Dhirānaka, 101. 102, 106, 278.
— 325.
Apisāl, 322.
Arpākahan, 255 (Greek).
Arísthānas, 161.
Aṣṭa-śiśāṭa, 136.
Aṣṭāda, 261.
Aṣṭami, namet in, 53, 120.
Aṣṭādhu, 130.
Aṣṭacūrdha, 265, 267, 271.
Aṣṭacūrda, 254 (Greek).
Aṣṭasāhas, 8, 28, 29, 48, 92.
— kāma, 118.
— jñetiṣa, 153.
— saindā, 65.
Aṣṭagnāpani, 64, 65.
Aṣṭa-śaṣṭi, 316.
Aṣṭa, Aṣṭa, 285.
Aṣṭas, 93.
Aṣṭa, 51, 63, 71, 123, 130, 132.
— 133, 157, 286.
Aṣṭa-śaṣṭi, 163, 164.
Aṣṭaśaṣṭi, 93.
Aṣṭaśaṣṭi, 133, 157.
Aṣṭaśaṣṭi, 63, 65, 66.
Aṣṭaśaṣṭi, 185.
Aṣṭaśaṣṭi, 270.
Aṣṭaśaṣṭi, 61, 254, 255, 257 ff.
Aṣṭaśaṣṭi, 61, 257.
Aṣṭaśaṣṭi, 257.
Aṣṭaśaṣṭi, 257.
Aṣṭaśaṣṭi, 85.
Aṣṭaśaṣṭi, 162.
Aṣṭaśaṣṭi-śaṣṭi, 75, 77.
Aṣṭaśaṣṭi-śaṣṭi, 74, 313, 316.
Aṣṭaśaṣṭi, 53.
Aṣṭaśaṣṭi, 289.
Aṣṭaśaṣṭi, 289.
Aṣṭaśaṣṭi, 278.
Aṣṭaśaṣṭi, 164.
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 327.
— Aṣṭādhyāy, 133.
Aṣṭādhyāy, 32, 34, 32 ff. 59, 62.
33, 85, 101, 106, 169, 266.
— Kanti, 159.
— Pariśisht, 62.
— Brāhmaṇa, 49.
Aṣṭasāha, 314.
Aṣṭasāha, 314.
— vāsī, 312.
Aṣṭasāha, 128, 140.
Aṣṭasāha, 128, 131, 133, 137, 235, 310.
Aṣṭasāha, 113.
Aṣṭasāha, 254 (Greek).
Aṣṭasāha, 254 (Greek).
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 328.
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 264 (Arabic).
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 89.
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 48.
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 124, 124, 124, 124.
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 159, 190, 191.
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 121, 183, 301.
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 254 (Greek).
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 264 (Arabic).
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 300.
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 254 (Arabic).
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 264 (Arabic).
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 179.
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 4, 102.
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 45, 110.
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 116, 155, 209.
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 238.
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 238.
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 236, 237.
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 264 (Arabic).
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 123.
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 67, 81.
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 83.
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 91.
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 125.
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 226.
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 216, 226.
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 169.
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 239 ff.
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 207.
— (aṣṭaśaṣṭi), 157.
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uttard, uttarārdhika, 63. 65.
uttardsthītha, 247.
Utala, 243. 260. 322.
Utpalini, 237.
Udayana, 246.
uddita, 314.
uddikṣaya, 132. 178.
uddātār, 14. 67. 149.
Uddāsaka, 69. 71. 123. 139. 131.
157. 284.
Uddiyotakara, 245.
Udbhata, 322.
Upanāra-tūra, 83. 84.
Upanishtha, 199.
upadeśa, 301 (Buddh.).
upavid, 144.
Upaniśadha, 28. 29. 42. 43. 73. 74.
121. 127. 153 ff. 235. 277.
— number of, 154. 155.
— (Up. Brāhmaṇa), 34. 74.
Uparājya, 171. 191. 282.
Uparēkha, 49. 59.
Upaneśa, 265. 271. 273.
upavijayaśana, 122.
upavijaya, 244.
upavita, 114.
upabhāya, 73. 122.
Uparāja, 297 (Jaín.).
upārāja, 82.
— nirupiṣṭhā, 271.
upātra, śāhā, 306.
Upanendra, 303.
upāyam avavāsya, 49.
Uma, 74. 156.
uraga, 98. 303.
Urvā, 134. 207 (draina). 208.
udāk, 246.
Uṣata, 42.
Uṣāna (Kārya), 36. 153.
— 278. 282. 312 (jur.).
Uṣanara, 45.
Uṣṇaśī, 71.
Uṣṣara, 3.
Uṣa, 34. 42. 59. 116.
Uṣata, 144.
Uṣadha, Uṣapadha, 64.
Rīk-Saṅghāda, 9. 10. 11. 14. 31 ff.
— and Sūtra-S, readings of, 313.
— concluding verse of, in the forty-eighth Ath. Par., 313.
— Kashmir MS., 314.
— galām in, 314. 315.
Rīgvyādha, 62. 74. (33). 313. 314. 316.
Rīgveda, 3. 33 (rīgvedaguptaye). 45. 121. 123. 127.

vyāsas, 3. 9. 14. 31. 33. 63. 64. 65.
74. 75.
— number of, 121. 153.
Rīki, 8 (= Vedā). 122. 145.
— Brāhmaṇa, 64.
— śāκha, 65.
Rīki-Ānukramanī, 68.
Elchichnī, 42. 91.
ekapālīka, 117.
ekavakrama, 124.
ekaśānā, 125.
ekāśa, 60. 76. 79. 80. 139.
ek, 134. 140.
Ākṣavika, 125.
Alakara, 48. 49. 56. 70. 85.
— Brāhmaṇa, 16. 44 ff. 72.
— śākha, 34. 62.
— śāṅkhya, 32. 48 ff. 75. 315.
— āyins, 49. 81. 85.
— śāṅkha, 48. 155.
Aitiśayana, 53. 241 (Aita).
Amlāśā (School), 321.
ścindram parva, 65.
cīvānā, 309.
cīvānā, 158. 160. 161. 163. 164.
crimśek, 89.
cakṣāka, 83. 240.
Aukhyāna, 88.
Anjulomi, 242.
Aunayya, 134.
audikṣaya, 34.
Audumbarāyana, 53.
Auddalaki, 157 (Ved.). 267 (erot.).
Auddhārī, 88.
Aupataśāmi, 134.
Aupamanyaya, 75.
Aupavidi, 133.
Aupasīva, 143.
Aupoditya, 133.
Avalīka, 246.
Auvāśvakha, 75.
Kesāvadeva, 108. 207.
Keshohāna (Buddha's wife), 318.
Keshohānya, 227. 293.
Kātha, 89. 92. 184; plur. 83. 89.
317.
— Kālīpa, 89.
— śākha, 89.
— śrutiśāmśad, 163. 164.
— Sūtra, 99. 100.
Kanabhakula, Kanabhuj, 245.
Kanāda, 244. 245. 246.
Kandāla, 59. 80. 107. 117. 118-120.
Kana, 140 (def).
Kavasha, 120.
Kaviputra, 204. 205.
Kavirija, 196.
Kadyapa, 140 (having black tooth).
Kadyapa, 53. 140.
— 278. 282 jur.
Kashaya, 78. 306.
Kasuraman, 188.
Kahola, 129. 133.
Kankhya, 153 (Ath.). 266. 269
(med.)
Kathiaka, 41. 81. 85. 88. 89 ff. 103. 317.
Kāṭhakopanishad, 93. 156. 238. 240.
kāndala, 240.
kārṣaṇa, 59. 60. 91. 92. 117 ff. 145.
Kāpjasamājana, 53.
Kānya, 103. 106. 113 ff. 142. 143.
144 (gramm.).
Kāṣṇaka, 105.
Kāvāpyutra, 105.
Kāvyakāṇa, 105.
Kātantra, 226. 227. 321.
Kātīya-Gṛhya, 142.
Kātīya-Sāstra, 91. 99. 100. 142
Kātya, 138. 223.
Kātyāyaṇa, 55. 61. 80. 83. 84. 107.
138 ff (Ved.). 222. 321. (gramm.),
227 lex. 266 med. 285 (Buddh.).
— Smṛiti-Śāstra of, 143. 144.
— Karandāhī, 159.
Kātyāyana, 127. 138; = Durgā,
138. 157.
— putra, 71. 138. 285.
Kādamba, 213.
Kāpila-Śāstra, 236.
Kāpya, 126. 137. 223. 236. 237. 284.
Kāmandakaśya (Nīś-Śāstra), 325.
Kāma-Śāstra, 267.
Kāmukāya, 241.
Kāmūla, 114. 115; āyu, 115. 138.
Kāmpola, 75.
Kāraṇḍasyahā, 299.
Kārtrikaśaya, 268.
Kārtīkāyana, 103 (comm.).
Kaiśikā, 309.
Kārshīkśina, 140. 241. 242.
Kāla, 248.
Kālakārātya, 262.
Kālakāvina, 14. 81. 83. 96.
Kālayavana, 220. 221.
Kālāyuvrddhapaniśad, 171.
Kālā, 89. 96.
Kālidāsa, 193. 196. 200 ff. 209. 228.
250. 252. 255. 318 f.
— three Kālidāsan, 204.
Kāli, 159.
Kāvahāra, 120. 131.
Kāvita, 278.
Kāvyas 36 (Udāna), 153.
Kāyaprabhā, 204. 232.
Kāyasthā, 232.
Kāyasthāpāharyājñīti, 226. 232.
Kāyasthāvikrama, 42. 91. 140. 242.
Kāyasthī, 139. 140. 242.
Kālī, 125. 286.
Kālīkā, 106. 130. 226. 227. 321.
Kālī, 126. 283.
Kālāma, 227.
Kālavata, 143 (granit.). 245 (phil.)
275 (archit.).
Kāmakṣāhāraya, 237.
Kāvera, 111.
Kāpadavā, 302.
Kāpyājñā, 196.
Kāpyā, 79.
Kāpyāhaya, 273.
Kāpyā, 259.
Kutthumāl, 84.
Kutthumāna, 91.
— (town), 168.
Kutapa-Saukrata, 266.
Kutapa-pātra, 146.
Kunī, 90.
Kugbha, 3.
Kumārapāla, 297.
Kumārambhāsaka, 195. 196. 208.
318.
Kumārakavaitta, 68. 74. 241. 242.
Kumāralavāmin, 100.
Kumārakavaitta, 303.
Kumārakavaitta, 302. 303.
Kursos, 114. 123. 133. 136. 137.
138 (and Katā, 256).
Kurakotra, 68. 136.
Kuru-Pānchala, 10. 34. 39. 45.
68. 90. 114. 129. 132. 135. 180.
266.
kuladbhava, 278.
kulā, 254.
Kullahaka, 251.
Kuvera, 124. 303.
Kusa and Lava, 197.
kulā, 197.
Kushāmānā, 303.
Kusumapātra, 257. 258.
Kushādhvasti, 245. 246.
Kuśināralīkha, 215.
Kuśināralīkha, 285.
Kalbhānāga, 303.
Kāli, 144.
Kritā, 113 (yoga).
Kritādhvasti, 2. 148. 247. 248. 304. 323.
— name, date of, 2.
Kritājyā, 100.
Kraśā, 266 med.
Krīdā, 197.
Krīdā (black), 304.
Krīdā Devakīpura, 71. 104. 148.
169. 186. 238. 284. 304.
— and Kālayavana, 220. 221.
— and the Pāḍavas, 136.
— worship of, 71. 189. 209. 238.
289. 300. 304. 307. 326.
— Aitkara, 71. 148.
Dvāparā, 184. 243.
— Aitkara, 148.
Krīdā (black), 304.
Krīdā Bhārata, 50.
Krīdā (black), 54. 58.
Krīdā (black), 207.
Krīdā (black), 242.
Krīdā (black), 266 med.
Kokoras, 120. 132.
Keta, 250.
Kanapūrādād, 73. 74. 75. 156 ff.
171. 316.
Kanadrama, 255.
Keshā, 245.
— nayadīka, 245.
Kesāva Kāmsūravatātta, 323.
Kesā (Aurma), 148.
‘Kesā’ rasgrāmdha, 188.
Kesāva, 304.
Kalki, 120.
Kalyāta, 56. 83. 93. 95. 223. 224.
Kanārāngāyāh, 155. 163. 169 f.
Kakila, 280.
kāna, 254.
Kosa, 160. 165. 192. 193. 324.
Kosala, 33. 68. 137. 235.
— Vidishas, 34. 39. 137. 134. 135.
285.
Kohain, 253.
Kaukūsta, 134.
Kurvāla, 305.
Kaukūmlīka, 102. 285.
Kauktta, 77. 140.
Kaukūstāni, 97.
Kaukūstāni, 47. 65. 76. 83. 84. 89.
96. 106.
Kaukūstāni, 140.
Kaukūstāni, 241.
Kaukūstāni, 39. 123. 135. 136.
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Godāvari, 283.
Gonardiya, 223 gr. 267 (erct.).
Gopāla-Brahmaṇa, 106. 150. 151.
152. 304.
Gopavana, 140.
Gopāla-patigopanishad, 169.
209. 169.
Gopālashanakanishad, 169.
Gobhils, 80. 81. 82. 84.
— Saprāśa, 280.
goldakhyāna, 262.
Govardhan, 211.
Govinda, comm., 55. 62.
— teacher of Śāṅkara, 161. 243.
— avānim, 101 comm.
Gauda (style), 232.
298.
Gautama, 77 (two G.'s),
— 84. 143 (Jūr.),
— 153. 162 (āsthī.),
— 245 (phil.),
— 162 (Rishi).
— Dharma (-Sūtra), 85. 273. 281.
282. 285. 286. 327.
— (Pitṛmedha-Sūtra), 84. 245.
Gautamab Śāṅkhyā, 284.
Gautamī, 137.
graudha, 15. 99. 165. 193.
— (ādāndanaśyānta), 81.
graudha, 67 (Somavas.),
— eclipse, 249.
— planet, 98. 249. 250.
— (ādāndanaśyānta), 98.
grīma, 64. 77.
Gṛgmaṇya-gāṇa, 64. 65.
Ghāṭakarpara, 200. 201.
Ghūra Angrīna, 71.
Ghātakaśaśālaśikadāśtrā, 275 (śākya).
ghataraśāga, gama of, 275.
Ghātarudhyāyaḥ, 151 (āddhyāyā).
Ghātakarṇiṁśatīpi, 280.
Ghanda, 219. 227.
Ghanda, 319.
Chandra, 4. 204. 217. 223.
251. 287.
— (Gupta dynasty), 204.
Ghandaśa, 209.
Ghanda-Prajñānu, 227.
Ghanda, 178.
Ghanda, 87.
Ghanda, 265. 266. 268. 270. 284.
324. 325 med.
Ghanda-Sadāḥ, 89.
Charakas, 87. 88. 164.
Charakadāchārya, 87. 113.
Charakādāvarya, 87. 133. 134.
Charopiyāyukta, 95. 142. 153 (āsthī.).
— charitra, 214.
Chudā, 123.
Chālukya, 71.
Chālukya, 129.
Chālukya, 129.
Chālukya, 129.
Chālvikā, 275.
Chālvikā, 269.
Chālukya, 259.
Chālukya, 288. 103. 317 (sūkṣma).
Chālvikā, 246.
Chālvikā, 214.
Chālvikā, 51.
Chālukya, 68 (Bāhikā).n.
Chālukya, 247. 248 (śivica).
Chālukya, 217.
Chānasa, 243.
Chānda, 130.
Chāndāyopanishad, 165.
— chela, 138.
Chelika, 138.
Chālikātimsya, 138.
Chālikātimsya, 138.
Chāltrarāti, 68.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
Chalitaki, 133.
dampati, 38.
Dāvana, 171.
dāvāpirāpa, 101.
Dāvatā, 206, 213, 250.
drakṣa, 63, 124, 149.
Dakṣatayī, 83 (comm.).
dakṣatayī, plur. dakṣatayyas, 32.
Dakṣapuruṣahārya, 123.
Dakṣarā, 231, 232.
Dakṣarathājātaka, 293.
Dakṣavrata, 293.
Dakṣikā, Dakṣihputra, 218, 228.
Dānava, Dānu, 302.
Dālihya, 85 (Parvīśa, 143 (gr.).
dāmakas, 36.
Dāmadarman, 55.
dīvijyaya, 141.
Dīnā, 209, 245.
Dīvoddas, 269.
Dīnada, 229, 304 (denarii).
Dīpanavāsa, 288.
Duhāhasta, 125.
durvāsā, 255 (Greek).
Durgā, 33, 41, 43, 63.
Durgātā, 226.
Durgā, 138, 159.
dūhrkīrtā, 87.
Dusāhartītu, 123.
drikṣa, 255 (Greek).
drikṣa, 319.
Drisadhvatī, 67, 102.
Dvi, Devayājika, Srī Dvi, 141.
Dvakī, 71.
Dvakśputra, 71, 148, 166, 169.
dvājanāvīdas, 121.
dvājanāvīdyā, 124, 183.
Devatāhārya, 74, 75.
Devatā, 54.
Devatādatta, 160.
Devapāla, 317.
Devadhārya, 41, 42.
Devavāma, 256 (nātir.).
Devāpi, 39.
Devyoganiśad, 154, 170, 171.
*devāja, 79.
Dāvūta, 85.
Dāvāpi, 125.
dakṣapa, 151, 318.
dyauta, 255 (Greek).
Dyaushpitar, 35.
Drajyā, Dravidādārya, 322, 323.
drume, (Greek).
drōka, 79.
Drāvīṣa, 94.
Drāhāyana, 53, 79, 84, 282.
Drona, 185, 271.
drōpa, 113, 151, 243.
Dravārakundākāyana, 324.
Dravīdāgāna, 72, 104, 113.
Dravīdāyana, Ṛ. Krishṇa.
Dhanaprāja, 232.
Dhanapatiśri, 243.
Dhanusreca, 271, 282.
Dhanṣī, 214.
Dhanvantari, 200, 265, 266, 269.
Dhanvī, 80.
Dhannapada, 293.
Dhanamapalaśīta, 292, 294.
Dharmā, 176, 276 ff.
— Śāstra, 159, 276–283.
— Śāstra-samgraha, 325, 326.
— Śāstra, 19, 85, 101, 277 ff.
317.
dhārman, 101.
Dharmā, putra, rāja, 186.
dharmadārī, 56.
Dhātu-taraṇga, 227.
Dhātu-pādha, pārthiva, 230.
Dhānāmājīya, 76, 77, 82.
Dhārā, 201, 202.
Dhāvaka, 204, 205, 207.
Dhūmāyana, 141.
Dhṛitarāstra (Valobitravira), 39, 90, 114.
— king of the Kāśis, 125.
Dhyānadvipariśad, 165.
Dhyānibuddha, 298.
dhūrvāsya praschalanam, 98.
nakta (nakta, 264, Arab.
nakshatra, 2, 90.
Nakṣatras-Kālpa, 153.
nakṣatradarśa, 112.
Nagpureti, 132, 134.
Nakṣatras, 157.
nakṣatras, 196, 197, 199.
— Śāstras, 197, 199, 271, 275.
Nāma, 205, 117, 223.
Nandikesvaraya-Uppurūṣa, 171.
Nāmin, 68.
Nuraka, 188.
nartaka, 199.
Nāla, 132, 189.
Nāloda, 196.
Naṣamantr, 201.
Nāvahasta, 101.
Nāka, 123.
Nāgas (nāga), 273, 303.
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Nāgārjunā, 232. 265. 287. 288 (date of).
Nāgadeśa, 223. 227.
Nāgajībhaṭṭa, 223. 224. 226.
Nāla, 196.
nāga, 197. 200.
— Sāstra, 231.
nāla, 205. 281.
Nāḍavindūpaniśad, 165.
Nārada, 72 (Ved.), 153 (Atk. Por).
264 (astr.). 272 (etym. and mus.).
— pañcādṛṣṭro, 239.
— (Śrī), 61. 272.
— (Śrī-muṭṛa), 276. 326.
Nārāyana, 94. 123 (purusha). 160. 167. 303.
Nārāyana, 51 (comm., several N.'s).
38 (do.). 141. 158 ff. (Upān.).
Nārāyaniyopanisad, 93. 157. 166.
167. 169. 171.
Nārāyaniyopanishad, 166. 170.
śrīdhara, 93. 121. 122. 127.
śrīnam, 8.
Nāgakumāra, 25. 41. 153 (Ād.).
227.
nāṭya; 167.
Nichhivisa, 276.
śrīdāna, 81 (Ved.). 301 (Buddh.).
Nidāna-Sāstra, 24. 62. 77. 81. 82.
Nīmi, 68.
Nīmapākaha, 325.
Nīrāmādopanisad, 162.
Nīrakṣa, "śrī", 14. 26. 41. 42. 44.
59. 87. 122. 126. 160. 167. 216. 217.
235.
Nīrūtta, 152.
nīrūtta, 49.
nīrūtta, 161 (brahmī). 308 (Buddh.).
Nīśumbha, 206.
Nīshadha, 132.
Nīshādas, 77.
Nīlakaṇṭha, 188. 189.
Nilamata, 320.
Nīlārubodopanisad, 171.
Nīlaśā, 167. 168.
— tōpaṇtyopanisad, 167. 168.
Nīlaśa, 101 comm., 168.
Nīga, Naigeyas, 65. 85.
Naigeyas-Sāstra, 84.
Naiguṣṭyakas, 25. 85.
Naigdāna, 81.

Naimātī, 70.
Naimāna, "śrīya, 34. 45. 54. 59.
68. 185.
naiyāyikā, 245.
Nairukṣa, 26. 85.
Nairātāyana, 190. 232.
Nairātāyana, 132.
Nayā, 159. 237. 242. 245. 246.
— śadvīpa, 246. 247.
— darśana, 246. 247.
— Sāstra, 85. 235. 245.
PañǇhilaśavāmī, 244. 245.
Pañcādhana, 206. 212. 215. 221.
.229. 240. 246. 267. 291. 301.
pañcādāraka, 122.
Pañcādāraka, 267.
pārisadārakara, 164.
pāsaṇḍalakakona, 190.
Pañcādārakarśa-Bṛhadāranya, 66 ff.
Pañcādārakarśa-Sāstra, 83. 84.
Pañcādārakarśya, 83. 84.
Pañcādāraka, 235. 236. 237.
Pañcādārakarśya, 259.
Pañcādārakarśa, 10. 90. 114. 115. 125.
135. 150.
Pañcādāraka, 50. 315. 326.
pāsaṇḍalopancārīti, 34.
Pañcādāraka, 10. 34. (erot.
Pañcādāraka, 44.
Pañcādāraka, 50. 82. 84.
Pañcādāraka, 126. 137. 223. 236.
237. 284.
Pañcādāraka, 87. 219 ff. 231. 277. 321
(gr.).
— 137. 223. 231. 237 ff. (phil.).
— 117.
— 91.
padārakarśa, 33. 43. 49. 60.
63.
padārakarśya, 34.
Paddhatī, 55. 59. 85. 102. 141.
142. 143. 145. 317.
Paddhatī, 191.
Paddhatī, 153.
Paddhatī, 102. 255 (Greeks).
Paddhatī, 68. 125.
Paramahāma, 163.
Paramādhavā, 257.
Paramādhavā, 162.
Paramādāraka, 44. 143. 185. 252. 260
(astr.). 265. 266 (med.).
— (Śrī), 278. 280 (Iglim and
ivrīdīhā). 326.
Parikṣāta, 136.
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Pārīkṣita, 293 (Buddh.).
Parāśārāsana, 101. 140. 144. 222.
Pareśārāsana, 112. 147. 154.
Parāśārāshā, 60. 62. 69. 75. 84. 85.
Parāśàkha, 101. 107. 142. 146. 149. 150.
Parāśākha, 151. 153. 317.
Parāśākha, 119 (Aṣṭāpa, Br.).
Partha, 4. 185. 318.
Parvān, 63 (Śāman.). 124 (dēha-
van, &c.). 145. 149. 183. 184.
Parśur, 3 (4).
Parṇa, 292. 294.
Pavān, 272.
Pādupatiśarman, 54.
Pādāvā, 137. 158.
Pādāvā, 238.
Pādāvā, 83.
Pādāvā, 207.
Parāśākha, 34 (gr.). 232 (rāh).
Parāśākha, 138.
Pādaś, 133.
Pādaś, 290. 295.
Pādaś, 293. 326.
Parāśākha, 2, 22. 49. 103.
Parāśākha, 3. 8. 12. 15. 26. 41. 57. 59.
Parāśākha, 61. 77. 82. 87. 216-222. 232. 239.
Parāśākha, 241. 242. 245. 249. 266. 281.
Parāśākha, 218.
Parāśākha, 133.
Parāśākha, 222.
Pātuṣā, 254 (Greek).
Pātuṣā, 151 (the four).
Pātuṣā, 318.
Pātuṣā, 137. 155.
Pātuṣā, 126. 135. 136. 137. 185. 186.
Pātuṣā, 286.
Pātuṣā, 326.
Pātuṣā, 293. 326.
Pātuṣā, 292. 294.
Pātuṣā, 272.
Pātuṣā, 54.
Pātuṣā, 137. 155.
Pātuṣā, 238.
Pātuṣā, 83.
Pātuṣā, 207.
Pātuṣā, 34 (gr.). 232 (rāh).
Pātuṣā, 138.
Pātuṣā, 133.
Pātuṣā, 290. 295.
Pātuṣā, 293. 326.
Pātuṣā, 22. 49. 103.
Pātuṣā, 61. 77. 82. 87. 216-222. 232. 239.
Pātuṣā, 241. 242. 245. 249. 266. 281.
Pātuṣā, 218.
Pātuṣā, 137. 155.
Pātuṣā, 126. 135. 136. 137. 185. 186.
Pātuṣā, 286.
Pātuṣā, 318.
Pātuṣā, 137. 155.
Pātuṣā, 222.
Pātuṣā, 254 (Greek).
Pātuṣā, 151 (the four).
Pātuṣā, 318.
Pātuṣā, 137. 155.
Pātuṣā, 238.
Pātuṣā, 83.
Pātuṣā, 207.
Pātuṣā, 34 (gr.). 232 (rāh).
Pātuṣā, 138.
Pātuṣā, 133.
Pātuṣā, 290. 295.
Pātuṣā, 293. 326.
Pātuṣā, 22. 49. 103.
Pātuṣā, 61. 77. 82. 87. 216-222. 232. 239.
Pātuṣā, 241. 242. 245. 249. 266. 281.
Pātuṣā, 218.
Pātuṣā, 137. 155.
Pātuṣā, 126. 135. 136. 137. 185. 186.
Pātuṣā, 286.
Pātuṣā, 126. 135. 136. 137. 185. 186.
Pātuṣā, 286.
Pātuṣā, 318.
Pātuṣā, 137. 155.
Pātuṣā, 222.
Pātuṣā, 254 (Greek).
Pātuṣā, 151 (the four).
Pātuṣā, 318.
Pātuṣā, 137. 155.
Pātuṣā, 238.
Pātuṣā, 83.
Pātuṣā, 207.
Pātuṣā, 34 (gr.). 232 (rāh).
Pātuṣā, 138.
Pātuṣā, 133.
Pātuṣā, 290. 295.
Pātuṣā, 293. 326.
Pātuṣā, 22. 49. 103.
Pātuṣā, 61. 77. 82. 87. 216-222. 232. 239.
Pātuṣā, 241. 242. 245. 249. 266. 281.
Pātuṣā, 218.
Pātuṣā, 137. 155.
Pātuṣā, 126. 135. 136. 137. 185. 186.
Pātuṣā, 286.
Pātuṣā, 126. 135. 136. 137. 185. 186.
Pātuṣā, 286.
Pātuṣā, 318.
Pātuṣā, 137. 155.
Pātuṣā, 222.
Pātuṣā, 254 (Greek).
Pātuṣā, 151 (the four).
Pātuṣā, 318.
Pātuṣā, 137. 155.
Pātuṣā, 238.
Pātuṣā, 83.
Pātuṣā, 207.
Pātuṣā, 34 (gr.). 232 (rāh).
Pātuṣā, 138.
Pātuṣā, 133.
Pātuṣā, 290. 295.
Pātuṣā, 293. 326.
Pātuṣā, 22. 49. 103.
Pātuṣā, 61. 77. 82. 87. 216-222.
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Pāṇḍava, 120.

Pāṇḍharasādi, 102. 285.
Pāṇḍhakāvya, 268.
Pāṇḍhakāvya, "śālīśi, 240.
Pāṇḍhakāvya, 318.
prakrīti, 177. 237.
prachalanaśa, 98.
Pratāpati, 76. 97. 137. 151. 244.
prajñapāti, s. Sāryaśa, 297.
Pranasaṇopaniṣadā, 154. 165.
Pratijñā-Purāṇikā, 102. 106. 115.
Pratik, 119.
Pratigā, 56.
pratigā, 129. 138.

Pratijñā, 214.
Pratidānu-Sātra, 83.
Pratikārya, 299 (Buddh.).
pratikṛṣṇa, 49.
Pratyāhāryāśastra, 322.
pr sadāhara, 63. 64. 65. 66. 76. 79.
So. 81. 82. 83. 84. 89. 97. 117.
145. 151.
Prasodhibandhodandas, 207. 241.
Prasodhacandra, 79.
pratāpā, 28. 244.
prapγγγγ, 102.
pravacana, 12. 83. 85. 131.
pravaraśānta, 101. 240.
pravasadākhyāya, 142. 317 (Kāṭhā).
pravṛtya, 108. 119. 139.
Pravitā, 71.
pravṛtya, 285.
pravṛtya, 281. 305.
pravṛtya, 129.
Pravāntara, 141.
pravāna, 89. 100. 101: 102.
Prāsmāyopaniṣadā, 58. 158 ff.
Prasthānābheda, 267. 271, 275.
prasthāna, 177.
— prakāśa, 227.
Prāchāya, 34. 132. 178.
Prāchāya-Kāthā, 88.
— Prāchāya-Kāthā, 34.
Prācigamī-Prapāthopaniṣadā, 154. 162.
Prātiṣṭhāna, 123.
Prātiṣṭhāna, 112.
Prātiṣṭhāna-Sātra, 23. 26. 59
(Riiv.): 83 (Saṁs.): 102 (Tulaśī).
143 (Vajra.), 151 (Aśvih.)
Prātiṣṭhāna, 56.
prāmAṇya, 28.
prāyaśchītā, 84. 118. 139.
prakāśa, 319.
Proti, 123.
Prāyaṣṭa-Bṛhadā, 74.
Prāyaṣṭa-Bṛhadā, 53.

phāla, 115. 134. 136.
phāla, 248.
phāla, 225.
Phalā-Sūtra, 83.
Phalāsāra, 236.
Phāla, 196. 198.
Phāla, 12: 124.
Phāla, 56.
Phāla, 132.
Phāla, 126. 263 (schol.).
Phāla, 192.
Phāla, 124.
Phāla, 124.
Phāla, 121. 122.
Phāla, 62.
Phāla, 100.
Phāla, 204. 205. 207. 213. 214.
232. 319.
Phāla, 53. 140. 239 ff. (phil.).
266 (med.).
— (astr.), 260.
— Sūtra, 163.
Phāla, 139. 140. 241. 242.
Phāla, 30. 34 (Ved.). 267
(erot.).
Phāla, 72.
Phāla, 246.
Phāla, 91.
Phāla, 97.
Rāja-Buddha, 190.
Phāla, 51.
Phāla, 3.
Bhaḍaka, 313.
Bhaḍaka, 313.
Phāla, 269.
Phāla, 33. 95. 132. 178. 218.
Phāla, 68.
Phāla, 214. 232. 319.
Phāla, 42.
Phāla, 133. 134.
Buddha, awakened, enlightened),
27. 167. 241. 284.
— Sūtra, 244.
Buddha, 3. 56. 98. 102. 138. 184.
273. 283 ff.
— date of Buddha’s death, 217—
220. 287—288. 302.
— posterior (f), or prior, to Pāṇini,
3. 222. 305.
— lived in the Sūtra period, 290.
301 f.
— wife of, 318.
— and Kāṇḍa, 326.
Buddhagāya, 228. 273.
Buddhagāya, 292. 293. 326.
Buddhagāya, 267.
Buddhāsana, 236.
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buddhapāda, *sīkā, 305.
"sūdhu, 27.
— with grāhat, 129.
Buddha, 278. 282 (jur.).
Byākhyātādakā, 259. 260.
— janātika, 163.
Byāhat-Kathā, 213.
— Sanskritā, 203. 204. 259 ff. 271.
—.
Byāh Atri, 269.
— śāstra, 269.
— Aranyaka, 70. 71. 72. 73.
100. 119. 177 ff. 139. 155. 285.
286.
— uttaratāpani, 169.
— devatā, 24. 33. 41. 62. 81. 88.
114. 316.
— Yājñavalkya, 281.
Brihadāranya, 97. 98.
bhāṣā, 282.
Aj̥ñānā-nārāyanapānijnānād, 156. 157.
166.
— Maṇi, 279.
Bṛhaṣpati, 153 (Atharvan).
— Satī, 278. 280 (laghu), 326.
Baijāvāpi, 266 (med.), a. Vaija-
väpa.
Bodha, 236.
Bodhāyana, 322. 323.
Boddhistava, 298. 301. 307. 310.
Buddhās, 108. 158.
Buddhāyana, 100. 101. 102. 112.
114. 317. 324.
— Dhyana, 101. 102. 278.
brāhma-chāndrin, 28. 112. 123. 164.
— jālakṣātra, 300.
brāhmaṇāya, 166.
Brahmadatta, king, 138. 286 (three).
— 55 (comm.).
brāhmaṇa, etymology of, 11.
— neut., prayer, formula, 11. 149.
171. 242.
— māca, Supreme God, 6. 97. 151.
158. 161. 165. 167. 170. 197. 164;
with Viṣṇu and Rudra, 97, 164;
with Viṣṇu and Śiva, 167. 189.
— chief priest, 123. 149.
Brahma-pūra, 169.
— bandhook, 78. 79. 112. 141.
— śiśṭāloka, 240. 241 ff.
— vid, 161.
— vidyāpānijānād, 164.
— vidyāpānijānād, 99. 158. 165.
— vedah, 149. 150.
Brahmavaivarta-Purāṇa, 191.
— Siddhānta, 258.
— śāstra, 70. 96. 242 ff. 308. 322.
— kādyu, 125. 126.
Brahmārātri, 322. 323.
Brahmapānijānād, 160 ff.
brāhmaṇa Śrūṇasiddhānta, 259.
brāhmaṇa, neut. (appellative: 'ex-
planation,' 'section of a text'),
75. 93. 117. 124. 152.
— work, 8. 11-15. 76. 159. 176.
239. 240.
— māca, 111. 161 (nature of a Br.),
176 (two languages), 180 (na-
mīlabhā), 276.
— māca, 176.
Bṛha, 238.
Bhagadatta, 188.
Bhagavad-Gītā, 207.
Bhagavatam, 121. 153 (Atharvan),
160 (Aṅgiras), 169 (mahādesa),
284 (Buddha, etc.).
Bhagavatā, 193.
Bhātāghast, 293.
Bhāṭṭa, 42. 90. 91. 241; a. Bhās-
karaśātra.
Bhāṭṭa-nārāyanapānijnānād, 207.
Bhāṭṭi-kṣapya, 195.
Bhāṭṭopādi Dikṣita, 89. 226.
Bhāṭṭopāda, 242. 243. 258. 259 ff
Bhadātā, Bhadanta, 260.
Bhadrabāhusvāmin, 297.
Bhadraścina, 286.
Bhārata, son of Duleṣhanta, 125
— plur. 114. 125.
— 231 (rbet.), 272 (māca).
Bharatavadāmin, 42. 65. 79.
Bhāravādāyaka, 31. 162. 163 (Upas).
— (Kapilabhāsha), 265. 268 (med.)
Bhartṛjīyājna, 141.
Bhāllu, 95.
Bhāva, 178.
Bhāva, 121. 284.
Bhavabhūti, 159. 200. 205. 206.
207. 319.
Bhāvaśāmin, 42. 79. 91. 101.
Bhāsmajādāla, 163.
Bhāgavata, 238.
— Purāṇa, 191.
Bhāgavatītī, 130.
Bhūgūra, 62. 246.
Bhūgaṇṭāyana, 77.
Bhādmati, 322.
Bhārata, 56. 176. 185.
Bhāradvāja, 100-102 (Tattī.). 139.
140. 158 (Ath.). 271 (Droptī).
Bhāradvedīya-Sūtra, 100. 317.
Bhāravi, 196. 319.
Bhāruci, 323.
Bādramaṇḍi adhīt, 170.
Bhārgava, 150. 153. 159 (Vaśār-βāl).
Bhārgava, 250 (astrologer).
Bhālavānī, 14. 62. 81. 95. 134.
Bhālavēya, 95. 126. 134.
Bhāḷāṣyapāṇiḥsad, 95. 154. 164.
Bhāṣād, 57. 103. 144. 176. 177. 180.
Bhālakīn-Sūtra, 68. 95.
Bhālakīn-Sūtra, 176.
Bhāṣyāya, 56. 57. 144. 176.
Bhāṣā, Bhāṣaka, 205.
Bhāṣakara, 229. 261 ff.
— maṭrā, 42. 90. 91. 94. 101. 103.
171.
Bhāṣādīkaraṇa, 261.
Bhāṣād, 123. 305.
Bhāṣād, 305.
Bhāṣād, 123. 305.
Bhāṣād, kahaṇī, 284. 285. 305. 306.
327.
— Sūtra, 143. 252. 305. 306.
Bhāṣā, 259.
Bhāṣā, 125. 135.
Bhāṣā, 39.
Bhāṣā, 98.
Bhāṣā, 227. 263. 314. 317.
Bhāṣā, 73. 153. 241.
— saṭṭ, 94. 154. 156. 157.
Bhāṣā, 265. 270 (med.).
Bhāṣā, 305.
Bhāṣā, 152.
Bhāṣā, 42.
Bhāṣā, 105. 202 (more than one).
— 269 med.
— epidae, 269 (med.).
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 75. 76. 83. 84.
Bhāṣā, 304.
Bhāṣā, 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 244.
Bhāṣā, 188.
Bhāṣā, 40. 43.
Bhāṣā, 211.
Bhāṣā, 55.
Bhāṣā, 206.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 75. 76. 83. 84.
Bhāṣā, 304.
Bhāṣā, 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
Bhāṣā, 195. 209.
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Mahâmâra, 93.
Mahâdignâ-Sûtras, 98. 239.
Mahâbharata, 138.
Mahâbharatâ, 292. 293.
Mahâbhimânasûtra-mûlakâta, 155.
Mahâdeva-sûtra, 167.
Mahâvîrâ, 296 (Jain.).
Mahâvîrachâryâ, 207.
Mahâvîramitra, 70. 147.
Mahâvishnu-pasta-stra, 298 ff.
Mahâvyutpattidikâ, 248 (Buddh.).
Mahâdeva, 161.
Mahâdevasûtra, 217.
Mahâdeva, 48. 70.
Mahâbhûta, 114.
Mahâbharesha, 104. 107 ff., 116. 141.
Mahâbharata, 291. 292. 295.
Mahâdeva, 262 (astr.).
Mahâpandava, 154. 165.
Mahârâgâra, 302.
Mâgadha, 79.
— dâl, 79. 112. 141.
Mâgadha, 111. 112. 138. 147. 237.
Mâgadhi, 232 (Khit.).
— language, 285. 286. 287.
Mâghâkiyâ, 196.
Mâghavâra, 61.
Mââyâkâya, 53.
Mândakâ-Nâkel, 49. 61.
Mâlâi, 49. 55. 112.
Mârita, 107.
Mârî-âdâstra, 144.
Mârîva, 134.
Mârîrâ, 126.
Mârî, 126.
Mârî, 41. 42. 47. 116. 235. 241. 243. 245. 246. 262. — dâva, 42.
Mârî, 95. 166.
Mâdhukri, 133. 134.
Mâdhâ, 91.
mâdhyamâdhyamâ, southern, 106.
mâdhyamâdhyamâ, 10. 11. 105 ff. 134.
159. 143.
mâdhyamâdhyamâ, 105.
mâdhyamâdhyamâ, 106.
Mâdhâya, 309.
Mâdhyamika, 224.
Mânava, 134 (Saryûta).
Mânava, Mânava, 91. 102. 280. 285.
Mânava-Grhûya, 20. 102. 278. 317.
Mânava-Dharma-dâstra, 20. 277 ff.
Mânasastra, 275.
Mânusântâvayu, 134.
Mâya-sara, 275.
mâya, 284.
Mâyādâna, 284.
Mâya, 151. 203. 204.
Mâryanâ-Parâsû, 191. 206.
Mâryanâ-dâharma, 207. 320.
Mâyâ, 201. 214.
Mâyâ-vâdâbhyâ, 259.
Mâyâ-mâlaka, Mâya-skârapânâ, 204. 207.
Mâyâmârâstra, 167.
Mâyâkâ, 152.
Mâyâkâ, 152.
Mâyâkâ, 103.
Mâyâkâ, 281.
Mâyâkâ, 306.
Mâyâkâ, 261.
Mâyâkâ, 102. 240.
Mâyâkâ, 121. 159. 233. 239 ff.
Mâyâkâ, 240.
— Sûtra, 140. 239.
Mâyâkâ, 263 (Arab.).
Mâyâkâ, 263 (Arab.).
Mâyâkâ, 322.
Mâyâkâ, 167. 34 (and amukta).
Mâyâkâ, 155.
Mâyâkâ, 226.
Mâyâkâ, 55.
Mâyâkâ, 134.
Mâyâkâ, 134.
Mâyâkâ, 58. 138 ff. 240.
Mâyâkâ, 164.
Mâyâkâ, 264 (Arab.).
Mâyâkâ, 207.
Mâyâkâ, 129.
Mâyâkâ, 264 (Arab.).
Mâyâkâ, 154.
Mâyâkâ, 147.
Mâyâkâ, 224. 225.
Mâyâkâ, 297 (Jain.).
mâyâkâ, 264 (Arab.).
Mâyâkâ, 200. 205. 206. 207.
Mâyâkâ, 305. 320.
Mâyâkâ, 167.
Mâyâkâ, 179.
Mâyâkâ, 179.
Mâyâkâ, 170.
Mâyâkâ, 198. 204. 208. 209.
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Rājāyanputra, 71, 77, 79.
Rājāyanvāyas, 65, 79, 84.
Rājā, 61.
Rāma, 135, 168, 192.
— as incarn. of Viṣṇu, 194.
— Anūpavasīni, 134.
Rāmakrishna, 85, 143.
Rāmāchandra, 59.
Rāmadantapayopaniṣadḥ, 168.
Rāmānītha, 323.
Rāmānutra, 168, 322.
Rāmānanda, 168.
Rāmḍagya, 4, 37, 89, 98, 135, 188.
— 191 ff. 205, 206, 214, 259, 324.
Rāmila, 205.
Rāvana (comm.), 42, 66.
Rājarajasadhāna, 196.
Rāju, 73, 249, 250.
Rāhula, 250.
rūtīs (varieties of style), 232.
Rucchidatta, 323.
Rudra, 6, 40, 97, 110, 123, 159.
— 170, 171, 238, 303.
— by the side of Brahman and Viṣṇu, 97, 161.
— jubilo, 163.
Rudrāsa, 322.
Rudrādatta, 101.
Rudrāsakanda, 80, 84.
Rudrāsakajābāla, 163.
Rudrapaniṣadḥ, 154, 170.
rāga (coll.), 205.
Ruyyaka, 322.
Rṣpuḍikhaṇa, 142.
rerew, 248.
Rvā, 123.
Romaka, 253, 324.
— pura, 253.
— riddhalala, 253, 254, 258, 260.
romabāpa, 253.
Raunyaka, 253.
Raunyānūya, 120.
*Lakṣmaṇa, 265.
Lakṣmiḍhara, 262 (astr.), 323.
Lagadābhāya, 61, 249.
Lagata, *ābha, 61, 249, 258.
Laghu, 250.
— Atri, 269 (med.).
— Āryabhata, 257.
— Kaumudī, 256.
— Jñatana, 78, 260.
— Ḫidāla, 163.
— Pardāra, 280 (jur.).
— Brīhaspati, 280 (jur.).
— Saunaka, 280 (jur.).
Lampā, 78.
Lahita-Vistarā, 199, 236, 256, 286.
— 291, 299, 300.
Lāgbhula, 250.
Lāha, 76, 258.
Lāṭikā, 76.
Lāṭ (śrī), 232.
Lāṭyāyaṇa, 53, 68, 76–79, 84, 105.
Lāṅgaḥkāra, 61, 258.
— *niṣa, 14, 99.
Likhita, 326 (Śrīpiṇī).
Lāṅga-Purṇa, 191.
Līchhavis, 276, 277, 285.
Lipi, 221.
Liptā, 235 (Greek).
Līdetā, 262 (art.).
Lega, 254 (Greek).
Lōja (laṣṭikā), 246.
Lokoprajāta, 321.
Lokākāsa, 246.
Lōgaṇa, 236.
Lōgoda, 78.
Lōka, 78.
Laukākāha, 96.
Laukākāja, 246.
Laukākāka, 99, 102, 103, 139, 317.
— Śūtra, 99.
Patañjala, 236.
— 134.
— mārītṛ, 113.
— Brāhmaṇa, 42, 74, 75, 79–84.
Vajra, 260.
Vajrayanāka, 167.
Vajrāyogopaniṣadḥ, 162.
Vādhava, 56.
Vatsa, 3.
Veda (ṣ), 148.
vadiśar, 180.
Vayuvidyā, 265.
Varadatta, 55.
Vārāndāra, 76, 83 (Ved.), 226 (gr.).
Vārāruchi, 200, 202, 230 (Vikrama);
83 (Pāṇini–Śūtra), 103 (Pāṇini–
Prāti.), 206, 227 (Prākṛta-pra-
khā), 223 (udṛkti.), 227, 230 (lex.).
— 203, 204, 243, 254, 259 ff. 268.
— 275, 279.
Varuṇa, 35, 188.
varga, 31.
varga, 25, 31.
— Śūtra, 227.
vṛjakāla, 246.
Vardhamāna, 226.
Vāraka, 217.
Valabhi, 196. 214. 256.
Valabandha, 196. 207.
"vātī", 93. 157.
Valhihka, 123. 134.
Valhihka, 147.
Vāsā (-Uśnāra), 45.
Vasāhatha, 31. 37. 53. 79. 123. 162.
— siddhānta, 258.
— śaśāsana, 258.
— śāṣṭra, 326.
Vasagupta, 322.
Vāsas, 303.
śāntakāmśya, 121. 122. 127.
Vāṣyapadīya, 225. 226.
Vāgbhata, 269 (med.).
— vidhānta, 269.
vidhānta, 74. 176. 234.
— (pāda), 180.
Vānhakmavī, 36. 129.
Vāschatamatiśa, 246. 322.
vidyā, 104.
vidyāpatra, 54.
Vājāśrayasā, 157.
vidyāsūri, 104.
Vājāsanaṇya, 104. 128. 130. 131.
Vājāsanayaka, 100. 105. 144.
Vājāsanayi-Samhātā, 317 (conclusion in the forty-eighth Śāṅk. Par.)
Vājāsanayinī, 81. 105.
vidyāṇ, 104.
Vāṃcheśvara (I), 101.
vidū, 266.
Vāṭaitaptra, 71. 138. 285.
— etsityā, 138.
Vāṭayā, 139. 140. 267.
Vāṭayāyana, 244. 245 (phil.), 266. 267 (erot.), 323.
— Pañcāhaparna, 267.
Vāṭhanā (I), 100.
ednagratha, 28. 164.
Vāṃnakalakāhyana, 120.
Vāmałow, 31. 315.
Vāmanas, 15. (Sāman.), 226. 227
(gr.), 282 (rhet.), 322.
Vāmanarāthis, 140.
Vāndgāt, 162. 163.
śrādrāmamitra, 168.
Vṛndavapativāndha, 94.
Vārkal, 32. 133.
Vārkalisa, 33.
vārāṭika, 222. 225.
Vārāhagāna, 77.
Vāraḥṣa, 133.
Vāraḥṣa, 133.
Vārābhāṣya, 53.
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Vissalagrahamottaramäld, 291.
Vivárasnä, 144.
Vivárasnäsilasal, 260.
Vivárasnäsilasal, 19, 36, 18, 38.
— p. 38.
Viváksamatta, 207.
Vivála, 48.
Vivála, 245.
Vivákarman, 275 (Pramyaśila).
Vivākarmaspraväda, 275.
Vivákara, 205.
Viváranätha, 244 (phil).
Vivárcaka, 148.
Vivávastava, 31, 37, 38, 53, 515.
162 (Upam.). 271 (Dāsānuśa).
Vivávastava, 169 (comm).
Vivácaridya, 265.
Vivāhu, 4, 42, 97, 126, 127, 136.
165, 166, 167, 168, 171, 190, 194.
284.
— with Rudra and Brahma, 97.
— with Śiva and Brahma, 167.
180.
Vivānagupta, 260.
Vivānagupta, 258.
Vivānagupta, 59.
Vivānagupta, 58, 142, 191, 230.
318.
Vivānagupta, 32.
Vivānacarya, 184.
Vivānacarya, 262.
Vivānacarya, 214.
Vivānacarya, 253.
Vivānacarya, 199, 319.
Vivānacarya, 293.
Vivānacarya, 91, 222.
Vivānacarya, 302.
Vivānacarya, 280.
— Atrey, 269 (med.).
— Gunga, 153, 253.
— Gungsana, 205, 281 (jur).
— dyumma, 136.
— Pundara, 280 (jur).
— Bhūja, 269 (med.).
— Manu, 270.
— Yajnavalkya, 281.
— Vagbhata, 269 (med.).
— Sāvatra, 259 (med.).
— Hārīta, 269 (med.).
— vihāra, n. bhikhu.
Vṛ families, 185.
Vṛshaśvāra, 207.
Vṛshaśvārā, 200.
Vṛshaliśavātakati, 214, 215.
— Veda, 8, 23, 58, 144, 176, 244.
— (triple).
— Ākād, 93.
— Veddāraṇa, 25, 60, 145, 159, 258, 272.
— vedāntavism, 149.
— Veddāsara, 48, 51, 158, 161, 162, 240.
245.
— saṅkhyāprabha, 232.
— adda, 323.
245, 322 f.
— Vedāntakrama, 315.
— Vagada (I), 64.
— adda, 255 (Greek).
— sārāka, 177.
— Vākānasa, 100, 275, 317.
— Vāchātra, 156.
— Vājāra, 142.
— Vājānāyaka, 152.
— Vājānāyaka (vīr), 232.
— Vājānāyaka, 159 (Buddhavājā).
— Vājānāyaka, 276.
— Vājānāyaka, 256, 270.
— Vājānāyaka, 309.
— Vājānāyaka, 26.
— Vājānāyaka, 106.
— Vājānāyaka, 106.
— Vājānāyaka, 184.
— Vājānāyaka, 34, 41, 56, 57, 58.
— Vājānāyaka, 37, 86, 93, 135, 184.
— Vājānāyaka, 236, 237.
245.
— Vājānāyaka, 216, 244, 245.
— Vājānāyaka, 124.
— Vājānāyaka (Makkha), 127.
— Vājānāyaka, 236.
— Vājānāyaka, 226.
— Vājānāyaka, 25 (Aśa), 83.
— sūtra, 215.
— Budhā, 300.
— Budhar, 176.
— Budhāda, 122, 127.
— Vājānāyaka, 106.
— Vājānāyaka, 259.
— Vājānāyaka, 227, 228, 321.
— Vājānāyaka, 176.
— Vājānāyaka, 93, 184, 185.
240, 243.
— Budhā, 243.
— father of Sūka, 243.
— author of the Sāntarudra, 111.
— 62 (teacher of Shadgurūsiha).
— (Śrīvatsa), 283, 326.
— Sūtra, 243.
— Vrāj, 169.
Śākyānanda, 52, 163, 164, 170.
Śāntanu, 39.
Śāharavāmin, 241, 322.
Śabala, 35.
Śākoldūndāsena, 217, 227.
Śambhuputra, 71.
Śantyukta, 313.
Śāryāsa, 134.
Śāva, 176.
Śāvaravarman, 226.
Śāturā, 218.
Śastra, canon, 14, 32, 67, 121.
Śākābudāsana, 217, 227.
Śākoldūndāsena, 217, 227.
Śākoldūndakāna, 217, 227.
Śākārya, 53, 143, 151, 152, 217, 222, 226.
Śākapāti, 85.
Śākala, 32, 33, 62, 313, 314, 315.
— (Ságala), 306.
Śākalya, 10, 32, 33, 34, 50 (two Śākalya), 56, 143 (gramm.), 163.
— Vaidūthika, 33, 129.
Śākalyapramāṇād, 163, 167.
Śākānyana, 33, 96, 120, 133, 137, 285.
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sunaphá, 255 (Greek).
Sundardhipapamapanahad, 171.
Suparna, 34.
Supradhivyáda, 174.
Suparshu, 134.
Suprabhadra, 196.
Subandhu, 189, 213, 245, 267, 319.
Subhagasa, 251.
Subhadra, 114, 115-116.
Subhadhadaitrakaraka, 320.
Subhadhadśrīdevī, 320.
Sumenaśantakā (l), 208.
Sumanta, 56, 57, 58, 149.
Sure, 92, 302, 303.
Sureśhira, 76.
Sureśha, 56.
Sureśhā, 56.
Sūrarahavas, 36.
Svairā, 266.
Svairata, 260 ff., 324.
— śṛiddhā, 269.
śākta, 31-32, 124, 149.
śāta, 111.
Śātāra, 8, 15 (śtyūmol.; śāhāndevat); 29, 55, 56, 216, 285, 290.
— 127, 128 (passages in the Bṛhad-
mayas).
— 290, 292, 296, 298 ff. (Buddh.),
śūradrā, 198, 275.
Śūrya, 62 (comm.).
Śūrya, 42 (god).
— prayagnāt, 297 (Jain.).
— Śūradhanta, 61, 249, 257, 258.
— śṛopārnāt, 154, 170.
(saptak) śṛyā, 250 (249).
Śūryadra (Śuṛīt), 280.
Śrījaya, 123, 132.
Śētuśāntaka, 196.
Śāltara, 61.
Śalindhavas, śārayanas, 147.
sobha, śogarāka, 198.
Soma, 6, 63 (god).
— (sacifice), 66, 108.
Somadeca, 213, 319.
Sūhānandan, 322.
Somāshvāra, 273 (mus.).
Śaujāta, 283.
Śauti, 34.
Śautrāntikā, 309.
Savitrīmargā, 107, 108, 118, 139.
savāhikā, 198; a śavāhikā.
Śauśnāppu, 134.
Śauvālī, 204, 205.
Śauvārīdhantā, 258.
sauvādhanś śrīdhanmāṇi, 56, 95.
Śauvāvavas, 105.
Śauvāvatprathavas, 266.
Śakī, 72.
— Pūrṇa, 191, 205.
Śakasvāmi, 41, 42, 79.
Śekmadopanahad, 171.
śukkā, śubhā, 233.
śūdra, 67.
śūmat, 67, 91.
śūmabhāka, 63.
śūpavas, 77, 102, 305.
śūrdraka, 89.
Śpadadhana, 322.
Śpūraśccbāva, 258.
Śpūraścīddanta, 259.
Śmaradakāna, 208.
Śmatra-Śātrav, 17, 19, 34 (Saun.),
101.
Śreyā, 17, 19, 20, 81.
— Śātravas, 20, 84, 143, 276.
Śrugaha, 237.
Śravaparīdhādā, 83.
Śūradhā, 8, 92, 144.
śūradhivāca, 309.
śūrdmāna, 79.
Śvāyambhūva, 277.
Śvāyamānya, 34.
Śuṣpadopanahad, 166.
Śuṣpadopanahad, 164, 165.
Śuddha, 263 (Arabic).
Śunumra, 272.
Śunuṣandafaka, 203.
Śāradatta, 89, 278.
Śārī, 166 (Vishṇu), 303 (Indra).
Śārī, 225, 226 (grnat).
Śurjya, 255 (Greek).
Śurīvaka, 34, 189.
Śurīvanda, 184.
Śurīvandha, 72, 79, 139.
Śūrīharamśīra, 142.
Śrī Harāhā (king), 204, 207.
— 106 (Nārāyanaśāh).
— ścarkā, 205, 314, 319 f.
Śrī Hala, 145.
Śrīśrī, 192.
Śalīvudha, 60 (mus.), 196, 237 (lex.).
Śaśa, 112.
Śasthaśa, 117.
Śārīvadānaka, 83.
Śārīvadānaka, 83.
Śāraśchātra (Krshaṇa), 30.
— 269, 69 (med.).
— śūrdā, 269 (med.).
— (Dharma), 278, 282, 325.
Śāra, 83, 311, 322.
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Abydous, 254.
Ahirman (and Māra), 303, 304.
Akbar, 283.
Albrectus, 60, 189, 202, 239, 249.
253, 254, 257-262, 266, 274, 323.
Alexander, 4, 6, 27, 28, 30, 179.
221, 222, 251.
Alexandria, 256, 309.
Alexandrinus (Paulus), 253.
Algebra, 256, 259.
Alkindi, 263.
'Aμπειρισμα, 251.
Amulet-prayers, 208.
Amyntas, 306.
Amygdal, 255.
Andrubal, 255.
Animal fablia, 70, 211 ff., 301.
Antigonus, 179, 252.
Antiochus, 179, 252.
Aphrodisius (f), 258.
'Aρμοδιος, 254.
Aρδελλα, 255.
Apollophanes, 188.
Apollophonus of Tyana, 252.
Apostelynamata, 289.
— Arabic astronomical terms, 263-264.
— commercial intercourse of the Indians with Arabia, 220.
— Arabian figures, 256.

Arabs: medicine, 266, 270, 271.
— music, 273.
— philosophy, 239.
Arphámades, 256.
Aronarius, 250.
Aρχαίον, 254.
Arim, Arin, coupole d', 257.
Aristotelis, 234.
Aristomenes, 250.
Arjabahr, 255, 259.
Arsund, 259.
Arrian, 4, 106, 136.
Araoaidan Parsihiana, 188.
Ara amandii, 267.
Astarte, 257.
Avesta, 6, 30, 148 (Indian names of its parts), 302.
— and Buddhism, 327.
Avicenna, 271.
Babrius, 211.
Babylon, 2, 247.
Bactria, 207; u. Valhika.
Bagdad, 255, 270.
Ball, island of, 189, 195, 208.
Bardessen, 309.
Bartlam, 307.
Baskar, 262, 263.
Baskës, Basili, 306.
Basilides, 309.
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Baali, 251.
Beatific, 211 ff. 301.
Bengali recensions, 194. 206. 208.
Bhadra mātra, 292. 294. 295.
Bhiṣañī, 211.
Blessed, world of the, 50. (73).
Bōhti, 309.
Boothius, 257.
Bozyaśśa, 23. 30.
Buddhism, Buddhista, 3. 4. 20. 22.
27. 78. 79. 99. 111. 138. 151. 165.
205. 220. 236. 247. 276. 277. 280.
283 ff.
Buddhist nun, 281.
Bundeshah, 247. 323.
Cesar, 183.
Caste, 10. 18. 78. 79. 110. 111. 161.
178. 237. 289. 290. 301. 306.
Ceylon, 192. 283. 291. 293. 295.
— medicines in, 257.
Chaldæans, astronomy, 248 (Xa-
rust).
Chaoa, 233.
Chiao, 275.
Chinese lunar asterisms, 247. 248
(Kio-liang).
— statements on the date of Ka-
nakha, 287.
300. 301 (Buddhi).
— travellers, a. Fa Hian, Huan
Thian.
Χριστιανός (Κομήθρος), 255.
Christian influences, 71. 189. 238.
300. 307.
— ritual, influences of Buddhist ri-
tual and worship on (and vice
versa), 307.
— sects, Indian influence on, 239.
309.
Chronicon Paschale, 255.
Clmoxu αλεξανδρίνος, 306.
Coin, 205 (nāpaka), 229 (dindra).
Commentaries, text secured by
means of, 181.
Comparative mythology, 35. 36.
Constantius, 255.
Creation, 233. 234.
Credal-formulas, 166.
Curīux, 136.
Cycles, quinquennial and sexennial,
113. 247.
Dama, 252.
Dancing, 196 ff.
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Fortunatus, praise of, 264-265.
Fox, in Fable, 211, 212.
Gamma, gamm, 272 (mus.).
Ganges, 4, 38.
— mouths of, 193, 248.
Geometry, 256.
Ginungga gap, 233.
Girnar, 179, 295.
Gnosticism, 239, 309.
Gobar figures, 256.
Gods, images, statues of, 273, 274.
— language of, the, 176.
— triad of: Agni, Indra, and Sūrya, 40, 63 (A., L., and Soma);— Brahman, Rudra, and Vishnu, 97, 161, 167 (Siva), 180 (Siva), 277.
Gnats, 203, 215, 251.
Greek female slaves, 203, 251, 252.
— monarchies of Bactria, 188, 207.
— words, 254, 255.
Groes : Greek Architecture, 274.
(three styles in India).
— Astronomy, 153, 243, 249, 251 ff.
— Commerce with India, 252.
— Drama, 207.
— Fables, 211.
— God of Love, 252, 274 (l).
— Influence upon India generally, 251 ff.
— Medicine, 268, 324, 325.
— Philosophy, 220, 221, 234.
— Sculpture, 273.
— Writing, 221.
Guido d’Arezzo, 272.
Gujarāt, 139, 179, 207, 251.
Gymnosophists, 137.
'Halon', 254.
'Hrāṣṭa, 6, 136, 186, 234.
Hermes, 255.
Heretics, 98.
'Hom', 254.
Homer, Indian, 186, 188.
— Homeric cycle of legend, 194.
'Orōn', 254.
'Orūn', 255.
Hindustan, 4, 6, 10, 18, 38, 39, 70.
— 187, 192, 283, 296.
Hiūn Tsang, 217 ff., 287, 300.
Humours, the three, 266.
Hiṣāra, 36.
'Hydrata, 254.
'Hydros, 254.
'Iōs, 28, 48.
'Iyōsin', 255.
Ibn Abi Usâlabah, 266.
Ibn Baithar, 266.
'Łač', 254.
Immigration of the Aryas into Hindustan, 38, 39.
Indo-Scythians, 220, 285.
Indus, 10, 37, 38, 218, 285.
Inheritance, law of, 278, 279.
Initial letters of names employed to denote numbers, 236; to mark the seven musical notes, 272.
Inscriptions, 183, 215, 228.
Intercalary month, 247, 262 (three in the year!).
Invincible cap, 264.
Jackal and lion in Fable, 211, 212.
Java, island of, 189, 195, 208, 229.
Jōlda, 253.
Jēlāngir, 253.
Jensahid, 36.
Kabul, 3, 179.
Kafu (kapi), 3.
Kāgyur, 291, 294, 326.
Kāhāna, 317.
Kalkavās, 36.
Kai Khoārā, 36.
Kallab and Damnag, 320.
Kalila wa Dimna, 212.
Kalamauck translations, 291.
Kāndāsādana, 93, 283.
Kambojas, 178.
Kāndāsāna, 178.
Kangar translation, 189.
Kaneri, 292.
Kankh, 269.
Kava U, 36.
Kavi languages, origin of name, 195.
— translations, 318 (date of), 325.
Keeping secret of doctrines, 49.
Kerāk, 255.
Kētra, 254, 255.
Kē:rē, 3.
Kē:rē, 35.
Kē<kā<, 302.
Kio-list, 248.
Kēlōpes, 254.
Kē<phē, 3.
Kē<phē, 3.
Ke<ři, 254.
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Aberd., 254.
Agra, 76, 258.
Lab, 249, 258.
League-books, 264.
As, 254.
Arr, 255.
Lion and jackal (fox), 211, 212.
Longest day, length of the, 247.
Love, God of, 252, 274.
Lunar mansions, 2, 30, 90, 92, 148.
226, 246-249, 252, 255, 281.
304.
— phases, 281.
Maandurel, 10, 106.
Magas, 179, 252.
Magia, art of, 264, 265.
Magie mirror, 264.
— ointmont, 264.
Mahomed of Ghana, 253.
Mairya (and Maria), 303.
Malacca, 222.
Manes, 309.
Manes, sacrifice to the, 55, 93, 106, 118.
Manetho, 260.
Mansions, twelve, 254, 281 (astr.).
Manuscripts, late date of, 181, 182 (oldest).
Mead-Ravia, 75.
Mazala-koth, Mazakoth, 248.
Medicine in Ceylon, 267; in India, 324, 325.
Megassthenes, 4, 6, 10, 20, 27, 48; 70, 88, 106, 136, 137, 186, 234, 251.
Meherdates, 183.
Menander, 224, 251, 306.
Mendels, 323 (in Sogd.),
Mendicancy, religious, 237.
Mesopotamia, 255.
Metheimpsychosis, 234.
Missionaries, Buddhist, 290, 307.
Migras, derv, mazand, 20.
Mongolism, system of, 307.
Monasteries, 274, 281.
Mongolian translations, 291.
Mundane ages (four), 247; a. Yuga.
Music, modern Indian; 325.
Musical scale, 272.
Mysteries, 197, 198.
Mythology, Comparative, 35, 36.
Names, chronology from, 29, 53.
— of the letters of the alphabet in their order, 222.
Numerical notation by means of letters, 257, 324.
— Symbols, 256.
Nabho, 212.
Omens, 69, 152, 254.
Ophir, 3.
Oral tradition, 12 ff., 22, 48.
Orodes, 73.
Orissa, 179, 274.
Ossib, 201.
Odensæ, 35.
'Orphos, 252 (a. Arin).
'Orphoidæm, 222.
Pahlav, 188.
Pahlaví, translation of Panishtastra into, 212, 267.
Pali redaction of the Amar-Kosha, 230.
— of Manu's Code, 279.
Parveta, 136, 137, 186.
Panjád, 2, 3, 4, 88, 207, 248, 251, 309.
Panthéon, 242.
Parmávétas, 254.
Parthians, 4, 188, 318.
Paris, parsiv, 323.
Pavuli, 285.
Paulus Alexandrinus, 253, 255.
— al Yúsuní, 253.
Picocka, exportation of, to Baveru, 2, 3.
Periplus, 4, 6.
Permutations, 256.
Perso—Aryan, 6, 133, 148, 178.
Persians, 3, 4, 274 (arch.)
— translation of the Upanishads, 155.
— Veda, 36, 148.
Personal deity, 165, 166.
Persepolis, 268.
Persia, 255.
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Philosopher's Ride,' 291.
Philolaus, 252.
Phoebus Apollo, 273 (type of).
Phoenicians, their commercial relations with India, 2, 3, 248.
Photoloulo, 218.
Phoenins, 218.
— Greek order of the, 319, 323, 326.
Plato (Bactrian king), 273.
Pliny, 136.
Plutarch, 306.
Polar star, 98.
Popular dialects, 6, 175-180.
Prayen, 28, 244.
Pros-e-writing arrested in its development, 183.
Ptolemaios, 252, 274 (astr.).
Ptolemy, 179, 251, 252 (two).
— 130 (geog.).
Quinquennial cycle, 113, 247.
Quotations, text as given in, 182, 279.
Rgya Cher Rol Pa, 185, 291.
Rhazes, 271.
Rock-inscriptions, 179.
Rosary, 307.
Zardokwston, 217, 223.
Zangdak, 28.
Scale, musical, 272.
Schools, great number of Vedice, 142.
Seleucos, 4.
Semitic origin of Indian writing, 15.
— of the Beast-fable, 211, 212.
Serapion, 271.
Seven musical notes, 150, 272.
Sindia, 255, 259.
Sinhala, translations, 292.
Sokkitk, 254.
Sokkub, 309.
Snake, 302.
Solar year, 246, 247.
Solomon's time, trade with India in, 3.
Zangsha, 251.
Speculum man, 258.
Squaring of the circle, 256.
Stoopes, 274, 306.
Stone-building, 274.

Strabo, 6, 27, 28, 30, 244, 246.
Style, varieties of, distinguished by names of provinces, 232.
Succession of existence, 259, 301.
Sufi philosophy, 239.
Swaroop, 255.
Sun's two journeys, stellar limits of the, 98.
Speech of Gorkha, 76.
Surgery, 260, 270.
Tandjir, 209, 210, 226, 230, 246, 267, 276.
Tausen, 254.
Tashkora, many, quoted, 30, 77.
Texts, uncertainty of the, 181, 182, 224, 225.
Thousand-name-prayers, 208.
Tirthankars, 3, 4.
Tungas, 254.
Transcribers, mistakes of, 181.
Translations, a, Arabs, Chinese, Kalmuck, Kandressa, Kawi, Mongolian, Pahlavi, Pali, Persian, Singhalese.
Transmigration of souls, 73, 288.
Tripus, 255.
Trojan cycle of legend, 194.
Tukshil, poteck, 3.
Valentinean, 309.
Venus with dolphin (and Cupid), 325.
Vernaculars, 175-180, 203.
Veterinary medicine, 267.
Weights, 160, 269.
Writing, 10, 13, 151—of the Yanasa, 221.
— consignment to, 22, 144, 181, 292, 295.
Written language, 173 ff.
Yabhis, 56, 302.
Yima, 36.
Yasa, Yuda, Buda, 307.
Zoro, 255.
Zeus, 35.
— planet, 254.
Zodiacal signs, 96, 229, 249, 254.
255, 257.
Zohak, 36.
Zoroastrians, 254.
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Ambrose, 272.
Ananda Chandra, 58. 68. 79.
Anquetil du Perron, 52. 96. 154. 155. 162.
Balasatrin, 223. 226. 237. 322. 323.
Ballantyne, 223. 226. 235. 237. 244.
Bapu Deva Satrin, 258. 262.
Barth, 257. 316. 321.
Barthelemy St. Hilaire, 235.
Bayley, 304.
Beal, 293. 300. 309. 327.
Benary, P., 195.
Benfey, 15. 22. 43. 44. 64. 66. 117. 157. 212. 221. 267. 272. 274. 301. 306. 320.
Bentley, 257. 267.
Bergaigne, 44.
Bernouilli, 325.
Bertrand, 202.
Bhagavan Indrajal, 324.
Bhavaya Vijaya, 327.
Bhagavata, 60. 150. 215. 219. 224. 319. 321. 326.
Bickell, 320.
Blake, 247. 248.
Bird, 215.
Von Bohlen, 272.
Bollens, 44.
Bopp, 178. 189.
Boyd, 207.
Breit, 4. 36.
Breckhaus, 213. 252.
Brownrig, 84.
Burnell, 3. 13. 45. 20. 22. 42. 61. 65. 69. 74. 83. 90. 91. 94. 101. 102. 103. 150. 155. 163. 164. 170. 171. 178. 203. 213. 215. 217. 222. 224. 226. 245. 256. 270. 313. 316. 321.
Cantor, 324.
Cappeller, 226. 232. 320.
Carey, 194.
Chandra Bhatta Tarkalankara, 84.
Childers, 178. 293. 295. 305. 308. 326.
Clarac, Comte de, 325.
Clough, 293.
Coomara Svamy, 293.
Cowall, 42. 43. 59. 52. 91. 97. 98. 99. 207. 227. 234. 235. 237. 238. 242. 256. 283. 321. 322.
Cox, 36.
Cunningham, 178. 203. 215. 273. 274.
D'Alwis, 293.
Darmesteter, J., 314.
David, 267.
De Gubernatis, 36.
Delbrück, 31. 44. 318.
Garder de Riaule, 3.
Dhanapati Silahari, 327.
Dickson, 326.
Dietz, 267.
Donner, 19. 44.
Downs, 141. 203. 215.
Dümlchen, 3.
Dumker, 308.
D'Eckstein, 97.
Elliot, H. M., 239. 257.
Elliot, W., 154. 155.
Paksha, 189. 194.
Faustöll, 293. 304. 326.
Forer, 188. 291. 293. 299.
Ferguson, 203. 215. 272.
Fleet, 319. 321.
Flügel, 270.
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Olahansen, 4. 188. 318.
Patterson, 273.
Pavia, 198.
Peters, 40. 60.
St. Petersburg Dictionary, 16. 104. 108. 112. 141. 265. 305.
Pterech, 206-208. 257. 295. 320. 321.
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