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Whenever the demand is made or an agitation takes place for the imposition of a ban on cow-slaughter, certain highly placed persons, out of ignorance or misunderstanding, publish articles in newspapers and magazines in which an effort is made to prove and establish that cow-slaughter was prevalent in Vedic India and beef was also taken. They give stray quotations in their articles from religious scriptures. Simple persons get confused on reading these articles. From time to time, scholars have clarified the position by correct interpretation of such quotations in Hindi, but these interpretations have not been available at one place, nor have they been published in those newspapers and/or magazines in which the misleading articles are published. Such clarifications have been collected and published in this book for the general benefit of all those who are interested in this question and who would like to know the true position.

Certain friends desired further clarifications on some issues and these are given in a ‘Supplement’ at the end of this book. Indication has been given with each clarification as to its proper place in the original article. We believe the readers will not find any difficulty in connecting the clarification with the context.

The work of collection and clarification has been done by Sri Jaidayal Dalmia with the co-operation of some scholars for which we are grateful to them. This is an English version of the Hindi original. The printing has been done at Delhi. Certain printing mistakes might have crept in as the publication has been hurried. Any such shortcomings brought to our notice by the readers would be looked into and corrected in the next edition.

(v)
In respect of any of the articles in this book, if any scholar brings to our notice any further new and/or strong argument in support of the contentions established therein, the same shall receive due consideration for being included suitably in the next edition.

We hope that this book will be useful in removing from the minds of the general public, such doubts as have crept in their minds by the misleading articles tendentiously written by certain persons.

Any writer and/or publisher desirous of utilizing any matter in this book for propagation is fully authorized to do so without seeking our permission.

Our efforts in this book are motivated only by the desire to bring the truth to light by removing wrong impressions created by misleading articles. There is no intention to cast any aspersion on any person. In spite of this, if anything appears otherwise, we earnestly beg to be excused.

Publisher

(vi)
GANDHIJI'S SOUND ADVICE

In my opinion the economic side of the cow question, if it is properly handled, automatically provides for the delicate religious side. Cow slaughter should be and can be made economically impossible, whereas unfortunately of all the places in the world it is the sacred animal of the Hindus which has become the cheapest for slaughter. To this end I suggest the following;

(1) The State should in the open market buy out every cattle offered for sale by out-bidding every other buyer.

(2) The State should run dairies in all principal towns ensuring a cheap supply of milk.

(3) The State should run tanneries where the hides, bones, etc., of all dead cattle in its possession should be utilised, and should offer to buy again in the open market all private-owned dead cattle.

(4) The State should keep model cattle-farms and instruct the people in the art of breeding and keeping cattle.

(5) The State should make liberal provision for pasture land and import the best experts in the world for imparting a knowledge of the science of cattle to the people.

(6) There should be a separate department created for the purpose, and no profit should be made in the department, so that the people may receive the full benefit of every improvement that might be made in the different breeds of cattle and other matters pertaining to them.

The foregoing scheme presupposes the State upkeep of all old, maimed and diseased cattle. This no doubt constitutes a heavy burden, but it is a burden which all States, but above all a Hindu State, should gladly bear.

My own study of the question leads me to think that the running of scientific dairies and tanneries would enable the State to cover the expenses of the upkeep of cattle, that have become economically useless, apart from the manure they yield, and to sell at market rates leather, leather goods, milk and milk products, besides many other things that can be manufactured from dead cattle, and which today, owing to want of scientific knowledge or false sentiment, are practically going to waste, or from which greatest advantage is not received.

(Young India, dated 7-7-1927)


(vii)
NO COMPROMISE ON COW-SLAUGHTER WITH MUSLIM LEAGUE BY MAHATMA GANDHI

The Congress was holding its annual session in Madras in December, 1927. We were staying in the house of Śrinivāsa Iyengar. Our host prepared a draft-resolution concerning Hindu-Muslim unity, and brought it to Bapu for his approval. Bapu had at that time withdrawn from active politics, and was devoting himself heart and soul to khādi work. When the draft was placed in his hands, he said: “I am prepared to agree to anything, to any conditions, that will bring about a settlement between Hindus and Muslims. Where is the need to show this to me?” However, in deference to the wishes of its author, he cast a cursory look over it and said: “it will do.”

Bapu went to sleep soon after evening prayer, and awoke at an unearthly hour the next morning. He also awakened Mahadevbhai. Hearing their voices I, too, awoke. Bapu said: “I have committed a grave error. I did not read that draft properly last evening. I just said, without due consideration, that it was all right. But in the night, I suddenly remembered that, that draft gave a general permission to the Mussulmans to slaughter cows, and the question of cow-protection was conveniently ignored! How can I bear this? If they slaughter cows, we cannot stop them by force, it is true, but we can at least win their trust by loving service and explain our point of view to them, can’t we? As for me, not even to win Swaraj will I renounce my principle of cow-protection! Go and tell those people at once that I do not accept that settlement! No matter what the consequences, I will not be a party to cow-slaughter!”

(Glimpse No. 78, from the “Stray Glimpses of Bapu” (Second edition, August 1960) written by Kakasahib Kalelkar, published by Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad-14)
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INTRODUCTION

It has been seen that for the last 100 years foreigners as well as some scholars of our own country are trying to prove from the Scriptures of Sanatana Dharma that during the Vedic period not only ordinary meat, but beef was taken. Beef eating was not only customary, but it was an essential item. Let us consider the background of such investigations and their propagation.

During the British period, when it was discovered that beef tallow was being applied in cartridges, mutiny broke out in the army during the year 1857. Since then, the Britishers were anxious to remove the feeling of reverence for the cow from the minds of the Hindus. With this object in view, they provided that European scholars become proficient in Sanskrit and ultimately mis-interpret the Scriptures of Sanatana Dharma, and the results of these so-called findings were propagated with ulterior motives. In support of this, please read the article entitled ‘Western Indologist—A Study in Motives’ appended to this book.

Our countrymen were also utilised to find out such instances from the Scriptures of Sanatana Dharma as would wipe out from the Hindu mind the feeling of reverence for the cow and also the feeling that it is unkillable. It appears that the first Indian victim to this stratagem was Raja Rajendra Lala Mitra. He was born in 1822. It is said that he belonged to a Vaishnava family of Bengal. His essay ‘Beef in Ancient India’ was first published in the year 1872, i.e. fifteen years after the mutiny, in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. Raja Rajendra Lala Mitra had to study a number of Vedic texts for preparing this essay and he has also commented on several of them. About four years after the publication of ‘Beef in Ancient India’, when no protest was made from any quarter, the Calcutta University conferred the degree of Doctor of Laws (LL. D.) on Raja Rajendra Lala Mitra in the year
1876. Raja Rajendra Lala Mitra's voluminous work was published in two volumes under the title 'Indo-Aryan' by W. Newman & Co., Calcutta, in 1881 and the article 'Beef in Ancient India' was incorporated as Chapter VI of its first volume.

This particular essay was published in the form of a booklet for the first time in the year 1926 from Calcutta by one Swami Bhoomanand. This was done just after Mahatma Gandhi had taken up the work of cow protection which is clear from his presidential address on 25th June 1925 at Belgaon at the Go-Raksha Parishad and his subsequent activities. In the Preface to the booklet, on pages i & ii from line 17th onwards, the publisher Swami Bhoomanand has written with great pride:

"In my long residence in the Punjab, and in my travels from Alwar to Peshwar, I came in contact with many educated Hindu gentlemen, but I was sorry to find that most of them did not study their own scriptures, and, being ignorant of the manners and customs of their ancestors, were necessarily very narrow in their outlook...... I myself do not pretend to be a Sanskrit scholar, but my studies of our ancient books, mostly in English and Vernacular translations, have opened my eyes to this fact, that the Hindu society was not always just like the present one. For instance, we find in the Vedic literature, the ultimate authority and the fountain of knowledge, clear evidence of inter-caste marriages, widow marriage, elaborate yajnas, animal sacrifices, drinking of soma juice and the eating of food which is at present prohibited in the Hindu Society."

The above extract from the Preface of the booklet brings out clearly the purpose behind its publication and propagation. How the people, ignorant of Sanskrit, are misled by such misinterpreted articles would be clearly evident from the various articles published in this book.

Hereafter, the cow protection movement gained momentum in 1967. A fresh reprint of the booklet 'Beef in Ancient India' was
published in June 1967 by Manisha Granthalaya Private Ltd., Calcutta. Several copies were distributed free. Whether they were distributed by the publishers or somebody else, could not be traced.

After Raja Rajendra Lala Mitra came Shri Pandurang Vaman Kane, M.A., LL.B., Advocate, Bombay High Court. He wrote a 'History of Dharmaśāstra' in several volumes and parts, which has been published by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona. He has also tried to justify meat and beef eating by quoting from several religious texts.

They did not rest content at all this. Besides the publication of the article 'Beef in Ancient India' by Raja Rajendra Lala Mitra, 'Beef-eating Clubs' were formed to propogate beef eating on an extensive scale. The following extract is self-evident:

"There were those among the intellectuals in touch with the British who were dazzled by the new ideas. The new light in their eyes was so bright that they thought the light within themselves was darkness."

"They took, so to speak, Macaulay at his word, and set out to Westernize themselves in thought, mind and spirit. They formed beef-eating clubs and gloried in the defiance of caste 'superstition'."

"The advocates of acceptance rather than the mutineers were the real revolutionaries of the nineteenth century India."


Lord Macaulay's famous words are quoted below:—

"English education would train up a class of persons—Indian in blood and colour, but English in tastes, in opinions, in morals and in intellect."

The prime objective of these people has been to conceal such provisions of the scriptures as prohibit meat or beef eating, and instead place before them in a prominent manner, words of scriptures
misinterpreted to mean meat-eating. Such people got recognition not only from the British Government, but also from the present Government of India, and they were also honoured by the so-called modern anglophilic society. People hankering after such honour, though having little or no knowledge of Sanskrit and religious literature, also write from time to time articles in English in favour of beef eating referring to misinterpreted passages from scriptures. They get them published in newspapers and magazines and thus mislead simple people. Any article giving correct and logical interpretation does not find place in these newspapers and/or magazines as it goes contrary to such anglophilic views. The common man is misled to think that articles of highly placed and learned people which get so much publicity must be authentic, especially when they are citing the scriptures. Thus they get astray that Sanatana Dharma scriptures do not prohibit, but on the other hand, prescribe meat as well as beef eating. How deceptive and incorrect are such notions, will be clear beyond doubt from articles published in this book.

The Vedas prohibit not only cow-slaughter, but the slaying of all kinds of herbivorous animals (see the heading ‘Were cow-slaughter, Meat-sacrifice and Meat-eating Prevalent in the Vedic Age?’) Scriptures of our and other faiths propound the creed of non-violence (ahimsā) (for details see ‘Non-violence is Supreme in Religious Scriptures’). Inspite of this, one may find references to act of slaughter and meat-eating here and there in the Scriptures. These passages should be understood in their appropriate contextual setting as to whether such indications are enjoined as ‘obligatory duties’, or whether they are a way out for preventing evil tendencies of meat-eating. Among sentient beings we find various kinds of evil propensities which are ingenerate, such as adultery born of passionate sensuousness, alcoholism, etc. etc. To prevent the tendency of indiscriminate cohabitation of man and woman it has been enjoined that a person should delimit his relations to one woman after entering into matrimonial sacraments with her and he should thus be considered on par with a brahmacārī. In a similar manner, to check the flesh-eating tendencies of meat-eaters, wherever
there are references to meat-eating, though the ulterior and real objective is prevention of meat-eating and forbidding of violence (hiṃsā), and vegetarian food and ahimsa have been promulgated as the prime dharma—when such passages are considered duly well and pondered over, it will be found that meat-eating and acts of violence have not been enjoined as ‘obligatory duties’. So wherever there are sentences which seem to support violence (hiṃsā), or meat-eating, or enjoin rituals entailing meat, they should be deliberated with due consideration as to whether they are inhibitions to prevent evil tendencies, or they are ‘obligatory duties’. If such sentences are in the form of ‘obligatory duties’, then they are invalid and they should be treated as interpolations (see the proof cited under the heading “What to do if there is contradiction between Śruti and Smṛti”).

It is stated in the Śāntiparva of the Mahābhārata:

तुष्टेवित्तपरेंव्रह्मान् नास्तिकं: समप्रवर्तितम्।
वेदवादविविदाय सत्याभाससिद्धान्तम्॥ (शान्तिपर्व २६३.६)

“O Brahmana! atheists pursuing efforts to amass wealth and covetous, having not understood the injunctions of vedas have spread falsities which have a semblance of truth.” (263.6)

गुरां मत्या मछु मांसमासवें कृसरौदनम्।
प्रवर्तितं हर्षं तन्नेतुदवेदेयु कलिपलम्॥ (शान्तिपर्व २६५.६)

“Liquors, fish, meat, mead, spirits, rice cooked with sesamum (til) seeds,—all these have been inserted into yajña by the wicked people. Vedas have not prescribed their use in yajña.” (265.9)

In the Mahābhārata, it is very clearly specified that in the yajñas, there is no place for violence to animals. Śāntiparva, Chapter 337, Verses 4 & 5 provide that according to Vedic Śruti seeds should be offered in oblation in a yajña.

बोजरेण्नेषु यष्टव्यमिति वै वैवकी क्षुद्रतः।
श्रमसंज्ञानि बोजानि च्यायं नो हन्तुमहतः॥
नैष धमः सतां देवा यत्र वद्येत वं पथु:॥ (शान्तिपर्व ३३७.४-५)
The seeds are named as aja. As such it is not justified to kill a goat. Wherever animals are sacrificed in yajña, it is not the norm of the Virtuous. (337. 4-5)

In the ‘Syādvādamañjari’ of the Jains, aja in a yajña is to be interpreted as seeds:

तथा हि किल वेदे ‘अजैयंष्टव्यम्’ इत्यादिवाक्येषु मिथ्यादशौज्ञवार्तः पशुवाचकं व्याचकते। सप्तवाचकं जत्माप्रायोगं त्रिवार्षिकं यवभीत्रावि, 
पञ्चवार्षिकं तिलमसूरादि, सप्तवार्षिकं कड़ुकुस्तर्पादि धान्यपर्यायत्तया पर्यवसायनित।

(Interpretation of verse No. 23, published by Bombay Sanskrit Prakrit Series, 1933, first edition, page 140, lines 49 to 54)

It means—In Vedic injunctions like ‘yajña should be performed with aja’, the ignorant interpret aja as an animal (goat). Those who are not to be reborn in the world, such wise persons interpret it as three-year old barley and rice, five-year old Sesamum indicum (til) and masura lentil, seven-year old panic seed (kangu) and mustard, etc.

In the third chapter (tantra) Kākolukīya of the Pañcatantra by Viṣṇuśarmā, it is provided:

एतेर्पि ये याज्ञिका यज्ञकर्मिणि पञ्चान्यपर्यायत्तस्य भूतेन्तर्जननित। तत्र किल एतद्वस्तर्ज्ञवायम्। अजा ब्रह्मस्वात्तेऽसप्तवार्षिकाः: कथयते न पुनः पशुप्रियेश्वः।

Meaning thereby—Those who kill animals in yajñas are fools, because they do not know the correct interpretation of Śruti. Śruti provides for aja to be used for yajna. Aja means seven-year old rice and not an animal. There the following verse is quoted in support:

वृक्षाङ्क्षिहतवा पशूनन्त्वाद्वृक्षवा स्तिवरकर्मम।
यद्वायं गम्यते स्वभवं नरकं केन स्वते॥

Meaning thereby—If, by cutting of green trees, by killing animals and playing with their blood, one can attain heaven, then by which action is one likely to go to hell?

“It is now crystal clear that killing of animals in yajña is an imagination of wicked persons. Such provisions in the Śrauta-sūtras, Gṛhya-sūtras, Brāhmaṇas, Smṛtis and other scriptures are unacceptable due to their being against the provision of the Vedas and thus being later interpolations.”

Such interpolations have been widely prevalent in ancient scriptures. This has been pointed out by the famous Dvaita teacher Madhvācārya alias Ānandatīrtha in his exegesis on the Mahābhārata, in the following words:

\[ \text{कर्मचिद्} \n\text{ग्रन्थां} \n\text{प्रक्षिपण्न: कर्मचिद्व्वितानिप} \]
\[ \text{कुरू: कर्मचिर्ज्ज्ज्ञां ग्रन्थां प्रमादात्वकर्मचिद्व्वित} \]
\[ \text{अनुस्म्वना ग्रंथां ग्रंथ: व्याकुल: इति स्वर्णः} \]


Meaning thereby—Wicked persons interpolate some scriptures, they omit sentences, and they introduce perversions due to inadverrence and sometimes otherwise. Thus the scriptures, though not completely destroyed, are wholly spoiled in this manner.

Besides the provision of Vedas, we may look through the provision made in Śrīmad Bhāgavata 7.15.7, 8, 10 and 11:

\[ \text{न दद्यावलिप्यं भाद्रे न चादाये धर्मस्वतविवित} \]
\[ \text{चुनये: स्वतप्रा प्रतिभियं न पशुहिस्या} \]

One who knows the essence of piety should not offer meat (to the manes) in a Śrāddha ceremony nor should he eat it (himself). The type of supreme gratification caused (to the manes as well as to the Lord Himself) through cereals fit for (the consumption of) anchorites (because involving no destruction of life) is never brought about through (meat etc. obtained by) the killing of animals.  (7)
For men seeking true piety there is no other such virtue as abstinence from violence to living beings, perpetrated through mind, speech and body. (8)

Seeing one proceeding to propitiate the Lord through sacrifices conducted with material substances, animals grow apprehensive lest the merciless fellow, who is ignorant of the truth of the Spirit and is (therefore) given to the (mere) gratification of his self, will surely kill them. (10)

Therefore, (remaining ever) contented, he who knows what is right should perform from day to day (his) obligatory and occasional duties even with the cereals fit for (the consumption of) hermits and obtained by force of destiny (rather than undertake big sacrifices involving destruction of life). (11)

It is not clear as for whom Manusmṛti verses involving meat are meant. A verse is found in Chapter 11, of the Manusmṛti, which is numbered as 95 in some editions and 96 in others. It reads as follows:

Meaning thereby—Wine, meat, liquor, spirit etc., are the food of Yakṣas, Rākṣasas and Piśācas, hence these are not fit for Brahmanas, who take havi offered to the Gods.

This clearly proves that meat and wine preparations are meant only for Yakṣas, Rākṣasas and Piśācas and not for the human species. In the Vedas also, it is mentioned that this type of food is
meant only for Rākṣasas and those humans who consume them deserve capital punishment or death.

यः वै यथेष्ठाः क्रिया समस्तः यो राज्येन पञ्चना वातुधानः।
यो ग्रह्याया भरति क्षीरमने तेषां शीघ्रिः हरसापि वृष्णः।

(ऋग्वेद १०.५७.१६)

Meaning thereby—Those who are addicted to meat and take meat of horse or other animals and by killing cows, deprive others from their milk, cannot be corrected by any other means, then O Ruler! sever their heads by means of your shining weapon, this is the last punishment, which can be accorded to them.

Dr. Umesh Chandra Pandeya, Hindi commentator of the Gautama Dharmasūtra with its Mitākṣarā Vṛtti (published by the Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, Varanasi, Samvat 2023, page 13 of Introduction), writes:

“There was great scope for interpolation in ancient literature. It is practically impossible to decide the correct and original text of any scripture.”

It appears that during the Muslim period under threat and during British period under temptation, interpolations have been effected in several scriptures. To arrive at the correct original text of such scriptures is, no doubt, a very difficult task, but it is not impossible. Those passages of such scriptures as contravene the provisions of Shruti, can be taken for granted as interpolations and thus those scriptures can be corrected to their original readings. This is a task beset with great difficulties. Only those persons can accomplish it who are capable of interpreting the Vedas in a correct manner. It is worth undertaking. Even now a days there are scholars learned in the scriptures and endowed with noble character. Day by day such persons are getting scarce due to neglect of Sanskrit language. If this difficult task is not undertaken at this stage, then it would become impossible in the future for want of scholars who are learned and also of noble character.
It is not easy to interpret the Vedas. Their language cannot
be properly understood without the study of Nirukta. Gods
appreciate indirect (cryptic) expression and not the direct.

परोक्षप्रयिया इच हि देवा सवन्नि प्रत्यक्षविविष्यः: (गोपथश्रवण १.१.१)

Even in the simple language of the Mahābhārata, there are
several passages which are difficult to interpret and understand. In
the Mahābhārata itself it is stated :

ऋष्टो इलोक-सहवासिन्स ऋष्टो इलोकवाचालिनः च
ऋहूं बेवृमि हुक्रो बेन्ति संजयो बेन्ति वा न वा॥ (आदिपर्व १.५१)

Meaning thereby—8,800 verses are such, which are fully understood
by Śrī Vyāsa and Śrī Śukadeva. Even Saṅjaya might or might
not understand them fully. (adi parva 1.81)

Shrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa also states that gods like
indirect expression :

यत्परोक्षप्रयियो देवो भगवान् विद्वभावः॥ (४.२८.६५)
परोक्षवाचो वेदोऽव बालानामप्रकाशसनम्॥ (११.३.४४)

Just as darkness cannot exist in light, similarly it is not
possible that in Vedas which are knowledge incarnate, there would
exist any such provision which would not help human beings to
uplift themselves on all planes from the material to the spiritual.
Just as, under light one sees the blackness of its own shadow,
similarly if one is bent upon seeing blackness of his own mind in
the Vedas, he is free to do so, but actually it is not there in the
Vedas.

Rishis, used to visualise the Veda Mantras and their
interpretation during their samādhi, therefore they were named as
‘Seers’. Likewise they came to know about the creation of the
universe. The Creator made some living beings to subsist on grass
and leaves, while others were made to sustain themselves on living
beings. Human beings were created to live on vegetation, which is
amply clear from the physiology of the human body. Modern
physiologists and diet experts also support it. A few extracts
selected from the voluminous writing of Earnest Crosby and James Oldfield, M.A., D.C.L., M.R.C.S., are quoted below in support of these biological facts:

WHETHER MEAT IS NATURAL FOOD FOR HUMAN BEINGS?

(Selected paragraphs from Enlightened and Voluminous writings by Earnest Crosby)

THE MEAT FETISH

That butchery is cruel is so self-evident that it is hardly necessary to dwell upon the fact, and cruelty usually attends the life of the victim from the beginning.

Finally, at the abattoir, the cattle are received by men who have been drilled into machines, who must kill so many creatures to the minute and begin the process of skinning before life is extinct. In some cases death must be prolonged to make the meat white.

The animal comes to the place of execution, as a rule, in a state of frenzy, and to overcome its resistance the eye must be gouged or the tail twisted till the gristle cracks. It is futile to preach humanity to men engaged in such a trade. You or I, enlisted in such a profession, would act the same way.

The essential idea of butchery for food is cruel, and you cannot be cruel humanely. "How could you select such a business?" Asked a horrified officer of a 'Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals', upon his first visit to the stockyards of Chicago. "We're only doing your dirty work, sir," was the true and silencing reply. It is brutalizing work as well as cruel work, and those who create the demand for it are responsible for it.

And with strange perversity we pick out the most inoffensive animals for slaughter. There might be an element of justice in preying upon beasts of prey, but we prefer to slay the harmless deer and cow and sheep. Is carnivorous flesh offensive? Then, why To we make our own flesh offensive by being carnivorous?
In addition to the uncleanliness and unwholesomeness of meat, it is easy to show that it is also an unnatural food for man. If it were a natural food, would you not be willing to go into the first butcher's shop, cut a slice from a carcass, and put it into your mouth? You would not hesitate to do so to any fruit or vegetable. If meat is a natural food, would you feel any repugnance at eating dog flesh or cat flesh merely because you are not accustomed to it? You would rather like to taste a new fruit. Dogs are raised for food in Korea, and there is no difference between their flesh and other meat in principle. Put a kitten and a chick in the same room, and the former will show—what its natural food is—by pouncing upon the latter and devouring it. Put a baby, in the place of a kitten, and it will not attempt to eat the chick; but it will try to eat an apple, which is its natural food. ...All of which goes to show that meat is not man's natural food.

The structure of his body confirms this belief. He has the long intestines of the graminivorous animals, and not the short intestines of the carnivora. His jaws are hung so that they can grind upon each other, like those of the horse, cow, and camel, and are not fixed vertically like the dog's. He has no carnivorous teeth, those to which that name is often given—the eye-teeth—being much more pronounced in the non-carnivorous anthropoid ape.

Richard Owen, the great anatomist and natural historian, said long ago that "the anthropoids and all the quadrumanas derive their alimentation from fruits, grains, and other succulent vegetal substances, and the strict analogy between the structure of these animals and that of man clearly demonstrates his frugivorous nature," and this truth is more firmly established today than it was when he wrote. It is not natural to eat meat.

(Selected paragraphs from writing of James Olefield, M.A., D.C.L., M.R.C.S., Earnshaw-Cooper Lecturer on Dietetics, The Lady Margaret Fruitarian Hospital).

The earliest medicine-man began to put two and two together, and rightly concluded that the waste matter from any animal was
a cause of disease to that animal if not quickly and completely removed.

He also noted that it was the excreta of animals that ate flesh that was by far the most dangerous of all. He might store his domesticated animals in the far end of his cave, and no one was much the worse, but any cave in which dogs or cats, or wolves have been confined or imprisoned, must be shunned for years after. He also made a mental note for future use that cattle droppings were left scattered all over the surface of the land, and were rapidly utilized as food by all vegetative growths from grasses upwards, whereas carnivorous animals were compelled, by an age-born instinct, to scratch holes and bury their excreta as soon as it left their body.

Let us consider for a moment the wonderful machinery which Nature has installed in the human body for the purpose of getting rid of this waste matter from our system. In the first place, we must get clearly fixed in our mind that all human waste matter is poisonously dangerous to the individual that produces it, and that, therefore, if he wants to escape the attack of any of the ever present disease, he must regularly and promptly get rid of this waste matter. In the second place, we must ever set before ourselves that all forms of flesh food produce the most dangerous of these waste products. It is not an error that the first duty of a nurse is to give to a meat-eating patient admitted to a hospital, either an enema, or a purgative, or an emetic, or all three.

The ordinary diet of a man or woman who gets seriously ill, is, in England, a very unnatural and a very unwise one. Most people have been taught by parents, who know no better, that the food for health and strength is meat. It used to be 'beer and beef'; now however, the beer fallacy has been exploded, while the beef fallacy is rapidly losing its hold upon the intellectual and cultured classes of the world. It is, however, the middle and the lower classes that are carried off to hospital when they get ill, and these are the classes that eat the most meat.

When I am called to a meat-eating patient, I always carry out the same ritual. It is the first step towards setting the body free
from its burden of overwork and of self-poisoning. When, on the other hand, I am dealing with clean eating patients, I am quite satisfied if even forty-eight hours have elapsed since the last clearance, because in this case, the faeces—like those of a horse or a cow—are not on the verge of septic putrefaction. When we have grasped these points clearly we can greatly appreciate how wonderful is the mechanism provided by Nature of keeping our bodies free from internal poisoning.

The mechanism is almost fool proof, but just as there are a great many people who will spoil every car they drive, and those for whom no watch will keep good time for long, so too, there is a high percentage of people who are not to be trusted with the delicate machinery of their own digestive organs—and certainly not with that of their children.

All vertebrates are built on the principle of a long, hollow tube, round which the muscular and nerve and circulatory organs are built up. Food is put in at one end of this tube and slowly passing along, leaves it at the other end. As it passes along, the digestive juices chemically act upon it. They physically absorb from it the various elements of nutrition that it contains, and then pass on the residue. Broken down sweepings of the body cells also are thrown into this part of hollow tube, which has now become a ‘sewage tube’. Little by little the contents are pushed on right to the end and then eliminated. So simple in theory, so excellent in practice, the machinery is built to work for about one hundred years, but fools get it out of gear long before it is normally worn out!

For the proper working of the machinery, a man must put into it:—

1. The food suitable to the particular human structure;
2. In a condition suitable to be dealt with by the machinery;
3. In a quantity in harmony with the requirements of the body;
4. At intervals sufficiently long to allow time for rest and repair of the various parts of the machinery.
Give up the use of flesh-foods. Flesh-foods cause retardations of intestinal rhythm. Flesh-foods leave, as waste matter, substances which decompose and produce an inhibitory toxic effect upon the colonic muscles. The waste matter of flesh-foods is so liable to set up a constitutional toxic effect that Nature has shortened the large intestine of her carnivorous animals so that the decomposing matter shall not remain in the animal's body a moment longer than necessary. She has also emphasized its danger to the living creatures around by teaching the carnivorous animals to scratch a hole in the ground, defaecate into the hole, and cover it up again; it is too dangerous a substance to be allowed to lie about.
WESTERN INDOLOGISTS: A STUDY IN MOTIVES

by Pt. Bhagawad Dutt (with minor additions)

INTEREST OF EUROPEANS IN BHARATAVARSHA AND ITS ANCIENT LITERATURE: The battle of Plassey, fought in Samvat 1814, sealed the fate of India. Bengal came under the dominance of the British. In Samvat 1840, William Jones was appointed Chief Justice in the British Settlement of Fort William. He translated into English the celebrated play Śakuntalā of the renowned poet Kālidāsa (Circa 4th cent. B. V.) in Samvat 1846, and the Code of Manu in Saṁvat 1851, the year in which he died. After him, his younger associate, Sir Henry Thomas Colebrooke, wrote an article ‘On the Vedas’ in Saṁvat 1862.

In the Vikram year 1875, August Wilhelm von Schlegel was appointed the first Professor of Sanskrit in the Bonn University of Germany. Friedrich Schlegel was his brother. He wrote in 1865 V. a work entitled ‘Upon the Languages and Wisdom of the Hindus’.1 Both the brothers evinced great love for Sanskrit. Another Sanskritist Hern Wilhelm von Humboldt became the collaborator of August Schlegel whose edition of the Bhagavad-gītā directed his attention to its study. In Samvat 1884 he wrote to a friend saying: “It is perhaps the deepest and loftiest thing the world has to show.” At that very time Arthur Schopenhauer (1845-1917 V.), a great German philosopher, happened to read the Latin translation of the Upanishads (1858-1859 V.) done by a French writer Anquetil du Perron (1788-1862 V.), from the Persian translation of prince Dara Shikoh (1722 V.), named as Sirre-Akbar—the great secret. He was so impressed by their philosophy that he called them ‘the production of the highest human wisdom’,2 and considered them to contain almost superhuman conceptions’.3 The study of the Upanishads was a

3. Ibid. p. 266.
source of great inspiration and means of comfort to his soul, and writing about it he says, "It is the most satisfying and elevating reading (with the exception of the original text) which is possible in the world; it has been the solace of my life and will be the solace of my death." It is well-known that the book 'Oupnekhat' (Upanishad) always lay open on his table and he invariably studied it before retiring to rest. He called the opening up of Sanskrit literature 'the greatest gift of our century', and predicted that the philosophy and knowledge of the Upanishads would become the cherished faith of the West.

RESULT OF THAT INTEREST: Such writings attracted the German scholars more and more to the study of Sanskrit, and many of them began to hold Bhāratīya culture in great esteem. Prof. Winternitz has described their reverence and enthusiasm in the following words:

“When Indian literature became first known in the West, people were inclined to ascribe a hoary age to every literary work hailing from India. They used to look upon India as something like the cradle of mankind, or at least of human civilization.”

This impression was natural and spontaneous. It was based on truth and had no element of bias. The historical facts that were handed down by the sages of Bhāratavarṣa were based on true and unbroken traditions. Their philosophical doctrines delved deep into the source and mysteries of life and propounded principles of eternal value. When the people of the West came to know of them for the first time, many unbegoted scholars were highly impressed by their marvellous accuracy and profound wisdom and being uninfluenced by any considerations of colour or creed they were generous in their acclamations. This enthusiastic applause of the honest people of Christian lands created a flutter in the dovecotes of Jewry and

1. Ibid. p. 267. Also see, New Indian Antiquary, Vol. 1, No. 1. April 1938, p. 59, article of Heinrich Zimmer. The translation is, 'the consolation of his old age.' The original of this quotation is in Parerga et Paralipomena, Vol. II, p. 427, 1851.

2. Lectures in Calcutta University, August, 1923, printed in 1925 at as 'Some Problems of Indian Literature,' p. 3.
Christian missionaries, who were as ignorant of the real import of their own Scriptures and traditions as those of Bhāratavarṣa and followed only the dictates of dogmatic Pauline Christianity which had made them intolerant of all other faiths.\textsuperscript{1}

The correctness of our conclusion can be judged from the following observation of Heinrich Zimmer:—

"He (Schopenhauer) was the first among the Western people to speak of this in an incomparable manner—in that great cloudburst of European-Christian atmosphere."\textsuperscript{2}

How revengeful are dogmatic Christians and Jews on those, who do not hold opinions similar to their own, is amply illustrated by the fate of Robertson Smith (1846-94 A.D.), the author of 'The Religion of the Semites', and a professor of Hebrew in the Free Church College, Aberdeen. The punishment he got for the frank and fearless expression of his scientific researches is well recorded by Lewis Spence in the following words:—

"The heterodox character of an encyclopaedia article on the Bible led to his prosecution for heresy, of which charge, however, he was acquitted. But a further article upon 'Hebrew Language and Literature' in the Encyclopaedia Britannica (1880) led to his removal from the professoriate of the College."\textsuperscript{3}

\textbf{Primary Reason}

\textbf{JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN BIAS:} The ancient Jews were descendants of the Āryas. Their beliefs were the same as those of

\textsuperscript{1} Intolerance was Inherent in all the Semitic faiths and was responsible for the crusades, jehads, and the institution of the Inquisition. A century before the time of Schopenhauer, Voltaire also fell a victim to the wrath of the clergy. He wrote an Essay on the Morals and the Spirit of the Nations, which offended everybody because it told the truth. It spoke highly of the ancient cultures of India, China and Persia and relegated Judea and Christendom to a relatively inferior position. How could then he be forgiven for 'so unpatriotic a revelation'? He was exiled for a second time by the French Government. (vide 'The Story of Philosophy,' by Will Durant, p. 241).

\textsuperscript{2} \textit{New Indian Antiquary}, April 1938, p. 67.

\textsuperscript{3} 'An Introduction to Mythology,' New York. (Date of publication not indicated in the book.)
the Áryas. The Primeval Man, whom they called Adam, was Brahmá, the originator of mankind. The Hebrew name is derived from ‘Ātma-Bhu’, one of the epithets of Brahmá. In the beginning of Creation ‘Brahmá gave names to all objects and beings’,¹ and so did Adam according to Jewish tradition: ‘and whatsoever Adam called every living creature that was the name thereof’.² In later times the Jews forgot their ancient history and ancestry and became narrow in their outlook. They considered themselves to be the oldest of all races.³ But in 1654 A.D. Archbishop Usher of Ireland firmly announced that his study of Scripture had proved that creation took place in the year 4004 B.C. So, from the end of the seventeenth century, this chronology was accepted by the Europeans and they came to believe that Adam was created 4004 years before Christ.⁴

Hence a majority of the modern Jews and the dogmatic Christians and especially many professors of Sanskrit found it hard to reconcile themselves to the view that any race or civilization could be older than the date of Adam accepted by them. They resented the hoary antiquity ascribed by their broad-minded brother scholars to the literature and civilization of Bhāratavarśa and much more to the origin of man. Referring to this deep-rooted prejudice, A. S. Sayce writes:—

“But as far as man was concerned, his history was still limited by the dates in the margin of our Bibles. Even today the old idea of his recent appearance still prevails in quarters where we

2. Genesis, II.10.
3. "..........that the Jewish race is by far the oldest of all these" Fragments of Megasthenes, p. 103.
Duncan Macnaughton in his 'A Scheme of Egyptian Chronology', London, 1932, writes:

"It is strange to see that Wilkinson place Menes (or Manu the first King of Egypt) as low as 2320, but it is to be remembered that in 1836 English-speaking scholars were still under the hypnotic influence of Usher's Biblical Chronology. The dates printed in the Bible were regarded as sacred, and it was positively wicked to disregard them." (p. 6).
should least expect to find it and so-called critical historians still occupy themselves in endeavouring to reduce the dates of his earlier history......To a generation which had been brought up to believe that in 4004 B.C. or thereabout the world was being created, the idea man himself went back to 100,000 years ago was both incredible and inconceivable.”¹

Ample evidence can be adduced to prove the existence of this inveterate prejudice but the above quotation from a great anthropologist would suffice for our purpose.

The studies of Sankrit continued and flourished in Europe and very rapidly the opinions and judgments of scholars also became warped by the influence of the inherent prejudice fanned by the clergy. From the Vikram year 1858 to 1897 Eugene Burnouf occupied the chair of Professor of Sanskrit in France. He had two German pupils Rudolph Roth and Max Muller, who later on made a name in European Sanskrit scholarship.

THE PURPOSE OF ODEN CHAIR OF SANSKRIT IN OXFORD UNIVERSITY: In Samvat 1890 Horace Hayman Wilson became the Boden Professor of Sanskrit in the Oxford University. His successor Prof. M. Monier-Williams has drawn the attention of scholars to the object of the establishment of that chair in the following words:—

“I must draw attention to the fact that I am only the second occupant of the Boden Chair, and that its Founder, Colonel Boden, stated most explicitly in his will (dated August 15, 1811 A.D.) that the special object of his munificent bequest was to promote the translation of Scriptures into Sanskrit; so as to enable his countrymen to proceed in the conversion of the natives of India to the Christian Religion.”²

Prejudiced Sanskrit Professors

I. Prof. Wilson was a man of very noble disposition, but he had his obligations towards the motives of the founder of the Chair he occupied. He, therefore, wrote a book on ‘The Religious and Philosophical System of the Hindus’ and explaining the reason for writing it he says: “These lectures were written to help candidates for a prize of £200—given by John Muir, a well-known old Haileybury man and great Sanskrit scholar, for the best refutation of the Hindu Religious System.”

From this quotation the learned readers can conclude to what extent the aim of European scholarship could be called scientific, how far the theories propounded by them could be free from partisanship and called reliable, and how true would be the picture of Bharatiya civilisation and culture drawn by them.

II. In the same spirit of prejudice the aforesaid scholar Rudolph Roth wrote his thesis ‘Zur Literatur und Geschichte des Veda,’ a dissertation on the Vedic literature and history. In 1909 V. was published his edition of the Nirukta of Yāska. He was too proud of his own learning and of the German genius. He asserted that by means of the German ‘science’ of philology Vedic mantras could be interpreted much better than with the help of Nirukta. Roth wrote many other things in this haughty vein.

III. The same pedantry is exhibited in the writings of W.D. Whitney who asserts: “The principles of the ‘German School’ are the only ones which can ever guide us to a true understanding of the Veda.”

3. A treatise on etymology and semantics.
4. It would be interesting here to point out that in the introduction of his edition of Nirukta, Roth has given a wrong interpretation of a passage of Aitareya Brāhmaṇa which has invited a derisive comment from Goldstrucker (cf. Pāṇini, p. 198).
IV. MAX MULLER: Max Muller was a fellow-student of Roth. Besides his teacher’s stamp on him, Max Muller’s interview with Lord Macaulay on the 28th December, 1855 A.D. also played a great part in his anti-Indian views. Max Muller had to sit silent for an hour while the historian poured out his diametrically opposite views and then dismissed his visitor who tried in vain to utter a simple word: “I went back to Oxford”, writes Max Muller, “a sadder man and a wiser man.”

Max Muller’s name became widely known to the people of Bhāratavarṣa for two reasons. Firstly, he was a voluminous writer and secondly his views were severely criticised by the great scholar and savant Svāmi Dayānanda Sarasvati (1881-1940 V.) in his public speeches and writings. The value of Max-Muller’s opinions, may be estimated from his following statements:—

(1) “History seems to teach that the whole human race required a gradual education before, in the fullness of time, it could be admitted to the truths of Christianity. All the fallacies of human reason had to be exhausted, before the light of a higher truth could meet with ready acceptance. The ancient religions of the world were but the milk of nature, which was in due time to be succeeded by the bread of life......... ‘The religion of Buddha has spread far beyond the limits of the Aryan world, and to our limited vision, it may seem to have retarded the advent of Christianity among a large portion of the human race. But in the sight of Him with whom a thousand years are but as one day, that religion, like the ancient religions of the world, may have but served to prepare the way of Christ, by helping through its very errors to strengthen and to deepen the ineradicable yearning of the human heart after the truth of God.”

(2) “Large number of Vedic hymns are childish in the extreme: tedious, low, commonplace.”

1. Life and Letters of Max Muller, Vol. I, Ch. IX, p. 171.
3. ‘Chips from a German Workshop’, second edition, 1866, p. 27.
(3) "Nay, they (the Vedas) contain, by the side of simple, natural, childish thoughts, many ideas which to us sound modern, or secondary and tertiary."

Such blasphemous reviling of the most ancient and highly scientific scripture of the world can come only from the mouth of a bigoted (not an honest) Christian, a low pagan or an impious atheist. Barring Christianity, Max Muller was bitterly antagonistic to every other religion which he regarded as heathen. His religious intolerance is borrowed from his bitter criticism of the view of the German scholar, Dr. Spiegel, that the Biblical theory of the creation of the world is borrowed from the ancient religion of the Persians or Iranians. Stung by this statement Max Muller writes: "A writer like Dr. Spiegel should know that he can expect no mercy; nay, he should himself wish for no mercy, but invite the heaviest artillery against the floating battery which he has launched in the troubled waters of Biblical criticism." (Strange to say that our History supports the truth of Dr. Spiegel's view to the extent that the Biblical statements were derived from Persian, Babylonian and Egyptian scriptures, which according to the ancient history of the world, were in their turn derived from Vedic sources.)

At another place the same devotee of the Western 'scientific' scholarship says: "If in spite of all this, many people, most expectant to judge, look forward with confidence to the conversion of the Parsis, it is because, in the most essential points, they have already, though unconsciously, approached as near as possible to the pure doctrine of Christianity. Let them but read Zend-Avesta, in which they profess to believe, and they will find that their faith is no longer the faith of the Yasna, the Vendidad and the Vispered. As historical relics, these works, if critically interpreted, will always retain a pre-eminent place in the great library of the ancient world. As oracles of religious faith,

1. 'India, What can it teach us', Lecture IV, p. 118, 1882.
2. "Chips from a German Workshop", Genesis and the Zend Avesta, p. 147.
they are defunct and a mere anachronism in the age in which we live.\textsuperscript{1}

Even a superficial reader can see the strain of Christian fanaticism running through these lines. If Bhāratīya culture could exact occasional praise from the pen of a bigoted man like Max Muller, it was only due to its unrivalled greatness and superiority.

MAX MULLER AND JACOLLIOT: The French scholar Louis Jacolliot, Chief Judge in Chandranagar, wrote a book called \textit{La Bible dans l’Inde} in Samvat 1926. Next year an English translation of it was also published. In that book the learned author has laid down the thesis that all the main currents of thought in the world have been derived from the ancient Āryan thought. He has called Bhāratavarṣa ‘the Cradle of Humanity’.\textsuperscript{2}

\textit{“Land of ancient India! Cradle of Humanity, hail! Hail revered motherland whom centuries of brutal invasions have not yet buried under the dust of oblivion. Hail, Fatherland of faith, of love, of poetry and of science, may we hail a revival of thy past in our Western future.”}

This book cut Max Muller to the quick and he said while reviewing it that “the author seems to have been taken in by the Brahmins in India”.

MAX MULLER’S LETTERS: Personal letters give a true picture of the writer’s inner mind. A person expresses his inmost feelings in the letters which he writes to his intimate relations and friends. Such letters are very helpful in estimating his real nature and character. Fortunately, a collection called the \textit{‘Life and Letters of Frederick Max Muller’} has been published in two volumes. A few extracts from

\textsuperscript{1} \textit{Ibid}. The Modern Parsis, p. 180. To write about an unconscious approach of an anterior religion to the doctrines of a posterior faith can only become a person of ‘scientific’ mind like that of Max Muller. How repugnant to a biased Christian mind is the idea of Christianity borrowing anything from another ancient religion even when the similarity is so striking! And these very so-called unbiased pedagogues have not hesitated to attribute to Bhāratīya literature a Greek borrowing on the flimsiest excuse, \textit{i.e.}, where the similarity is not at all obvious but is strained.

\textsuperscript{2} Cf quotation from Winternitz after 3rd para from the beginning of this chapter. Probably Winternitz refers to Jacolliot.
those letters would suffice to expose the mind of the man who is held in great esteem in the West for his Sanskrit learning and impartial judgment.

(a) In a letter of 1866 A.D. (V. Sam. 1923) he writes to his wife:

“...This edition of mine and the translation of the Veda will hereafter tell to a great extent on the fate of India,...It is the root of their religion and to show them what the root is, I feel sure, is the only way of uprooting all that has sprung from it during the last three thousand years.” (Vol. I, Ch. XV, Page 346)

(b) In another letter he writes to his son:

“Would you say that any one sacred book is superior to all others in the world? ...I say the New Testament, after that, I should place the Koran,¹ which in its moral teachings, is hardly more than a later edition of the New Testament. Then would follow according to my opinion the Old Testament, the Southern Buddhist Tripitaka, the Tao-te-king of Laozte, the Kings of Confucius, the Veda and the Avesta.” (Vol. II, Ch. XXXII, page 339)

(c) On 16th December 1868 A.D. (Sam. 1925) he writes to Duke of Argyll, the Minister for India:

“...The ancient religion of India is doomed and if Christianity does not step in, whose fault will it be?” (Vol. I, Ch. XVI, page 378)

(d) On 29th January 1882 (Sam. 1939) he wrote to Sri Bairamji Malabari:

“I wanted to tell......what the true historical value of this ancient religion is, as looked upon, not from an exclusively

---

1. A clear indication of Anglo-Muslim alliance worked out by the English bureaucrats and later evident in a work like the Cambridge History of India and a hoard of other works.

It is also evident in the works of the French author Garcin de Tassy, Les Auteurs Hindoustanis et leurs ouvrages 2nd., Paris 1868 and Histoire de la literature Hondoustainic, 3 vols, 2nd ed., Paris 1870-71.
European or Christian, but from a historical point of view. But discover in it ‘steam engines and electricity and European philosophy and morality, and you deprive it of its true character.’” (Vol. II, Ch. XXV, pages 115-116)

(e) Max Muller grew so insolent and audacious that he started to challenge Indians in a direct foolhardy manner. It is clear from a letter written by him to N.K. Majumdar:

"Tell me some of your chief difficulties that prevent you and your countrymen from openly following Christ, and when I write to you I shall do my best to explain how I and many who agree with me have met them and solved them...... From my point of view, India, at least the best part of it, is already converted to Christianity. You want no pursuasion to become a follower of Christ. Then make up your mind to work for yourself. Unite your flock—to hold them together and to prevent them from straying. The bridge has been built for you by those who came before you. STEP BOLDLY FORWARD, it will break under you, and you will find many friends to welcome you on the other shore and among them none more delighted than your old friend and fellow labourer F. Max-Muller.” (Vol. II, Ch. XXXIV, pages 415-416)

Herein Max Muller claims to know ‘the true historical value’ of Vedic religion, but our history is going to expose the hollowness of the learning and scholarship which he and his colleagues boast of possessing.

V. WEBER’S BIAS : At the time when Max Muller was busy besmirching the glory of Bhāratiya literature and religion in England, Albert Weber was devoting himself to the same ignominious task in Germany. We have already referred to the unstinted praise of the Bhagavad-Gītā by Humboldt. Weber could not tolerate this. He had the temerity to postulate that the Mahābhārata and Gītā were influenced by Christian thought. Mark what he writes :—
“The peculiar colouring of the Kṛṣṇa Sect, which pervades the whole book, is noteworthy; Christian legendary matter and other Western influences are unmistakably present........”¹

The view of Weber was strongly supported by two other Western scholars, Lorinser² and E. Washburn Hopkins.³ Yet the view was so blatantly absurd that most of the professors in European universities did not accept it in spite of their Christian leanings. But the propagation of this wrong view played its mischief and was mainly responsible for the hesitation of the Western scholars (including the antagonists) to assign to the Mahābhārata a date, earlier than the Christian era.

WEBER AND BANKIM CHANDRA: I am not alone in holding this view.

This is what Bankim Chandra Chattopadhyaya, the well known Bengali scholar, has to say about Weber in his Krishna-charita, 4th chapter:—

“The celebrated Weber was no doubt a scholar but I am inclined to think that it was an unfortunate moment for India when he began the study of Sanskrit. The descendants of the German savages of yesterday could not reconcile themselves to the ancient glory of India. It was therefore, their earnest effort to prove that the civilization of India was comparatively of recent origin. They could not persuade themselves to believe that the Mahābhārata was composed centuries before Christ was born.”⁴

WEBER AND GOLDSSTUCKER: Weber and Boehtlingk prepared a dictionary of the Sanskrit language called the ‘Sanskrit

---

1. “*The History of Sanskrit Literature*” Popular ed. 1914, p. 189, footnote; of also p. 300, foot-note.
2. He wrote an article ‘*Die Bhagavad Gitä*’ in samvats 1926.
3. ‘*India, Old and New*’, New York, 1902, p. 146. Also cf. his Religions of India, p. 429, Boston, 1895.
4. An English translation from the Bengali version.
Worterbuch. Prof. Kuhn was also one of their assistants. Being mainly based on the wrong and imaginary principles of philology, the work is full of wrong meanings in many places and is, therefore, unreliable and misleading. It is a pity that so much labour was wasted on account of sheer prejudice. The dictionary was a subject of severe criticism by Prof. Goldstucker which annoyed the two editors. Weber was so much upset that he stooped to use abusive language of the coarsest kind\(^1\) against Prof. Goldstucker. He said that the views of Prof. Goldstucker about the Worterbuch showed 'a perfect derangement of his mental faculties',\(^2\) since he did not reject the authority of the greatest Hindu scholars freely and easily. Replying to their undignified attacks Prof. Goldstucker exposed the conspiracy of Professors Roth, Boehtlingk, Weber and Kuhn which they had formed to undermine the greatness of ancient Bhāratavarṣa. He wrote;

"It will, of course, be my duty to show, at the earliest opportunity, that Dr. Boehtlingk is incapable of understanding even easy rules of Pāṇini, much less those of Kātyāyana and still less is he capable of making use of them in the understanding of Classical texts. The errors in his department of the Dictionary are so numerous...... that it will fill every serious Sanskritist with dismay, when he calculates the mischievous influence which they must exercise on the study of Sanskrit philology'.\(^3\)

He further remarks: "that questions which ought to have been decided with the very utmost circumspection and which could not be decided without very laborious research have been trifled with in the Worterbuch in the most unwarranted manner".\(^4\)

Goldstucker was called upon by one of Boehtlingk’s men not only to have respect for ‘the editor of Pāṇini...’ (i.e. Boehtlingk),

---

2. Ibid. p. 200.
3. Ibid. p. 195.
4. Ibid. p. 197.
but even for the hidden reasons for foisting on the public his blunders of every kind.¹

We know that there were no other ‘hidden reasons’ than their Christian and Jewish bias which impelled them to suppress the correct information of the Hindu grammarians and underrate and vilify Aryan civilization and culture, and at the same time to serve as tools of the British government towards the same end.

Professor Kuhn, who ‘gave his opinion on the Worterbuch’ was “an individual whose sole connection with Sanskrit studies consisted in handling Sanskrit books to those who could read them, a literary naught, wholly unknown, but assuming the airs of a quantity, because it had figures before it that prompted it on, a personage who, according to his own friends, was perfectly ignorant of Sanskrit”.²

Provoked by the unwarranted flouting of the authentic Hindu tradition, Professor Goldstucker was compelled to raise his ‘feeble but solitary voice’ against the coterie of mischievous propagandists masquerading under the garb of ‘scientific’ scholars. He concludes his laborious work with the following significant remarks:

“When I see that the most distinguished and the most learned Hindu scholars and divines—the most valuable and sometimes the only source of all our knowledge of ancient India—are scorned in theory, mutilated in print, and, as consequence, set aside in the interpretation of Vaidik texts;...... when a clique of Sanskritists of this description vapours about giving us the sense of the Veda as it existed at the commencement of Hindu antiquity;—when I consider that the method of studying Sanskrit philology is pursued by those whose words apparently derive weight and influence from the professional position they hold;..............then I hold that it would be a want of courage and a dereliction of duty, if I did not make a stand against these Saturnalia of Sanskrit Philology.”³

1. Ibid. p. 203.
2. Ibid. p. 203.
3. Ibid. pp. 204-205
VI. MONIER-WILLIAMS, who revealed the real object of the purpose of the establishment of the Boden chair, thus delivers himself:—

"Brahmanism, therefore, must die out. In point of fact, false ideas on the most ordinary scientific subjects are so mixed up with its doctrines that the commonest education—the simplest lessons in geography—without the aid of Christianity must inevitably in the end sap its foundations." ¹

"When the walls of the mighty fortress of Brahmanism are encircled, undermined, and finally stormed by the soldiers of the cross, the victory of Christianity must be signal and complete." ²

Therefore, we are justified in drawing the conclusion that his book, 'The Study of Sanskrit in Relation to Missionary work in India' (1861 A.D., London) was written with the sole object of promoting Christianity and ousting Hinduism. Inspite of this some of our Indian Sanskrit scholars call these European scholars, unbiased students of Sanskrit literature, whose sole aim has been to acquire knowledge for its own sake.

Again, expressing his deep rooted veneration for the Bible, Monier-Williams writes:—"the Bible, though a true revelation." ³

VII. RUDOLF HOERNLE: Rudolf Hoernle was the Principal of Queen's College, Banaras, in Samvat 1926. At that time Svāmī Dayānanda Sarasvatī, who later on founded the Ārya Samāja, happened to reach Banaras for the first time for the propagation of his mission. Dr. Hoernle met Svāmī Dayānanda on several occasions. He wrote an article⁴ on Svāmijī from which the following extract is noteworthy, because it reveals the real intention of many European scholars who take to the study of Sanskrit and ancient scriptures of Bhāratavarṣa. Hoernle says:—

¹ Modern India and the Indians, by M. Williams, third ed. 1879, p. 261.
² Ibid. p. 262.
³ Indian Wisdom, p. 143.
⁴ The Christian Intelligencer, Calcutta, March 1870, p. 79.
“.......he (Dayānanda) may possibly convince the Hindus that their modern Hinduism is altogether in opposition to the Vedas...... If once they became thoroughly convinced of this radical error, they will no doubt abandon Hinduism at once...... They cannot go back to the Vedic state; that is dead and gone, and will never revive; something more or less new must follow. We hope it may be Christianity,........”¹

VIII. RICHARD GARBE: was a German Sanskritist, who edited many Sanskrit works. Besides these, in 1914 he wrote a book for the missionaries, entitled “Indien und das Christentum.” His religious bias is quite evident in this book.

IX. WINTERNITZ: The pride of the superiority of their own philosophy and religion and of the infallibility of their own conclusions has become so ingrained in the above-mentioned type of Western Sanskrit scholars that they feel no hesitation in giving expression to it brazen-facedly before the public. Reverent admiration of the philosophy of the Upaniṣads by Schopenhauer, often quoted by Bhāratīya writers, rankled in the heart of the Europeans, and as late as A.D. 1925 Prof. Winternitz thought it incumbent on him to denounce the sincere and heartfelt views of Schopenhauer in the following words:—

“Yet I believe, it is a wild exaggeration when Schopenhauer says that the teaching of the Upaniṣads represents ‘the fruit of the highest human knowledge and wisdom’ and contains ‘almost superhuman conceptions the originators of which can hardly be regarded as mere mortals........”²

Not content with his invective against the Upaniṣads he had the audacity to deprecate even the greatness of the Vedas by saying:—

“It is true, the authors of these hymns rise but extremely seldom to the exalted flights and the deep fervour of, say, religious poetry of the Hebrews.”³

² Some Problems of Indian Literature, Calcutta 1925, p. 61.
³ History of Indian Literature, page 79, 1927.
This vilification did not remain confined to Sanskrit scholars alone, but through them it percolated into the field of Science. Not knowing a word of the exact and multifarious scientific knowledge of the ancient Hindus, Sir William Cecil Dampier writes:

"Perhaps the paucity of Indian contribution to other sciences (than Philosophy and Medicine) may in part be due to the Hindu religion"\(^1\).

The climax of hatred against Hinduism is seen in the highly mischievous and provoking remarks like the following even in popular literature:—

\((a)\) "The curse of India is the Hindoo religion. More than two hundred million people believe a monkey mixture of mythology that is strangling the nation." "He who yearns for God in India soon loses his head as well as his heart"\(^2\)

\((b)\) Prof. McKenzie, of Bombay finds the ethics of India defective, illogical and anti-social, lacking any philosophical foundation, nullified by abhorrent ideas of asceticism and ritual and altogether inferior to the ‘higher spirituality’ of Europe. He devotes most of his book ‘Hindu Ethics’ to upholding this thesis and comes to the triumphant conclusions that Hindu philosophical ideas, ‘when logically applied leave no room for ethics’; and that they prevent the development of a strenuous moral life.\(^3\)

It is a matter of serious mistake on the part of a Government which is anxious to win the friendship and sympathy of Bhārata to allow such heinous type of literature as Ripley’s to be published. And again, it is a matter of regret that such books, whether published in India or abroad, are not taken notice of by our politicians and have not been banned by our National Government. Not only is our

---

Government indifferent to the interdiction of such slanderous literature, but even our Universities not only prescribe but recommend for higher study books on Bhāratiya history and culture written by foreign scholars who lose no opportunity of maligning our civilization openly or in a very subtle way.

Remarks like those of McKenzie on the ethics of a country from whose Brahmans the whole world learnt its morality and rules of conduct, are nothing short of blasphemy and national insult. The irony of the situation is that, instead of being condemned such persons receive recognition and honour from our educationists and political leaders.

MOST BHĀRATIYA SCHOLARS AND POLITICIANS UNAWARE OF THIS BIAS: We have sufficiently exposed the mentality of this type of Western scholars. They received enormous financial aid from their Governments and also from the British Government in India, which they freely used in writing articles, pamphlets and books propagating their reactionary views in a very subtle and disguised manner. It was their careful endeavour not to give themselves away and to mislead the world and the people of Bhāratavarṣa under the cloak of scholarship and impartiality. They might have pretty well succeeded in their work had not their apple-cart been upset by Svāmi Dayānanda Sarasvatī, who ruthlessly exposed their nefarious designs. Svāmiji was a man of unique personality, indomitable courage, keen intellect and far-reaching vision and imagination. He had come in contact with many European scholars of his time. He had met George Buhler, Monier Williams, Rudolf Hoernle,

1. Manu, II. 20.
2. Monier Williams himself writes of his meeting:—"Dayanand Sarasvati,...... I made his acquaintance at Bombay in 1876, and was much struck by his fine countenance and figure. There I heard him preach an eloquent discourse on the religious development of the Aryan race. He began by repeating a hymn to Varuna (IV.16) preceded by the syllable Om—prolating the vowel in deep sonorous tones." Brahmanism and Hinduism. M. Williams, 4th ed. 1891, p. 529.

"In one of my interviews with him, I asked him for his definition of religion. He replied in Sanskrit:—'Religion (धर्म) is a true and just views (चेतिः) and the abandonment of all prejudice and partiality (प्रतिद्वन्दिताविनोदते)—that is to say, it is an impartial inquiry into the truth by means of the senses and the two other instruments of knowledge (भाषण), reason and revelation." Ibid. (p. 530),
Thibaut and others who had worked with Christian zeal in the field of Sanskrit research. He was the first man whose penetrating eye could not fail to see through the ulterior motives of their research work, although the common run of people in Bhāratavarṣa and even most of the learned men in the employ of the Government here had permitted themselves to be deluded by their so-called profound scholarship, strict impartiality, scientific and liberal outlook. He gave a timely warning to the people of his country and to a great extent succeeded in saving them from the clutches of these pseudo-scholars and clandestine missionaries.

We have studied almost the entire literature produced by generations of Western scholars and have thoroughly examined it with an open mind. We have arrived at the conclusion that there is a definite tinge of Christian prejudice in the writings of most of these scholars, which is responsible for discrediting all that is great in Bhāratavarṣa. The ultimate aim of the writers seems to be the proselytization of the people of this land to Christianity by instilling into their head in a subtle manner the inferiority of their indigenous religion and culture.

But truth can never remain hidden for long. Now some modern scholars of Bhāratavarṣa have also begun to see to some extent, though not thoroughly, through the thin veneer of European scholarship, e.g. :—

I. Prof. V. Rangacharya writes :—

"Incalculable mischief has been done by almost all the English and American scholars in assuming arbitrarily the earliest dates for Egypt or Mesopotamia—dates going back to B.C. 5000 atleast—and the latest possible dates for Ancient India on the ground that India borrowed from them."¹

II. Sri Nilakantha Śastri, the Head of History Department of

---

Madras University, although a supporter of many untenable Western theories, had to write:—

"What is this but a critique of Indian society and Indian history in the light of the nineteenth century prepossessions of Europe? This criticism was started by the English administration and European missionaries and has been nearly focussed by the vast erudition of Lassen; the unfulfilled aspirations of Germany in the early nineteenth century, doubtless had their share in shaping the line of Lassen's thought."1

III. Sri C. R. Krishnamacharlu, Ex-Epigraphist to the Government of India, having realized the ulterior motives of European writers, has expressed his views more strongly. He writes:—

"These authors, coming as they do from nations of recent growth, and writing this history with motives other than cultural, which in some cases are apparently racial and prejudicial to the correct elucidation of the past history of India, cannot acquire testimony for historic veracity of cultural sympathy."2

IV. Prof. R. Subba Rao, M.A., L.T., in his Presidential Address, (Sectional), Sixteenth Session of Indian History Congress, Waltair, (29th December, 1953) writes:—

"Unfortunately, the historicity of Purāṇas and their testimony has been perverted by certain Western scholars who stated rather dogmatically that the historical age cannot go back beyond 2000 B.C., and that there is no need for fixing the Mahābhārata war earlier than 1400 B.C. They accused the Brahmins of having raised their antiquity and questioned the authenticity of the Hindu astronomical works."3

1. *All India Oriental Conference*, December 1941, Part II, p. 64, printed in 1946.
2. 'The Cradle of Indian History,' p. 3, Adyar Library, Madras, 1947.
3. J.A.H.R.S., Vol. XX, p. 187,
Conclusion

In short, the foregoing pages make it clear that it was this Christian and Judaic prejudice which:

(a) did not allow the real dates of ancient Bhāratīya history to be accepted by the occidental scholars, who were always reluctant to give to the Vedas a higher antiquity than the earliest portion of the Old Testament and to place them beyond 2500 B.C.¹

Even the school of Paul Deussen, A.W. Ryder and H. Zimmer, which followed Schopenhauer in the appreciation of ancient Indian intellect, but which did not work directly on chronology, could not throw off the burden of these extremely unscientific, fictitious dates.

(b) gave rise to the two interrelated diseases of Western Indologists; firstly the disease of myth, mythical and mythology, according to which Brahmā, Indra, Viṣṇu, Parvata, Nārada, Kāśyapa Purūravās, Vasiṣṭha and a host of other ancient sages have been declared as mythical. Nobody ever tried to understand their true historical character apprehending that the dates of Bhāratīya history would go to very ancient periods; and secondly, as a corollary to the above, the disease of ‘attribution’ and ‘ascription’, under which the works of these and other sages have been declared to be written by some very late anonymous persons who are said to have ascribed or attributed them to those ‘mythical’ sages.

(c) brought to the fore-front, the most fanciful and groundless theory of the migration of the Aryans into India, according to which the very existence of Manu, the first Crowned King of Bhārata, Egypt etc.; Ikṣvāku, Manu’s glorious son; Bharata Chakravartī, the glorious son of Šāṃkunāla; Bhagīratha, who changed the course of the Ganga; Kuru, after whom the sacred sacrificial land is called Kurukṣetra: Rāma, the son of Daśaratha and a number of other kings is being totally denied.

¹ Cf. A.L. Basham:—

(d) was responsible for the altogether wrong translations of Vaidika works, and misrepresentation of Vaidika culture.

(e) did not allow the acceptance of Sanskrit, as being the mother language of at least the Indo-European group; as at first very ably propounded by Franz Bopp, and often mentioned by ancient Indian authors.

We are not sorry for all this, for, nothing better could be expected from such biased foreign pioneers of Sanskrit studies.

With these brief remarks we earnestly pray that the light of truth may dawn on every thinking and learned man of Bhāratavarṣa, so that in these days of political and individual freedom he may shake off the yoke of intellectual slavery of the west.
NON-VIOLENCE IS SUPREME IN RELIGIOUS SCRIPTURES

Non-violence has been accorded a very high position in the scriptures of the Hindus as well as those of other faiths. It is evident from the citations given below:—

1. सा हिंस्यात् सर्वं सूक्तानि
Do not kill any living being.

2. तत्राहिंसा सर्वं च सर्वं सूक्तानाय भिवः: (पायो. २.३०)
Having no ill feeling for any living being in all manners possible and for all times is called Ahimśā. (Pātuṇjala Yoga  2.30)

3. श्रोहिस्या च सूक्तानाय मुतत्वाय कल्याते (मनुस्मृति ६.६०)
By not killing any living being, one becomes fit for salvation (Manusmṛti  6.60)

श्रोहिस्या तत्पदम् (मनुस्मृति ६.७५)

By non-violence, one attains the supreme state, the paramapada. (Manusmṛti  6.75)

Manu in 10.63 in his prescription of duties for all human beings, has given priority to ahimsā even over truth etc.

श्रोहिस्या सत्यमःस्तेयं मुुव्विविश्वयःविप्रहः (मनुस्मृति १०.६३)

4. धर्माणाम् च यथाहिंसाभ्यासवान् बरेण्यकृः (श्रीदिपुराण १.१६)

Just as ahimsā is highest among all religions, similarly granting of fearlessness (Abhaya-dāna) is the highest of all gifts (dānā).
(Ādipurāṇa  1.19)
5. प्रविष्टिनं यथा नवं: समुद्रमेवजूवक्रमः।
सर्वगंधमित्र सिस्यां प्रविष्टिनी तथा हुँदम्।।

Just as rivers following straight or crooked path enter the ocean, likewise all sins (adharma) surely converge into violence (himsā) that is, himsā is the greatest sin. (Padmapurāṇa, Uttara 243.6)

6. सत्यं न सत्यं खलु यत्र हिसा (देवीभागवतं 3.११.३६)

The truth which involves violence is not a truth.

(Devibhāgavata 3.11.36)

7. शृयते हितविषं शौर्यं विचारवेद्यं: परुपासितम्।
वार्तं निलेंकिर्गच्चमना: शौर्यमहिसिनम्।।
श्रद्धा: शृद्धाविनिगतानि वुद्धिजिनिन श्रुद्धायति।
श्रवणया च मूलात्मा मनस्तस्तत्त्वेन श्रुद्धायति।।

Purification is of two kinds. Outer purification is effected by removal of adherences and inner purity is effected by ahimsā. The physical body is purified by water; intellect is purified by knowledge; the spirit (atma) is purified by ahimsā and the mind is purified by truth. (Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra 3.10.23-24)

8. The Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra (3.10.14) accords a premier position to ahimsā in the various kinds of tapas.

9. In the Pātañjala Yogasūtra, ahimsā is the first of the five yamas.

(Sādhanapada 60)

10. Even Bhagavān Śrī Kṛṣṇa while replying to the queries of Uddhava has given priority to ahimsā harmlessness or non-violence, while describing yama-niyama in Śrimad-Bhāgavata (11.19.33-35).
Bhagavān Kapiladeva also has given priority to \( ahimsā \) over truth etc. while preaching ‘\( yōga \)' to his revered mother Devahūti in Śrīmad-Bhāgavata 3.28.4.

Enumerating His glorious manifestations, Lord Kṛṣṇa said to Uddhava in Śrīmad-Bhāgavata 11.16.23—“Of all sacred vows I am (the vow of) harmlessness \( ahimsā—\) अहिंसामविबिधिनन्दनम्”

(११) अहिंसा सत्यमकौदः (गीता १६.२)

Among \( daivi-sampad \) qualities, \( ahimsā \) gets priority over truth.

(Gītā 16.2)

12. परम धर्म ज्ञृति विविध अहिंसा । (रामचरितमानस)

\( ahimsā \) is known to be the highest religion in Śruti.

(Rāma-carita-mānasā)

13. In the Pañcha-tantra by Viṣṇu Śarmā, where practical knowledge is illustrated by way of stories, \( ahimsā \) is described and praised as the prime religion. In the third section Kākolukiya it is said:

हिंसकाक्षमिव भूतानि यो हिंसति स निधं :।
स याति नरकं घोरं किः पुनर्यं: शुभानि च ॥

meaning thereby, that he who kills even ferocious animals without any reason or justification, is a cruel person and he goes to infernal hell; what to speak of one who kills innocent living beings.

Stress has been laid on ‘\( ahimsa \)' (non-violence) at several places in the Mahābhārata. Some extracts are quoted below. The references to chapter and verse are from the Gita Press edition followed by the Bhandarkar Research Institute edition.

**VANA-PARVA**

\( \text{ग्रहिष्टानिर्देश: स्वर्ग गच्छेति दिति महिमम् । १८१.२; १७८.२} \\
\( \text{ग्रहिष्टार्थसमायुक्ते कारण: स्वर्गमहनुते। १८१.१०; १७८.१०} \)
A Review of ‘Beef in Ancient India

Discourse on ‘ahimsā’ versus ‘himsā’ by Dharma- Vyādha.
The whole chapter deals with the subject. 208 ; 199.

UDYOGAPARVA :

DRONAPARVA :

SANTIPARVA. Raja-dharma-anuśāsana :

181.42; 178.43
189.22; 187.21
207.74; 198.69
207.91-92-93; 198.87-88

314.8; 298.8

33.52; 33.48

192.38; 165.29

35.37; 35.33
36.10; 37.7
65.20; 65.20
79.6; 80.6

79.18; 80 17
111.6; 112.6
SANTIPARVA  Āpad-dharma:

श्रीहसा सत्यचन्द दानमिल्लियलिग्रहः।
एतेवयो हि महाराज तयो नानशानात् परसः॥
श्रीहसा चैव राजेन्द्र सत्याकारस्त्रयोवदशः।

SANTIPARVA  Mokṣa-dharma:

श्रीहस: सर्वभूतानां मेघायणगतशचरेत्।
श्रीहसा सत्यमयोऽध: सर्वभिमाणां तपः।
श्रीहसा सत्यचन्द सर्वभूतेऽपि चार्जवम्।
क्षमा चेवामादित्वं परास्येत् स तुवृधो भवेत्॥
श्रीहसक: सम: सत्यो धृतिमान् नियतेत्रियः।
शरणं: सर्वभूतानां गतिमान्यत्वृत्तमाम्।
प्रज्ञातनमहे वृत्तमहिलाः महात्मनाम्।
श्रीहसाग्रिहतं कर्म इह चैव परत्र च।
श्रीहसा सर्वभूतेऽपि धर्मेऽपि ज्यायस्ती मताः।
श्रीहसां लोको सर्वमेको ज्यायस्ती मताः।
पञ्चानां श्रीहसां लोको सर्वमेको ज्यायस्ती मताः।

पञ्चानां श्रीहसां लोको सर्वमेको ज्यायस्ती मताः।

215.6; 208.6

श्रीहस: सर्वभूतानां मेघायणगतशचरेत्। 189.12; 182.12
श्रीहसा सत्यमयोऽध: सर्वभिमाणां तपः। 191.15; 184.15
श्रीहसा सत्यचन्द सर्वभूतेऽपि चार्जवम्। 245.20; 237.20
क्षमा चेवामादित्वं परास्येत् स तुवृधो भवेत्॥ 262.19; 254.20
श्रीहसाग्रिहतं कर्म इह चैव परत्र च। 264.6; 256.6
श्रीहसा सर्वभूतेऽपि धर्मेऽपि ज्यायस्ती मताः। 265.6; 257.6
श्रीहस: सर्वभूतानां मेघायणगतशचरेत्। 270.39-40; 262.37-38
श्रीहसा सकलो धर्मोऽपि हिंसाधर्मस्तथाहितः। 272.20; 264.19
पञ्चानात् तु कर्तं हिंसाधर्माः व्यक्तवर्तिः।
रक्षकां नावस्ते नास्त्य विहन्त्वबानुकर्षितः। 291.12-13; 280.12-13
श्रीहसा चानूशद्वयं च विधिवत् परिपालय। 321.5; 309.4
श्रीहसाधर्मसंयुक्तः: प्रचरेयः; सुरोतमाः।
स वो वेशः: केलित्वयो मा वोधवर्म: पदा स्वर्लोकः॥ 340.89; 327.78
श्रीहसाधर्मसंयुक्तेऽ प्रीयते हृतीरोवरः। 348.56; 336.52
श्रीहसया परे स्वर्गः। 354.12; 343.12
ANUSAŚANAPARVA  Dāna-dharma

श्रीहिसा सत्यमकायो श्रानूपांतं वमस्तथा।
श्राजेंव चेव राजेन्द्र निषिक्तं चर्मवल्क्षणम्।।
श्रीहिसान्तव्यदोषकः स राजानू केतनकः।।
श्रीहिसान्तिरता ये च...तानू नमस्यामि केशव।
श्रीहिसा दस्म श्राजेबः...ततपात्रे मानमहःति।
श्रीहिसाया: फलं रूपं दीक्षता जनम वे कुले।
श्रीहिसा सत्यभूतेः...सत्यं भवतः सभृत्।
श्रीहिसान्तिरतो नितः जुल्लानो जातवेदसः।
पद्धिरेव स वर्षेऽऽ सिर्ध्यते नात्र संसायः।।
श्रीहिसा सत्यसूतानामः।
श्रीहिसा सत्यवचनं...गार्हिण्ये थरी उत्तमः।
उपवासवतवैतन्ता ह्याहिसा: सत्यवादिनः।।
संसिद्धा: चैत्य गन्धवः: तह सोन्दत्त्यनामया।।
श्रीहिसा सत्यमकायो वाणेति चन्द्रृइष्टयः।
श्रीहिसाया च दीर्घयुरिति प्रायमणीषिणः।।

ASVAMEDHAPARVA:

श्रीहिसा सत्यवभारणामिति बुद्धानुसासनम्।
श्रीहिसति प्रतितेषेऽथि वथि बवखायम्यतः परसः।।
श्रीहिसा सत्यभूतानां नित्यमस्मातु रोचते।
श्रीहिसारमो वर्नो हिसा चाषर्मलक्षणा।
श्रीहिसा ब्रह्मवर्यं च सत्यमार्गबेनव च।
श्रीहिसा सत्यभूतानामेतत् कृत्यतमं मतम्।।
CHRISTIANITY ON NON-VIOLENCE

1. For 'meat' destroy not the work of God. (Romans 14.20)

2. It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak. (Romans 14.21)

3. Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire, mine ears hast thou opened; burnt offering and sin offering hast thou not required. (Psalms 40.6)

4. I will take no bullock out of thy house, nor he goats out of thy folds. (Psalms 50.9)

5. For every beast of the forest is mine, and the cattle upon a thousand hills. (Psalms 50.10)

6. I know all the fowls of the mountains, and the wild beasts of the fields are mine. (Psalms 50.11)

7. If I were hungry, I would not tell thee: for the world is mine, and the fulness thereof. (Psalms 50.12)

8. Will I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats? (Psalms 50.13)

9. I will have mercy and not sacrifice. (Mathews 9 13)

10. He that killeth an ox* is as if he slew a man, he that sacrificeth a lamb, as if he cut off a dog's neck. (Issiah 66/3)

* According to dictionary 'Ox' represents both male and female of Cow progeny.
How strange that in spite of the provision in their scriptures that killing of the bovine species is like human murder, the Christians are the biggest cow-killers and beef-eaters and even persuade others to do so for their selfish ends.

ZARATHUSTRA RELIGION

The Parsi Zarathustra religion has also attached great importance to *ahimsā* and it considers meat as very impure. Mr. Dastur Khurshedji, the High Priest of the Wadia Temple, Bombay has written in his letter dated 7-2-1969:

1. Our religion has the attribute—

   "Not advocating compulsion and violence"

   (Naida-Snaithishem)

2. Any cruelty to animals is prohibited; and protection or kindness is advocated.

3. It is pointed out that at the final ‘judgement’ (Resurrection) man’s food should consist of vegetarian products; and none would kill living creatures for food.

4. The sacred hymns of Zarathustra emphasise our homage (*nemo*) to the animal kingdom. All life is sacred.

5. Animal sacrifices are forbidden and none of our rituals ever offer meat. Nay, it has to be far away from sacred precincts.

Although many Parsi friends take meat against their religion, their priest Shri Dastur Khurshedji is completely vegetarian.
WHAT TO DO IF THERE IS CONTRADICTION BETWEEN SRUTI AND SMRTI?

विरोधे त्वनपेक्ष च्यादसति हृतनामाम्। (जैमिनी पुर्वमीमांसादर्शन १.३.३)

In case Smṛti provision is against the provision of Šruti, Smṛti provisions become inoperative. If the Šruti is not against, then it has to be presumed that in Šruti also there must have been provisions similar to Smṛti but by the passing of time, the same is lost and is not traceable. (Jaimini Pūrva Mīmāṁsā Darśan 1.3.3)

प्रथमाने विषयस्तिनां दर्शनानि विचारते इ।
थर्मेऽज्ञातसातानि प्रमाणं परसं प्रवृति: || (मनुस्मृति) २.४३

These are the duties prescribed for those who are not addicted to artha and kāma. For those who are anxious to know dharma, šruti is the best proof. (Manu 2.13)

या वेदबाग्यः स्मृतयो यांच काष्ठ कुवृष्टयः ||
सर्वास्तत्न निषिद्धता: जेवा: तमोतिष्ठ ति: स्मृता: ||
(मनुस्मृति १२.६५)

Those (या:) Smrtis (स्मृतय:) and those (यांच काष्ठ) despicable systems (कुवृष्टय:) which are not based on the Veda (वेदबाग्य:) are all (सर्वास्तत:) futile (निषिद्धता:) for (ति) they (ता:) are declared (स्मृता:) to be founded on dark ignorance (तमोतिष्ठ:)
(Manu 12.95)

श्रुतिस्रूतिविरोधं तु श्रुतिरेष गरीयसि।
श्रिवर्तो तत्त्वं स्मार्तं वैदिकवस्तव॥ (जाबाल)

In case of contradiction between śruti and smṛti, the former is to be given more weight. Where there is no contradiction, good
people should perform actions ordained by *smṛti* as if they were prescribed by *śruti*. (Jābāla)

शुच्या सह बिरोधेन वाध्यते विषयं विना। (भविष्यपुराण)

In case of contradiction with *śruti*, *smṛti* becomes inoperative and ineffective. (Bhaviśya-puraṇa)

Śri Mādhavācārya *alias* Swami Ānandatīrtha has quoted passages from Vedic texts and Purāṇas at certain places in his commentary on the Brahmaṣūtra and he has clearly specified:

पुराणस्योपनीष्ठायं वेद एव न चापर:।
तत्त्वायर्थें कथं मानं तत्त्वं न भविष्यति॥

The basis of Purāṇas is Veda and nothing else. As such, how can they be taken as authentic against Vedic provisions?
IS BEEF EATING PRESCRIBED IN THE BRIHADARANYAKA UПANISHAD?

Notorious importance has been attached to Raja Rajendralala Mitra’s ‘Beef in Ancient India’, published as a booklet by Manisha Granthalaya (Private) Ltd., Calcutta. On pages ii & iii of its ‘Preface’ a passage from the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad (6th Chapter, 4th Brāhmaṇa, 18th kāṇḍikā), has been cited and interpreted as the ‘eating of a beef-preparation by a couple desirous of begetting a son learned in all the Vedas’. This verse is invariably quoted by almost all who support beef-eating in the Vedas. Shri Panduranga Vaman Kane, M.A., LL.M., Advocate, High Court, Bombay, has also referred to it in Chapter XXII ‘Bhojana—flesh-eating’ of his ‘History of Dharmaśāstra’, Vol. II, Part II, published by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona. Later scholars like Dr. R.C. Majumdar, Honorary Head of the Department of History, Bharatiya Vidya Bhawan, Bombay, in the chapter ‘Food and Drink’, (‘History and Culture of the Indian People’, chapter XXI, page 577) have relied on Kane’s History of Dharmaśāstra for supporting the contention of beef-eating. Shri A. B. Shah, Professor of Mathematics and Statistics at the Universities of Poona and Bombay for about 20 years, now Director of Programme in India for the Congress for Cultural Freedom, author of ‘Scientific Method & Planning for Democracy’ and other essays, in the ‘Introduction’ to his book ‘Cow Slaughter—Horns of a Dilemma’, has emphatically supported beef-eating on the basis of the same controversial verse of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad. This article intends to discuss this oft-cited verse. It reads as follows:

श्रवणे इच्छेद कुशो मे पण्डितो विगोत: समितिगमः: श्रुव्यूषितां वाच भाषिता जायेन सर्वान् वेदान्तनुद्वैत सर्वामायुरियार्विति सांसौदर्य पाचित्वा सप्तधमन्तस्तमोंपातामोऽवरी जनितिवा श्रीकृष्णे वायणेण वा ॥

(ब्रह्मदारण्यक उपनिषद् ६४१५)
In the ‘Preface’ of the ‘Beef in Ancient India’, this verse has been translated into English as follows:—

“And if a man wishes that a learned son should be born to him, famous, a public man, a popular speaker, that he should know all the Vedas and that he should live to his full age, then after having prepared boiled rice with meat and butter, he and his wife should both eat, being fit to have offspring. The meat should be of a full-grown or of an old bull.”

Mr. Robert Earnest Hume, Ph.D., D. Theol., Professor of the History of Religions at the Union Theological Seminary, New York, has translated this verse in different words but the idea is the same, except that in place of ‘full grown or old bull’ he has interpreted the meat as ‘either veal or beef’.

The controversial words are interpreted by the two authors as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rajendralala Mitra</th>
<th>Robert Earnest Hume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Māṁsāudanam</td>
<td>boiled rice and meat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aukṣena</td>
<td>meat of a fullgrown bull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ārṣabheṇa</td>
<td>meat of an old bull</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In English usage ‘veal’ is the flesh of a calf and beef that of a grown-up animal.

If it be accepted that rice with veal, meat of a full-grown or an old bull, cooked in butter, would beget a son, blessed with the learning of all the Vedas, then the Western people, who are almost all beef-eaters, should have all acquired this learning. Let us examine the interpretation of this verse in its appropriate context. The four verses immediately preceding the said controversial verse in the Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad read as follows:—

स य इच्छुकः पुनः मे शुभलो जायेत बेदमनुच्छीति सर्वमात्रायिरियाविति
क्षीरोदनं पातित्वासर्पिष्ठमात्रमीतामोहावरो जनयितवे ॥ १४ ॥
These four verses, according to all the translators, give dietary prescriptions for begetting progeny which is well versed in one or more Vedas as follows:

For a son, proficient in one Veda, diet of rice cooked in milk, and mixed with ghee;

For a son, proficient in two Vedas, diet of rice cooked with curd, mixed with ghee;

For a son, proficient in three Vedas, diet of rice cooked in water, mixed with ghee; and

For a learned daughter, diet of rice cooked in til (sesamum), mixed with ghee.

According to Western scholars, the chronological order of the four Vedas is as follows:

(i) Rg-Veda; (ii) Yajur-Veda; (iii) Sāma-Veda; and (iv) Atharva-Veda.

If the sequence of the Vedas in the above-quoted verses of the Brhadāranyaka Upaniṣad is taken to correspond to the order in which the respective Vedas have appeared, then the diet prescribed for a couple to acquire a son well versed in one or more of the Vedas will be as follows:

(i) For Rg-Veda, diet of rice and milk, mixed with ghee;

(ii) For Rg, and Yajur-Vedas

(iii) For Rg, Yajur & Sāma Vedas
(iv) For Ṛg, Yajur, Sāma & Atharva Vedas diet of rice and beef, mixed with ghee

If the above interpretation is accepted, beef diet has been enjoined for the acquisition of the knowledge of the Atharva-Veda only.

The above verses do not indicate a diet of the meat of smaller animals like goat, sheep or others for acquiring a child proficient in one or two or three of the Vedas. Then how can it be justified that beef diet has been prescribed for begetting a son learned in the four Vedas, particularly for the Atharva Veda. Let us consider the question further and in greater details.

Just as the English word 'flesh', besides meaning 'muscular tissues of an animal', also means 'soft pulpy part of fruits and vegetables' and 'meat', besides meaning 'flesh of an animal', also means 'anything eaten as food for nourishment', the Sanskrit word ṛmaṣa also means 'soft pulpy part of fruits and vegetables, etc.' The readers can consult any Sanskrit dictionary. Similarly, the peel of a fruit is called skin; its hard part is called bone and fibres are called ligament or nerves etc.

'PRASTHAM KUMĀRIKĀ-MĀMSAM ĀNAYA' in Sanskrit could mean 'bring a seer of girl's flesh', but it means only 'bring a seer of the fleshy pith of the medicinal plant called kumārī (Hindi—ghikvār).

There are several words in Sanskrit which mean a particular animal or which refer to parts of their body, but primarily they are the names of medicinal plants.

Go-dantī cow's-teeth; a kind of medicinal plant; yellow orpiment (Monier-Williams); a white mineral substance (Monier-Williams)

Go-kṣura cow's hoof; a medicine called gokharu; Tibulus lanuginosus, sivṛuta (Monier-Williams).
Go-jihvā cow’s tongue; Ayurvedic medicine called gajwan or gojwan (its leaf is rough like cow’s tongue); name of a plant Phlomis or Premna esculenta (Monier-Williams).

Ajā-karna goat’s ear; asana arjuna (आसान अर्जुन) tree whose parts are used in the preparation of medicine; the tree Terminalia Alata Tomentosa (Monier-Williams).

Ajā she-goat; plant whose bulb resembles the udder of a goat (Monier-Williams)

It would be blasphemy if one interprets these words only as parts of the body of a cow or goat or the animal itself.

The chapter VI-4 of the Brhadāranyaka Upanishad deals with the subject of begetting learned progeny according to one’s own desire. The very first verse of this chapter is:—

एवां वे सूतानां पृथिवी रसः, पृथिवीम ग्रापोपवामोक्षय, ग्राहविनों पुष्पार्णि, पुष्पार्णां फलांि, फलां गुर्जय, पुर्जय रेत: 1111

which means—

“Verily, of all created things here, earth is the essence;
of earth, water is the essence;
of water, medicinal plants are the essence;
of medicinal plants, flowers are the essence;
of flowers, fruits are the essence;
of fruits, man is the essence;
of man, semen is the essence.

In this chain from earth to semen (seed of the human species), no mention has been made of anything connected with animal flesh. The specification of the plant kingdom clearly indicates that high class semen needed to beget high class progeny, can be produced by fruits of medicinal plants only and not from any kind of animal flesh.

The word ‘auksena’ is from ‘Ukṣa’. It will be relevant here to quote the various meanings of this word from the famous Sanskrit-English Dictionary compiled by Monier-Williams. They are as follows:—
(i) a bull (as impregnating the flock);
(ii) name of ‘soma’ (as sprinkling or scattering small drops);
(iii) one of the eight chief medicaments (ṛṣabha).

The word ‘āṛṣabheya’ is derived from the word ‘ṛṣabha’. The said Dictionary renders this word as follows:—

(i) a bull (as impregnating the flock);
(ii) a kind of medicinal plant (Suśruta, Bhāva-Prakāśa);
(iii) Carpopogon Pruriens (Caraka).

The well-known Sanskrit-German Dictionary under the title Sanskrit-Wörterbuch published by the Imperial Academy of Sciences, St.-Petersburg in 1855, explains the word ‘uksā’ as dripping or trickling soma. The Dictionary has cited the word from various mantras 1.135.9, 9.83.2, 9.85.10, 9.86.43, 9.89.2, 9.95.4 of the Rg-Veda.

A few more meanings are ascribed to these two words, but they are not relevant here.

‘SOMA’ in Monier Monier-Williams’ Sanskrit-English Dictionary is ‘Juice of soma plant’ where soma plant itself is said to be a climbing plant Sarcostema Viminalis or Asclepias Acida; a drug of supposed magical property. ‘Soma’ is interpreted as ‘nectar’ as well. Almost similar interpretations of the soma plant are given in other indigenous dictionaries also.

The concluding words of the above verse are ‘aukṣēya vā ṛṣabheya vā, which stand for ‘either uksā or ṛṣabha’. As such uksā and ṛṣabha must be two different things and not one and the same thing. According to the dictionaries, uksā does not mean ‘go-vaisa’ or calf, while both words uksā and ṛṣabha, if interpreted as an animal of the bovine species, will mean bull (as impregnating the flock) i.e. one and the same thing. Hence the word uksā and ṛṣabha, with the conjunctions ‘either’ and ‘or’, cannot mean one and the same thing i.e. bull (as impregnating the flock). By adding the conjunctions ‘either...or’ to ‘uksā’ and ‘ṛṣabha’ the seer of the verse must have intended to represent two different things. In the field of medicine ‘uksā’ may also
mean ‘ṛṣabha’, but with the words ‘either’ and ‘or’ added with the words ‘ukṣā’ and ‘ṛṣabha’, ‘ukṣā’ cannot mean ‘ṛṣabha’. As such ‘ukṣā’ stands for ‘soma’ (as sprinkling or scattering small drops) and ‘ṛṣabha’ signifies a medicinal plant as described in the Caraka-Saṃhitā, Suśruta-Saṃhitā and Bhāva-Prakāśa.

In Caraka-Saṃhitā, Volume I, Chapter IV-13, the first mahākaśāya consisting of ten medicines, among which ‘ṛṣabhaka’ is one, are termed as ‘jīvanīya’ or energy-increasing. The text is as follows:—

1 2 3 4 5 6 7-8

जीवकर्ष्यबन्धकोः मेदा महामेदा काकोलो शैरकाकोलो मुद्रमाधिपत्याः
9 10

जीवन्ती मनुकत्मिति दसौमानि जीवनीयानि भवति।

In the 38th Chapter of the sūtra-sāṭhāna of the Suśruta-Saṃhitā, which is named as dravya-saṅgrahāṇiya, ṛṣabhaka’ is one of several items.

In Bhāva-Prakāśa, Pūrṇa-khaṇḍ ‘ṛṣabhaka’ is one of the eight medicaments. The text is as follows:—

1 2 3-4 5-6 7 8

जीवकर्ष्यबन्धको नेरे काकोलयो ऋद्धिवृद्धिके।

Among the various qualities of aṣṭa-varga or the eight medicaments, the most important are: brhaṇa—aphrodisiac; śukra-janaka—semen-producing; and bala-bardhaka—tonic.

It is further mentioned there that the ‘ṛṣabha’ medicine is found on Himalayan peaks. It is shaped like the horn of a bull.

From the several references quoted above as well as from verses 1, 14, 15, 16 and 17 of the same chapter of Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, it is amply clear that ‘ukṣā’ and ‘ṛṣabha’ in verse 18 can mean only two different medicinal plants referred to in Ayurvedic texts and not the meat of a calf or an ox (whether full-grown or old) in any case.
Commentary of Jagadguru Ādi-Śaṅkarācārya

Jagadguru Ādi-Śaṅkarācārya’s Sanskrit Commentary on controversial kāṇḍikā 6.4.18 of Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, is often cited in favour of the prescription of beef. Some contend that it is evident from this commentary that even Jagadguru Ādi-Śaṅkarācārya has accepted the prescription of partaking of rice cooked with beef for a couple desirous of begetting progeny well-versed in the four Vedas. The wording of the commentary is as follows:

"विविधं गीतो विगीत: प्रख्यात इत्यर्थः। समितिगमः सभां गच्छतीति प्रगल्भ इत्यर्थः। पाणिडत्यस्वतः पुष्यप्रह्यानात्। शुष्किष्ठिता श्रोतुमिश्रिता रमणीयं वाचं भाषितं संस्कृताया प्रख्यात्वत्या बाचों भाषितेत्यथः।

मांसमिथ्यमोदनं मांसोद्यनमः। तप्पमांसिनियमार्थमाहः—श्रीकृष्णं वा मासेन।
उक्षं सेवनसमस्यं: पुणःस्तत्तदीयं मांसम्। ऋषभस्ततोष्णिधिकवायस्तदीयमार्थं मांसम्।"

There is no difference of opinion about the translation of the first part of the commentary which is as follows:

“One whose importance is sung in varied ways is called vigūta. Vīgūta i.e., renowned. Samitiṅgama i.e., a fearless or undaunted person who attends the assembly of the learned. As learned has been specified separately in the text, the word samitiṅgama has not been taken in the sense of a scholar or learned person. Suśrūṣṭa is affable in speech, speaker of charming expression, i.e., a coherent speaker endowed with saṃskāras”.

The meaning of the latter part is as follows:

“Cooked rice mixed with māṁsa is māṁsauḍana. The māṁsa is further specified as: that of ukṣā, ukṣā is a puṅgava potent in impregnation; or that of a rśabha of vayās exceeding that of ukṣā”.
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Commentry of Jagatguru Ādi-Śāṅkaraçārya

This is the literal meaning. Jagadguru Ādi-Śāṅkaraçārya has not clarified whether it is the meat of an animal or whether it is the māṁsa i.e., fleshy part of medicinal fruits. In such a situation it has to be considered in the light of its context, whether the meat of an animal is appropriate here or the fleshy part of medicinal fruits. This will be clear by considering the signification of secana-samarthāḥ puṅgavaḥ and of ‘a ṭṭabha exceeding in vayas than that of ukṣā’'. There is no difference of opinion about the meaning of secana-samarthāḥ which is potent in impregnation. The meanings of the words ukṣā, puṅgava, ṭṭabha and vayas will have to be considered.

The meaning of ukṣā has been discussed earlier in this chapter.

The meanings of the word puṅgava are given by Monier Williams in his Sanskrit-English Dictionary p. 630, column 3 (lines 8-11 from bottom) as follows:

“a bull, a hero, eminent person, chief of, a kind of drug”.

On their basis, the meaning of secana-samarthāḥ puṅgavaḥ can be:

i) a stud-bull potent in impregnation.
ii) a hero potent in impregnation.
iii) an eminent person potent in impregnation.
iv) a chief potent in impregnation.
v) a kind of drug potent in impregnation.

The herb potent in impregnation has been termed as vājikaraṇ or aphrodisiac in Āyurveda. Soma is also an aphrodisiac herb (a drug of supposed magical property) which is a favourite of the gods. According to Hindu scriptures one attains birth among the gods for enjoying the fruits of one’s meritorious deeds. These include all enjoyments according to one’s inclination or longings. The Purāṇas recount a number of legends of the amours of the gods enjoying the fruits of their meritorious deeds. Therefore, it is not surprising that the herbal juice of soma which is potent in impregnation, should have been
such a favourite of the gods enjoying the fruits of their meritorious deeds. Now, the readers should themselves consider as to which of the five meanings mentioned above will be more appropriate and in accordance with the context for ‘ukṣā secana-samarthāḥ’. Taking the contextual propriety into consideration, the meaning ‘a herb (ukṣā, i.e. soma juice) potent in impregnation’ will be the most appropriate and relevant.

The meaning of ‘tataḥ api adhika-vayāḥ’ is ‘one exceeding in vayās than that’. The base of vayāḥ is vayās. The meanings of the word vayās are given as under in Monier-Williams’ Sanskrit-English Dictionary, page 920, columns 2, 3:

i) enjoyment, food, meal, oblation;

ii) energy (both bodily and mental), strength, health, vigour, power, might;

iii) vigorous age, youth, prime of life, any period of life, age.

Accordingly, tataḥ api adhika-vayāḥ will mean:

i) more enjoyable than that;

ii) more energetic than that;

iii) more invigorating than that.

The meanings of ṭṣabha as given by Monier-Williams’ Sanskrit-English Dictionary have been cited already. In the section on plants and herbs in the Amarakośa 2.116 it is rendered as śṛṅgī tu ṭṣabhō brśah. The plant śṛṅgī is also called ṭṣabha and vṛṣa. This plant śṛṅgī is an aphrodisiac.

If we take it as the flesh of the bovine ṭṣabha (bull) here, then the meaning of ‘ṛṣabhaḥ tataḥ api adhika-vayāḥ’ will be ‘the bovine ṭṣabha who is older in age than the ukṣā capable of impregnating the bovine species’. But the reality of the situation is that the vigorous age for impregnation is growing youth and not the advancing age (declining youth). So this meaning does not fit in the context.

Taking the context into account ṭṣabhāḥ tataḥ api adhika-vayāḥ will mean, ‘a medicine of aṣṭavarga called ṭṣabha which is more
invigorating even than *soma* juice’. This medicine is often prescribed by Ayurvedic practitioners for frequent use by the rich to keep their sexual powers undiminished. The medicine of the *aṣṭavarga* is an aphrodisiac which increases semen.

The prescription of beef is impossible, particularly because the bovine species is declared as inviolable in *Vedas*. There is no mention of meat in this section from its very first *kaṇḍikā* among the items which ultimately result in the best, purest *sāttvika* semen. And only the purest *sāttvika* semen is required for begetting progeny proficient in the Vedas. Therefore, in the present passage *ukṣā* and *ṛṣabha* can never signify the meat of animals, but they can only mean the fleshy part of pulp of pure medicinal fruits.

In none of the dictionaries do we find that the word *ukṣā* means ‘a stud-bull of younger age, potent in impregnation’ or that the word *ṛṣabha* means ‘an older stud-bull potent in impregnation’. If we take that according to Jagadguru Ādi-Śaṅkarācārya, both the words *ukṣā* and *ṛṣabha* mean stud bulls potent in impregnation, and one of them be younger while the other be older, then the words *ukṣā* and *ṛṣabha* taken collectively, will mean, a bull of any age potent in impregnation.

If, in the *māṁsāudana*, the meat of a bull of any age, potent in impregnation had been intended then in the original Upaniṣad the wording would have been *govaṁśa aukṣ:ya* (bovine *ukṣā*) or *govaṁśa ārṣabheṇa* (bovine *ṛṣabha*) and Jagadguru Ādi-Śaṅkarācārya, to make it clear beyond doubt that the meat of the stud-bull is intended, would also have written, *secana-samarthoḥ govaṁśa-puṅgavaḥ tadiyam māṁsam*.

Stud-bulls potent in impregnation are of a very high breed and also very rare. Their slaughter will never be desirable. Moreover, the original words in the text are *aukṣeṇa vā ārṣabheṇa vā*, that is, either of an *ukṣā* or of a *ṛṣabha*. The use of the conjunctions ‘vā…...vā’ i.e. ‘either……or’ itself indicates that *ukṣā* and
ṛṣabha are not the same, but distinctly different. Therefore, it is impossible that a highly learned personality like the Jagadguru Śaṅkarācārya would interpret as a tautology the words uksā and ṛṣabha signifying 'a stud-bull as long as it is potent in impregnation', when the contradistinctive conjunction 'vā.....vā' i.e. 'either......or' is used to contrast the words uksā and ṛṣabha. It is certain that 'uksā secana-samarthah puṇgavaḥ' as used in the commentary of Jagadguru Śaṅkarācārya means an aphrodisiac drug, i.e. soma juice, and 'tataḥ api adhika-vayāh' means 'the drug ṛṣabha of the aṣṭavarga, which is supposed to be more invigorating even than uksā i.e. soma juice'.
WERE COWS SLAUGHTERED AT KING RANTIDEVA’S PLACE?

In the booklet ‘Beef In Ancient India’ by Raja Rajendralal Mitra, it is stated on page iii of the ‘Preface’ that according to the Mahābhārata, 2000 cows used to be slaughtered every day at King Rantideva’s place to entertain guests. In support of this assertion the following verse has been quoted from Vana-parva, Chapter 207. Actually this verse is not found in Chapter 207, but occurs in Chapter 208 of the Chitrashala edition and in Chapter 199 of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute edition:—

राजो महान्ते पुर्वं रान्तिदेवस्य वे हिंज ||

dē sāhē vyu vandhaye paruṣaṇām tvah tad ||

ग्राह्याहिनि वन्द्येते dē sāhē gavaṇa tvah ||

In this verse, interpreting the word vandhyete as ‘used to be slaughtered’, it is being propagated that 2000 cows and 2000 animals used to be slaughtered every day in the kitchen of King Rantideva. According to Pāṇini’s Sanskrit grammar, this cannot be the correct interpretation, which we will discuss later.

Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, in their renowned publication ‘The History and Culture of the Indian People’ whose General Editor is Shri R. C. Majumdar, M.A., Ph.D., F.R.A.S.B. has also stated in Vol. II, page 579 as follows:—

"According to Mahābhārata, a King called Rantideva killed every day two thousand cattle and two thousand kine in order to dole out meat to the people.”

They have neither quoted nor given a reference to the Mahābhārata in this respect. It appears that their ideas are also based on the above quoted verse. They must have also done so following in the footsteps of other persons without caring to study the full
context, which is most unfair on the part of an institution like the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, whose publications carry weight with the general public.

This verse, along with a few more, is not available in all the editions of the Mahābhārata. Wherever this verse exists it is followed by another verse. The lines of this further verse read as follows:

समांस दबतो ह्वातने रत्निदेवस्य नित्यवः।
प्रतुला कौतिरस्ववनुस्पर्श्य द्विजस्ततम्॥

It means: “O superior among Dvijas! King Rantideva earned unparalleled glory by serving guests with such meat.”

Let us now consider the propriety of this verse.

Incompatibility of Rantideva’s Glory by Animal-Slaughter while Propagating Ahimsa

At this place in the Vana-parva of the Mahābhārata, a Dharma-vyādha, while giving discourse to a Kauśika Brāhmaṇa, discusses the merits of non-violence vis-a-vis, violence. In the previous chapter he has preached non-violence as the greatest virtue in verse no. 74 of the Gita Press and Chitrashala editions and verse no. 69 of the Bhandarkar Institute edition. He has not quoted any historical incident as an example.

Taking into consideration the previous context of the subject, no sane person will admit that after preaching non-violence as the supreme religion in the previous chapter, and praising non-violence and decrying violence in the chapter under discussion, any historical example of attainment of fame by any king by practising violence by way of killing 2000 innocent animals and 2000 innocent cows every day, could be quoted by the Dharma-vyādha. As such it is more than certain that these verses being repugnant to the subject cannot form part of that chapter and in whichever edition of the Mahābhārata they appear, they are not genuine but interpolated. Examples can be quoted from the Mahābhārata itself to show that the above-quoted verses relied upon in the
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‘Preface’ of ‘Beef in Ancient India’ by Raja Rajendralala Mitra are not genuine. They are as follows:

(1) In Mahābhārata, Anuśāsana-parva, Chapter 115, in verse 63-67 of the Gita Press edition and verses 72-76 in the Chitrashala edition, names of various kings of ancient times are quoted, who were never addicted to any sort of meat-eating. Among them, the name of King Rantideva is also mentioned. These verses appear in Chapter 116 and are numbered 67 to 70 in the Bhandarkar Institute edition.

If Brāhmaṇas would have been served beef and/or ordinary meat at King Rantideva’s place, then the king himself would have taken beef and/or meat as prasādam, in which case his name would not have found place among kings who never took meat.

(2) Even if one insists that the text samāṁsāṁ dadato hyamnam is correct, then too, considering the special virtues of King Rantideva, which will be described later, māṁsa cannot mean the meat of an animal body. In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 11.7.1.3 the word māṁsa is equivalent to and carries the same meaning as paramānṇam—एतद्व हूं व परममल्लाख्य वन्यतांस्यु—and paramānṇam according to the Sanskrit lexicon Amarakośa 2.7.24 is pāyasam prepared with the admixture of milk, rice and sugar—परमान्त तु पायसम्. Thus it would mean that King Rantideva earned fame by entertaining Brāhmaṇas with pāyasam and not with animal meat.

(3) If 2000 cows are killed every day, then 7,20,000 cows would have been killed in a year. If this had continued year after year, then the cow progeny would have gradually vanished from the earth. As such, from the practical point of view also, this does not appear to be justified,
(4) Again in the Mahābhārata (Gita Press and Chitrashalā editions), Droṇa-parva, Chapter 67, Nārada is describing to King Śrīnījaya, the greatness of King Rantideva, wherein he has said that Rantideva made gifts to Brāhmaṇas out of his honest and just income in which thousands of ‘niśka’ used to be given daily. There, a ‘niśka’ is defined as equal to “1000 golden bulls and 100 cows as well as 108 gold coins with each bull”.

(5) In the Mahābhārata, Śanti-parva, Chapter 262, verse 47 in the Gita Press and Chitrashala editions and Chapter 254, verse 45 in the Bhandarkar Institute edition, it is stated:

श्रवण्या इति गवां नाम के एता हृतुमहृति।
महुच्चकाराकुशलं वृष्ण गां बाज्झलेनतु य:॥

meaning thereby that in Śruti the cow is referred to as aghnīyā ‘not to be killed’; as such who can even think of killing a cow? He who kills a cow and/or a bull, commits a great sin.

Let the readers consider, whether it is consistent or possible for such a pious king to get 2000 innocent animals and 2000 innocent cows slaughtered in his kitchen for the entertainment of guests.

With the foregoing observations about the revered cow and King Rantideva in the Mahābhārata, how can it be believed that the verse quoted in the Preface of ‘Beef In Ancient India’ by Raja Rajendralala Mitra can be genuine and correct?

Many persons, either being themselves ignorant of the Sanskrit language or not willing to take pains to consult the quoted passage in its context in the original books, take it for granted that a passage quoted by a famous person and announced publicly and published in the press, must be correct beyond doubt. But the facts are not so.
Misleading Views expressed by Shri Mukandi Lal, formerly Deputy Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of United Provinces, and by Rahul Sankrityayan

Recently, tendentious book 'Cow Slaughter—Horns of a Dilemma', has been published by Lalwani Publishing House, which is edited by one Shri A.B. Shah, who has been Professor of Mathematics & Statistics for about 20 years at the Universities of Poona and Bombay and who is at present Director of Programmes in India for the Congress of Cultural Freedom. It contains similar irrelevant material. In this book, an article 'Cow—Cult in India' has been published, which is written by one Shri Mukandi Lal, an Oxford Graduate and a Barrister-at-Law, who was Deputy Speaker of the U.P. Legislative Assembly during the British period in the years 1927-30. The shallowness of personal knowledge of Shri Mukandi Lal is clear from his statement on page 31, wherein he has stated that the great Vaiśṇava saint Vallabhācārya translated the Bhagavata Purāṇa in Hindi. Shri Vallabhācārya has written his commentary on the Bhāgavata Purāṇa in Sanskrit, which is entitled 'Subodhitī'. In this essay propagating cow-slaughter in the ancient period, Shri Mukandi Lal has quoted freely from Shri Rahul Sankrityayan’s Hindi book Volgā se Gangā. He himself has not taken pains to consult the texts in the original. Let us discuss these quotations and also consider what Shri Rahul Sankrityayan has alleged.

In a foot-note to page 228 of his book, Rahul Sankrityayan has quoted three lines of two verses from the Drona-parva, Chapter 67. The first śloka and the first-half of the second śloka read as follows:

सांक्रेत रसिद्वेषं च मृतं चौं जय शुद्रम्।
यस्य विशालसाहस्र्या श्रास्त्रन सूदा महत्मनः॥
युध्यानस्यागतान् विश्रानतिथीवृः परिवेषकाः॥

These lines have been interpreted by Shri Rahul Sankrityayan and have been accepted as correct by Shri Mukandi Lal, that two thousand cooks were employed in the kitchen of King Rantideva.
to cook beef. The number of cooks in the Sanskrit text is 200 thousands (dvi-śata-sahasra) and not two thousand. From these interpretations one can fathom the knowledge of Shri Rahul Sankrityayan and Mukandi Lal as regards Sanskrit. ‘To cook beef’ is not mentioned in these lines anywhere. Rahul Sankrityayan has cleverly omitted the latter half of the second sloka reading:

पञ्चापक्षं दिवारात्रं बरानाममनुतोपसम्।

All the four lines of the two verses quoted above are interpreted in the Gita Press edition as follows:—

Närada, explaining to King Śrīnāya who was miserable due to the death of his young son, said:

"O Śrīnāya, it is said that Sāṅkṛti's son Rantideva also could not live for ever, though that great king used to employ two lakh cooks in his kitchen, who prepared nectar-like meals both unfried (consisting of dal, rice, etc.) and fried (poori, kachori, sweets, vegetables, etc.) for Brāhmaṇa guests and used to serve them day and night'.

Later, two other lines of the same chapter reading as follows have been grossly misinterpreted by Rahul Sankrityayan:

तत्र स्म सूब्दः क्रोषणिं सुमृष्टमिष्कुष्काण्डः।

Shri Rahul Sankrityayan has changed the word māsam meaning ‘month’ to māṁsam meaning ‘meat’ and interpreted these as follows:—

"The number of guests used to increase to such an extent that due to shortage of meat, the cooks had to request them to accept more quantity of soup."

The paraphrasing according to the correct text and its interpretation as given in the Gita Press edition are as follows:

"Sūdāḥ (the cooks) sumṛṣṭa-manikyadalāḥ (wearing glittering and jewel-studded pendants) kroṣantī sma (used to speak
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loudly) tatra (there) (that) aśnīḍhyam (you all eat) bhūyīṣṭham (as much as possible) sūpam (liquid preparations like dal, cury, etc.) yathā (a kind of which) nādyā (has not been prepared) māsam purā (since the last one month).”

In the second line of the above quoted verse of the Mahābhārata, Drona-parva 67.2, the phrase varānnam amṛtopamam means that the food served to Brāhmaṇas was high class, and tasted like nectar. The word varānnam literally meaning ‘supreme food’ is equivalent to the word paramānnam. The Sanskrit dictionary Amarakośa 2.7.74 says “paramānnam tu pāyasam (a preparation made by boiling rice in milk and then mixing sugar with it).” It has been discussed already. As such, the cows at King Rantideva’s kitchen could be present only for the supply of milk for making pāyasam and not to be slaughtered for beef. A slaughter-house, which is always so dirty, is never situated near a habitation and in no case near the kitchen or inside the kitchen. As such it is clear that in King Rantideva’s kitchen, neither cows nor other animals used to be slaughtered for serving beef or meat to the guests.

The above episode in the Dronaparva is narrated by Vyāsa-deva to console King Yudhiṣṭhira, when he was in grief after the death of his nephew Abhimanu. This episode is said to have been narrated by Devarṣi Nārada to King Śrīṇayā long long ago, when the latter was very miserable due to the death of his son. The Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, considers this episode to be an interpolation† and it has not included this in its critical edition of the Mahābhārata.

†“With the stanza commences the story of the sixteen Great Kings, which is found duplicate in the Dronaparva. The occasion in the Dronaparva, the death of Abhimanu, would lead one to suppose that these sixteen stories must have been first told in the Dronaparva and subsequently repeated in the Śāntiparva. But the fact seems to have been otherwise. There are also some variations in the names of the kings and in the sequence of the stories, as can be seen at a glance. . . .

“As far as the Dronaparva list is concerned, since the Kashmir version omits the chapter altogether, it is obvious that there is a duplication from the Śāntiparva original, probably by one interested in glorifying the Bhṛgus.” (Mahābhārata, edition of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, Vol. 13, Śāntiparva, Rājadharma, page 649 of the critical notes on chapter 29).
This episode is said to have been narrated briefly in the Śāntiparva by Bhagavān Śrī Kuśā to King Yudhiṣṭhirā, when he was in grief due to the destruction of practically his entire family. At this place (Śāntiparva, Chapter 29) verse 128 in both the Gita Press and Chitrashala editions, has a text identical with that of the above quoted verse “हत्र स्म चूँकः……मात्र च वधा पुत्र” with the difference that the word गाय in the last portion of the verse is गाय in the Chitrashala edition while in the Gita Press edition it is गाय. The text of this verse with the word गाय is admitted by Rahul Sankritiyayan as well (see his Hindi book Volgā se Gangā, page 228, last line of the foot-note). The same verse appears in the edition of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute in the Śāntiparva, Chapter 29, verse 120 and there also the reading गाय, but it is stated that in manuscript no. 198 of the Bombay Government Collection 1891-95, the reading of this word in the Kashmirian recension is गाय. In the last part of the verse तत्र च स्मा चूँकः…….the text गाय is not relevant according to the principle of ahimsā paramo dharmaḥ. As such, the reading of this word either as गाय or as गाय is the only correct text. So the fame of King Rantideva can never rest on the daily slaughter of 2000 innocent animals and 2000 innocent cows, but this can be by rearing them and giving them away in gifts.

True Facts of King Rantideva’s Glory as narrated in the Mahābhārata

In the Śāntiparva, the fame of King Rantideva is further sung in verse 7 of Chapter 292 in the Gita Press and Chitrashala editions and chapter 281 of the Bhandarkar Institute edition. There too, it is due to entertaining Rṣis with fruits and tubers and not with meat. The text is as follows:

राजिनि लोकेश्वर मिहिष्मि: प्राच्य भक्तिर्नाथम्
भुक्तमेतेऽगुरु: सुमर्गु नीरतिवद्वात्स: ।

In the Mahābhārata Śāntiparva (Rājadharmā) chapter 29, Bhagavān Śrī Kuśā narrates an episode to King Yudhiṣṭhirā, grieved by the destruction of practically his entire family. Once
upon a time this episode was narrated by Sage Narada to King Śrījaya who was in grief due to his son's death. Herein a number of ancient kings have been mentioned, who were highly endowed with Dharma, knowledge (jñāna), renunciation (vairāgya) and affluence (aśvarya) and who by their noble deeds had earned a good name but they too could not live for ever. Among those noble deeds which earned them a good name, there is no mention of the killing of animals or cows, but on the other hand, gift of cows has been clearly specified. King Rantideva's name is also quoted there. Instances of the gift of cows are as follows (the verse numbers indicated below are of the Gita Press and Chitrashala editions, followed by those of the Bhandarkar Institute edition):

शतं शतसहस्राणि बृहाणा हेममालिनाम् ।
गवां, सहस्रानुचरं दक्षिणामत्यकालयत् ॥ (34-35; 30)

This verse mentions the gift of a crore of cows and bulls with gold chains around their necks accompanied by thousands of servicemen by King Brhadratha of the Anāga country.

तावती: प्रबधो गा: स विभिरौजीनराधवरे । (42; 37)

Gift of lakhs of cows by King Śibi in his yajña is pascibed in the above verse.

शतं गवां सहस्राणि शतसहस्रतराणि । (115; 108)
ताबतीवेह गा: प्रबवापूर्तरसो गयो ॥ (118; 111)

In the above, lakhs of cows were donated by King Gaya.

ब्राह्मणेष्यो वदै निष्कान्त सदसि प्रतले नृपः ।
तुम्म निष्क तुम्म निष्ककमिति कौशमिति वेह हिजः ॥
सहचर्ता तुम्ममित्युक्तवा ब्राह्मणान् सम्प्रदत्ते ।
प्रवाहयोपकरणं दयोपकरणं च यत् ॥
घटा: पाथ्व: कटहानि स्थालवच धिराणिः ।
नासीतुः किचिदसौवरं रत्नितेवस्य धीमत: ॥
सांहृते रत्नितेवस्य यां रात्रिस्वतन्त्र गुहे ।
श्रालभ्यत्वं शतं गाव: सहस्त्राणि च विशालिः ॥

(124-127; 117-119)
The above verses describe gifts by King Rantideva amounting to thousands of Niśkas and thousands of cows. The word ālabhyānta in the above verses does not mean violence, but means touching for the purpose of giving away.

In the whole of this chapter, several kings including King Rantideva are named, who earned fame and good name, but nowhere is it said that they did so by killing animals and/or cows.

Throughout the world, at places where violence (killing of animals) is not considered a sinful practice, there is not a single instance, where one could have earned fame and good name by killing living beings. Fame and good name is earned by bravery in battle, which may include killing of opponents, or by killing of undesirable characters which becomes necessary for the protection of innocent persons from their clutches. No other type of killing of living beings can earn fame and good name. In the episode of of King Rantideva, neither instance of bravery in war nor protection of the helpless from undesirables is narrated as such. Killing of 2000 innocent animals and 2000 innocent cows cannot be the cause of his fame and good name, but this is possible by giving away cows as gifts, which is more logical.

At several places in the Mahābhārata ‘Ahimsā’ is praised and ‘hiṁsā’ is denounced (see quotations from the Mahābhārata under the caption ‘Non-violence is Supreme in Religious Scriptures’). In Anuśāsanaparva, Chapters 114, 115 and 116 of Gita Press edition and 115, 116 and 117 of Bhandarkar Research Institute edition are full of superiority of ‘Ahimsā’. Some verses therefrom are quoted below. The reference numbers of chapters and verses are from the Gita Press edition followed by the Bhandarkar Research Institute edition:—

एवं नागाधीश्यानि पदवानि पद्यामितां ।
सर्वाण्येवापिष्ठोन्ते पदनान्तानि कौश्ये ॥
एवं लोकेश्वरां हि निबिष्टा धर्मं: पुरा ।
114.6 ; 115.6

114.7 ; 115.6
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As the footprints of all other moving living-beings are engulfed in those of the elephant, even so all other religions are to be comprehended in *ahimśā*.

\[\text{श्रीहिसा परमो धर्मस्तवाहिसा परं तपः।} \\
\text{श्रीहिसा परमं सत्यं यतो धर्मं: प्रवर्त्ते॥ 115.23 ; 116.25} \]

Abstention from injury (*ahimśā*) is the highest religion; it is again the highest penance; it is also the highest truths from which all duties proceed.

\[\text{श्रीहिसा परमो धर्मस्तवाहिसा परो दमः।} \\
\text{श्रीहिसा परमं दानमहिसा परमं तपः॥ 116.28 ; 117.37} \]

\[\text{श्रीहिसा परमो यज्ञस्तवाहिसा परं फलम्।} \\
\text{श्रीहिसा परमं मित्रमहिसा परमं सुखम्॥ 116.29 ; 117.38} \]

Abstention from cruelty (*ahimśā*) is the highest religion.  
Abstention from cruelty is the highest self-control.  
Abstention from cruelty is the highest gift.  
Abstention from cruelty is the highest penance.  
Abstention from cruelty is the highest yajña.  
Abstention from cruelty is the highest puissance.  
Abstention from cruelty is the highest friend.  
Abstention from cruelty is the highest happiness.

\[\text{सवंय्यशु वा दानं सवंतीथ्यं वासस्वतुत्सम्।} \\
\text{सवंतदानन्यं वाविषं नेतत्तत्त्वमैहिस्सय। उ 116.30 ; 117.39} \]

Gifts made in all *yajñas*, ablutions performed in all sacred water, and the merits that one acquires from making all kinds of gifts mentioned in the scriptures—all these do not come up to abstention from cruelty (in point of the merit that attaches to it).

In the *Mahābhārata*, where *ahimśā* is so much praised, it would not have been possible to praise the glory of King Rantideva therein, had there been killing of cows or other animals at his place.
Possible Reasons of Naming the River as Charmanvati

On page 277 of his Hindi book Volga se Gaṅgā, Rahul Sankrityayan has stated that from the undried raw hide of 2000 cows, which used to be killed every day in the kitchen of King Rantideva and stored there, liquids oozed out, which became a river which was named ‘Carmanvati’ due to its water being accumulated from the carma (hide) of the cows. In support he has quoted the following verse in the foot-note:

महानवी चर्मराशेष्क्लेवालू संधुजे यत।
तत्रचर्मण्णबतीर्थवें विष्णुवाता सा महानवी।

The verse is from chapter 29 of the Śāntiparva of the Mahābhārata, but the serial number of the verses differ in the editions of the Gita Press, Chitrashala and Bhandarkar Institute. We will discuss this verse and others appearing along with it. The whole context is quoted below. The serial numbers quoted against these verses are those given in the Gita Press edition:

उपासिष्ठत पशुव: स्वयं तं संशितव्रतम्।
प्राम्यार्थ्या महात्मानं रत्निवेष्यं यास्तिविनम्। ||१२२||

Animals from villages and forests used to come themselves* for the yajña of famous and magnanimous King Rantideva, who used to observe very strict vows. (122)

महानवी चर्मराशेष्क्लेवालू संधुजे यत।
तत्रचर्मण्णबतीर्थवें विष्णुवाता सा महानवी। ||१२३||

The water flowing from the wet carma took the shape of a big river, which became famous as Carmanvati (Chambal). (123)

* See footnote on page 74,
The king used to offer gold \textit{Niśka} to the Brāhmaṇas in \textit{yajña}. The \textit{Rājjas} used to exclaim—“O Brāhmaṇa! these \textit{Niśkas} are for you”, but no one used to come forward to accept them. When they offered a 1000 \textit{Niśkas}, then they could find people to accept them. (124, first half of 125).

For the \textit{yajña} of wise king Rantideva, the utensils for offering oblation or for collection of materials—pots, plates, cauldrons, pans, vessels—were all made of gold. (125-126)

When a crowd of guests spent a night at the place of King Rantideva, the son of \textit{Sāṅkṛti}, then 20,100 cows used to be gifted to them by touch. (127)

The cooks, wearing polished and bright jewelled pendants, used to announce that all of you please eat liquid preparations (like dal, curry, etc.). The food prepared today is of very high order, the type of which has never been prepared before.

From these verses, it is amply clear that there was no animal killing at King Rantideva’s place. If there would have been killing, then the animals would have never gone of their own accord to the \textit{yajña} of King Rantideva.
In the Râm-charit-mānas of Gosvāmī Tulsīdās also it is stated:

हुनिगान निकट विहग मुग जाह्नौ | बाधक बधिक विलोकि पराहौँ ॥

(Ayodhyā-kānda, between dohā 263 and 264)

meaning that birds and animals go to the Sages, while they run away on seeing a hunter who entices and kills them.* The idea of animals coming by themselves was only because of affection, that is to love and to be loved. The cattle might have been going to the yajña to serve with their milk or for rendering similar other services. Then, gift by King Rantideva is also described. From this, it appears that King Rantideva used to donate them at the yajña. Before giving away as a gift, these animals must have been washed and bathed to make them clean, and they were beautified by decoration. The water used for washing their skin (carma) used to flow in quite a big quantity, which might have taken the shape of a river, which became famous as Carmaṇvatī (Chambal).

The description as given by Rahul Sankrityayan indicates that cows used to be slaughtered in the kitchen, their beef cooked, the hides (carma) used to be stored there and the liquid dripping from these hides (carma) became a river. The first argument is

---

*On page 56, lines 19-23 of Urdu book ‘Abbar-ul-Itkya’ (containing life histories of Muslim saints) which is translated from the Persian book ‘Tazakirat-ul-aulia’, an incident is narrated therein as follows:—

"Hazrat Rabia Basri once went to a hill. Many animals gathered round her and started glancing at her with affection. At that time Hazrat Hasan Basri reached there. On seeing him all the animals ran away. Hazrat Hasan Basri enquired the reason of their flying away on seeing him and why they kept on staying near her. Hazrat Rabia questioned as to what diet had been taken by him. Reply came, ‘I took meat diet’. She explained that when he had taken meat diet, it was natural for those animals to get scared on seeing him and to run away."

This incident is also narrated on page 16 of the Hindi book Sufi-Sant-Charit, 1961, published by Sasta Sahitya Mandal, New Delhi.

Such incidents clearly prove that the animals coming to the yajña of King Rantideva were doing so not for being slaughtered but for getting affection and for rendering services voluntarily.
that even beef-eaters do not slaughter cows in the kitchen, neither do they store hide (carma) in the kitchen. Secondly, liquid dripping from the hides cannot be of such a huge quantity, which can take the shape of a river. As such, the impossible imagination of Rahul Sankrityayan cannot be accepted. Considering the context of the entire description, the only possibility is that the animals coming of their free will, before being gifted away, might have been washed and bathed and water flowing from washing the skin (carma) of living animals must have been taken the shape of a river, which might have been called ‘Carmanvati’. This is more in keeping with the context.

Shri Sudhir Kumar Gupta has edited the Meghaduta of the great poet Kalidasa, along with the commentary of Mallinatha and he has given a literal Hindi translation with detailed annotations to his notes on the 49th stanza of Purva-megha, which relates to the fame of King Rantideva, he writes as follows which is translated below into English:

“In the Tāṇḍya-Brahmana 19.13.1 गोसवः क्रुः: is explained as अवैयः गोसवः स्वाराज्ये यजः: . The word ‘Rantideva’ means रण्टि: रमणं देवानां यथिमु: स: or ‘one in whom the learned rejoice’, that is one who pleases scholars and hence is honoured by them. The word ranti occurs in this very sense in Yajur-Veda 22.19 (see Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa 13.1.6.2). Thus the surabhitanayālambha yajña, of the mighty king Rantideva who is honoured by the gods, is nothing else but the defence of his dominions. The river Carmanvati symbolises his glory. Its very banks have evidenced the King’s munificence, love of learning, heroism, and devotion to the welfare of his people. The word carmanvati is formed as carman+vat+i. According to the Unadi-kośa 4.115 (Rishi Dayanand’s commentary, Ajmer, Vikrama era 1989) the word carman means चरति गच्छिति वेन तवं चर्म “whereby one moves unto or attains glory that is carma”. So, being denotative of the glory of Rantideva it is termed Carmanvati.
It can be interpreted in another way also. In the Taîttrîrya Brâhmana 3.9.7.5 (प्राण व शुरुव्यः) surabhâyah (शुरुव्यः) is interpreted as prāṇāh (प्राणः). So सुरुव्य: (वीरपुष्वः; योधा: इति यावत्) तेनायुः प्राप्तम् (प्राप्तिः; स्वीकारः; प्रहणम्) तस्मात् जाता that is, ‘that which retains an immense army of heroes’, or ‘one who is the vanquisher of powerful warriors’. This interpretation denotes the mighty valour of the great king Rantideva—which is not at all impossible.

Mr. Sadhuram has suggested another interpretation: the ālambha yajña of agriculture, the daughter (तन्य: ) of the earth (सुरुव्यः). Affording due facilities and protection for the crops of different seasons is verily ‘the gomedha yajñā or the agricultural culture of the land’. This is also a plausible suggestion. It is possible that the great king Rantideva had rendered the Chambal region into a highly fertile area lush with greenery, during his rule replete with yajñās.”

In all the passages where King Rantideva is mentioned in literature, there is no contextual relevance of cow-slaughter. Those who have alleged it to be cow-slaughter, that is due either to their misunderstanding or to some ulterior motive.

In Mônier-Williams’ Sanskrit-English Dictionary, two meanings of Carmanvati are given as follows:

(i) Name of a river flowing through Bundelkhand and merging in the Ganges; modern name is Chambal.

(ii) Musā Sapientum. This is the technical term for banana or plantain tree in Botany. Musa is a synonym of Arabic mauzah and Sanskrit mocha.

The tract of land through which Chambal flows may have been covered with Musa Sapientum (banana trees) in ancient times and hence the river was named ‘Carmanvati’. It is possible that the cows meant for donation by King Rantideva used to graze in
that tract of land and hence the name of the river ‘Carmanvati’ came to be associated with King Rantideva’s glory earned by donating cows. Be it as it may, this much is certain that the theory that the dripping of liquid from the hides of cows collected in King Rantideva’s kitchen caused a stream to flow from their carma (hide) which came to be known as Carmanvati—is baseless, and neither liquid dripping from a collected heap of hides can form a stream which could make a river like Chambal. As such, association of the name of the river Carmanvati with the glory of King Rantideva can not prove that cows used to be slaughtered in King Rantideva’s kitchen and their hides used to be stored there and the liquid dripping from these hides caused a stream, which came to be known as ‘Carmanvati’.

If the whole episode is carefully studied from beginning to end, it will be found that there is no relevance of slaughter of cows, but of course there certainly is a propriety in giving them away in gift.

Rantideva in the Bhagavata Mahapurana

In the Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa 9.21, the legend of King Rantideva is narrated. Its resume follows:

King Rantideva was so generous that without caring for his own self and for his family, he used to offer every day to others whatever he had or used, to get. Once it so happened that after remaining hungry for 48 days, he got some pāyasa (milk-rice preparation), pudding, etc. As soon as they sat for their meals, a Brāhmaṇa guest arrived, who appeared to King Rantideva as God incarnate. The King entertained him with due respect: When the Brāhmaṇa went away and the king and his family sat down at meals with the remaining food, a Śūdra guest arrived. The king gave part of the food to that guest. When the Śūdra guest went away, then another guest accompanied by a few dogs arrived and demanded food for his hungry dogs, and King Rantideva respectfully offered all the remaining food and honoured them as so many manifestations of God. Now only water was left with them which too
would suffice only for one person. They were just on the verge of drinking that water after sharing it amongst themselves, when a thirsty candāla arrived and beseeched for water. The king felt pity on him and offered the whole water to him and prayed to the Creator as follows:

न कामयेःश्च गतिमोद्वरातु परामर्शःद्वियुक्तामपूनभवं वा ।
श्राति प्रवन्दितेकिलदेवभाजामन्तःस्वयं पैन महन्त्युःखः ॥

(श्रीमोभो ६.२१.१२)

I do not seek from the Lord the highest position attended with the eightfold Yogic power (Anīmā and so on), or even final beatitude (cessation of rebirth). Dwelling in their hearts (as the sufferer), I would (rather) undergo the suffering of all the embodied souls, so that (through such vicarious sufferings of mine) they may be relieved of misery. (Bhāgavata 9.21.12).

A person, who does not seek the kingdom of heaven, the highest position attended with the eightfold Yogic power or even beatitude and who prays for vicariously suffering himself to relieve others of misery—how can such a person think of even causing harm to any living being, let alone the question of slaughtering innocent animals.

As pointed out earlier, Mahābhārata, Vanaparva, chapter 208 deals with the subject of non-violence versus violence, and non-violence is established as a super virtue, and when no other historical example is quoted therein, it is incomprehensible how the episode of King Rantideva has been inserted there in a manner, which does not support the principle enunciated therein, but goes against it. In other words the principle established there is that non-violence is a super virtue and should be practised by all, violence is condemned as not worth to be practised. Hence the example of King Rantideva attaining high fame by slaughtering 2000 innocent animals and 2000 innocent cows every day in his kitchen for the entertainment of guests goes clearly against the
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context. As such it is more than certain that the verses referred to in the beginning of the article can never be authentic, and they are definitely interpolated. Some beef-eaters must have done so to misguide simple people. Śāntiparva, chapter 265, verse 9 supports this:

शुरा मत्त्या मधु मांसमासवं क्षरोदनम्।
शूरवः प्रवावितं हनतन्तंत्रेवेदेषु कलितम्।।

(शान्तिपर्व २६५.९)

“Liquors, fish, mead, meat, spirits, rice cooked with sesamum (til) seeds—all these have been inserted into yajña by the wicked people. Vedas have not prescribed their use in yajña.” (Śāntiparva 265.9)

Correct meaning of ‘vadhyete’ according to Grammar

Even if the opponents insist that the verses pertaining to King Rantideva and the cows in chapter 208 of the Vanaparva of the Mahābhārata, not found in some of the editions, are not interpolated, then the context preceding and succeeding in the same chapter as well as elsewhere in the Mahābhārata makes it clear that they never intended to convey the slaughter of two thousand innocent animals and two thousand innocent cows. In both the verses relevant to it, the word vadhyete is used, which has been mistranslated as “were killed” or “used to be killed” by the protagonists of cow-slaughter. In Sanskrit grammar, vadḥ (वध) is not an independent root in the meaning of ‘to kill’; to convey this, the root han (हन) is used. This is further corroborated by the Uddyota commentary on Mahābhāṣya (2.4.42-43) and by Śabdenduśekhara (3.1.133) nyut tṛcau (न्युत्‌ त्रचो) The root han is substituted by vadḥ in certain cases. The rule according to Pañini 2.4.42-43 reads: hano vadha līṇi lūṇi ca (हनो वध लिङ्ग लुढ़ि च). It means that the root han is substituted by vadha in the Benēdective (liṅ लिङ्) and also in the Aorist (lūṅ लूङ्). There are two types of liṅ (लिङ्)—the Potential Mood (viḍhi-liṅ विढ्ठलिङ्) and the Benedective Mood
(āśīr-liṅ अशीरलिङ्ग). The root han is not substituted by vadha, in both types of liṅ (लिङ्ग), but only in the Beneditive, which is used for benediction or blessing. In Pāṇini’s grammar, the aphorism substituting vadha is preceded by the aphorism ārādhātuke (आराधातुके). This order of precedence in the Pāṇinian technique means that vadha will be substituted for the root han only in ārādhātukā (आराधातुक) which is a technical term for the perfect and benedictive. The substitution is not applicable to sārvadhātuka (सार्वधातुक) or the entire verbal base. Thus, except these two, the Beneditive Mood and the Perfect Tense, nowhere is the root han replaced by vadha. The form vadhyete used in the Mahābhārata pertains to neither of these two paradigms. In them the conjugated forms will be avadhī (अवधी) and vadhīyāt (वधीयात). By no stretch of imagination can there be the form vadhyete in these two, because vadhyete is a form of the Present Tense. In this tense han is never replaced by vadha. The forms of the Present run hanyate (हन्यते), hanyete (हन्यते) etc., as in na hanyate hanyamāne śārīre (न हन्यते हन्यमाने शारीरे), Bhagavad Gītā 2.20: here the root han is used to convey the idea of killing. If vadha were substituted in the Present Tense, then the passage would have read: na vadhīyate vadhīyamāne śārīre (न वधीयते वधीयमाने शारीरे). But it is known to everyone that it is not so. So the word vadhyete, occurring in the two verses of the Rāntideva episode of the Mahābhārata, cannot be considered to be an instance of the root han meaning ‘to kill’. In Sanskrit grammar vadh in the sense of ‘to kill’ is not an independent root. As it cannot belong to the root han ‘to kill’, it is from of the root badha bandhane (बध बन्धने) meaning ‘to tie, to bind’. In Sanskrit phonetics, b (बकार) and v (वकार), r (रकार) and d (डकार), r (रकार) and l (लकार) are undifferentiated. That is b (ब) can be used instead of v (व), v (व) for b (ब), r (र) for d (ड), d (ड) for r (र), r (र) for l (ल) and l (ल) for r (र). The interchange of these letters is a common phenomenon. In tune with the considerations of Sanskrit grammar and also keeping in view the context, the correct meaning of vadhyete can only be “are tied”.

Rāntideva in the Meghaduta of the great poet Kalidāsa.

The great poet Kalidāsa has also mentioned King Rāntideva’s glory in the prior part (Pūrva-megha) in a stanza, which is
numbered as 45 in some editions and 48 or 49 in others. The text with the resolution of sandhi and English translation based on Shri M. R. Kale is quoted below:

2 3 4 5 1
श्राराध्य एन्म सरवणभद्र देवमृ उल्लिघिताध्वा
7 9 8 6
सिद्धवंशः जलकणमयात वीणिमिः मुल्लारामः
10 16 15 11
व्यालम्बेः सुरचितनया श्रालम्बनाः मानविध्यन्
18 17 14 13 12
लोतोमूर्याः भुवि परिषताः रत्निर्देवस्य कौतिमः

(1. उल्लिघिताध्वा) When you have gone over some distance, (2. श्राराध्य) after having waited on (3. एन्म 4. देवमृ) the God (5. सरवणभद्र) born of Śara reeds, (6. मुल्लाराम:) your path being left (7. सिद्धवंश:) by the pairs of Siddhas (8. वीणिमिः:) bearing lutes (in their hands) (9. जलकणमयात) from fear of the drops of water, (10. व्यालम्बेः:) you do hang down (and stop there) (11. मानविध्यन:) to do honour (12. कौतिमः) to the glory (13. रत्निर्देवस्य) of Rantideva (14. परिषताः) sprung (15. श्रालम्बनाः) from ĀLAMBHA (16. सुरचितनया) of cows (daughter of Surabhi) and (17. भुवि:) appearing on earth (18. लोतोमूर्यः) in the form of a river.

Mallinātha in his ‘Samjivanti’ commentary on Meghadūta has interpreted the portion “सुरचितनया श्रालम्बनाः परिषताः भुवि लोतोमूर्याः” as follows:

पुरानकिलराजोरत्निर्देवस्यग्वालाम्बेवेकत्र
समृतात्रकल्किनिष्यवाच्चमरातोऽकाचिन्नवेस्य
सा चर्मण्वतीत्वाभ्यायतं इति

meaning thereby that:

(पुरान:) In ancient times (किल) verily (काचिन्न) a certain (नवी) river (स्यञ्जः) streamed out (रत्निनिष्यवाच्च) of blood trickling down (चर्मा:स्यं) from the heaps of hide (समृतात्र) collected together
(एकत्र) in one place (गवालम्ब्र) in the ālambha of cows (रात्रि रत्तिवेक्ष्य) by King Rantideva. (सा) It (हयायते) became famous (वर्ण्यावतीति) as Carmanvati.

The same portion has been commented upon by Madhava Shastri on page 18 of ‘Kāvyasāra-saṅgraha’ published by Sunderlal Jain, Punjab Sanskrit Pustakalaya, Lahore, 1929 as follows:


gurūpaṃtya—gaṅga; tāsaṃ a-alambhya—prokṣaṇa, tato jātā—prasūta, bruvī, c śvēloṣṭulaḥ—pravāhakṣerena, parāṇaṁ—ha-pravāhantā gataḥ.

The literal English translation of above would be as follows:

gurūpaṃtya—gaṅga: Cows; tāsaṃ their; a-alambhya—prokṣaṇ sprinkling or spraying with water; tato therefrom; jātā—prasūta delivering; bruvī on earth; c and; śvēloṣṭulaḥ—pravāh kṣerena in the form of a stream; parāṇaṁ—ha-pravāhantā gataḥ having been transformed;

The running translation of the above would be as follows:

Sprinkling or spraying of cows with water delivered on earth and which has been transformed in the form of a stream.

Madhava Shastri has interpreted ālambha to mean prokṣaṇa that is sanctifying by means of water, which resulted in a stream. Sanctifying by sprinkling of water cannot result in a stream. The stream can only be possible if vast numbers of animals are sanctified by water spray bath. After such sanctifying he has also indicated killing of cows, which cannot be correct according to descriptions at several places in the Mahābhārata and also according to their larger context, but so far the word ālambha is concerned, he has not directly interpreted it to mean violence (see the caption “Meaning of Ālabhyanta, Ālambha etc.” in this chapter). Any sane person considering the episode without any prejudice would arrive at the only conclusion that according to the description of King Rantideva at several places in the Mahābhārata and their
respective contexts, violence by King Rantideva is not proved but
gift of cows alone is proved which resulted in spreading his glory.
(See the caption: ‘True facts of King Rantideva’s Glory as narrated
in the Mahabharata’).

Killing of cow progeny is prohibited by Hindus as well as
Christian scriptures. Muslim religion also prohibits beef eating.
(See the caption ‘Cow-slaughter—Hienous crime in Manu-
smriti’, ‘Cow-slaughter—Hienous crime in christianity’ and
‘Prohibition of Beef-eating in Islam’ under ‘Were Cow-
slaughter, Meat-Sacrifice and Meat-eating Prevalent in the
Vedic Age’?). Therefore, no sane person will agree that heinous
acts like cow-killing can be the cause of earning glory for King
Rantideva. As such, the words alabhyanta in the Mahabharata and
Alambha in the Meghaduta of the great poet Kalidasa cannot
mean violence.

It is also worth noting that according to Mallinatha’s
commentary, trickling of blood drops from the heap of hides
resulted in a flow of a river which is famous by the name
Carmanvati. The basis of this appears to be a verse of the 29th
Chapter of the Saptiparwa of the Mahabharata, which has been
discussed earlier (see caption ‘Possible Reasons of the Naming of
the River as Carmanvati’).

The readers may see that neither is there any mention of
blood in the original text of the great poet Kalidasa and nor is
there any justifiable basis in support of this. Such views of
Mallinatha about the formation of the Carmanvati river cannot be
acceptable to any reasonable person.

Meanings of ‘Alabhyanta’, ‘Alambha’. etc.

In the Dhautpatha of Pannini’s grammar, dulabhas praptau
(दुलब्ध प्राप्त: प्राप्त) occurs as root number 975 in the first conjugation
called bhvadi-gana. Its conjugated form in the present tense
third person singular is labhate (लभते). Panini’s grammar stands
out pre-eminent amongst all treatises in the depth of its insight; it
supersedes all in importance and authoritativeness. According to
this authentic work, the meaning of labhate (लभते) is none except
the sense of ‘obtaining’ (प्राप्त करना). The science of grammar is vast—पन्तपारं किल शब्दवात्रं. As such, to find out whether there is any other meaning of the root ‘labh’, we looked into other references and found that ‘labh’ also means प्रेषण that is urging, inciting, direction, command etc. This has been accepted by the Maitrāyaṇi-saṁhitā, Śāyaṇa-bhāṣya, Čandra-Vyākaraṇa, Jainendra-Vyākaraṇa, Kāśakṛtsna-Vyākaraṇa, Kātantra-Vyākaraṇa. Śākaṭāyana-Vyākaraṇa and Hemacandra Vyākaraṇa also. The Varanaseya Sanskrit University of Varanasi, which is considered the seat of Sanskrit learning in India, has published a ‘Dhatupātha-samikṣā’. There too, we do not find the root ‘labh’ in the meaning of violence ‘himsa’ by any stretch.

A Sanskrit scholar has stated:—

"Some time before Pāṇini, the root lambh had ceased to be used in its conjugated forms. Hence grammarians did not incorporate this root lambh in the Dhatupātha lists. The words derived from the lambh were corelated to the root labh, and hence both the words ālabha and ālambha came to mean the same. In fact, the meanings of both the roots labh and lambh, as well as of their derivatives, are different. The root labh has two meanings: (1) obtaining, and (2) touching. Likewise, the root lambh also has two meanings: (1) killing and (2) touching. The word ālabha from the root labh and ālambha from the root lambh are synonymic in the sense of ‘touching’. So much is certain that ālabha does not signify killing anywhere, and ālambha does not mean ‘obtaining’.

The scholar does not cite a scriptural or historical proof in support of the above.

No dictionary gives the meaning of killing for lambh. In modern times no one has put in so much hard effort as European savants in Sanskrit studies and in researches into the semantics of Sanskrit words. Had any word carried the sense of killing, then it could not have escaped their researches, because an objective of
European scholars was to bring out and propagate that Hindu scriptures enjoin killing (hiṃsā).

Even according to all the meanings of the prefix ā found in the different dictionaries, the roots labh or lambh with this prefix, that is ālabha or ālambha, cannot signify ‘killing’. In spite lexicographers have also given the meaning of killing both for ālabha and ālambha, which can be possible only in a conventional meaning. These lexicons also give for both the words the following meanings:—

‘to obtain, touch, take hold of, etc.’ which have nothing to do with killing. By virtue of their etymology ālabha and ālambha do not carry any meaning of killing, and as lexicons have still accepted ‘killing’ as their meaning, and as in some passages we come across the meaning of ‘killing’, in such a situation wherever these words occur, they should be rendered in a ‘killing’ or ‘non-killing’ meaning only after due consideration of the context.

In Yajurveda 30.5, the word ‘ālabh’ means ‘to obtain or receive’, such as:

1. श्रृंगरेण ब्राह्मणं आलम्बते ... For knowledge he obtains a knower (a wise man).
2. कण्ठाय राजनं आलम्बते ... For heroism he obtains a hero.
3. नृत्ताय सूतं आलम्बते ... For dance he obtains a sūta.
4. धर्माय समाचारं आलम्बते ... For dharma he receives a member of a religious congregation.

In the Smṛtris, Gṛhyasūtras, and allied texts ālambhana and ālabhate mean ‘touching’; for example:

(i) In the Subodhini commentary on ‘Mīmāṃsā-darśana’ 2.3.17, it is stated: आलम्बः स्पर्शों मवति, that is ālambha is sparśa ‘touching’.
(ii) In the duties of a Brahmacārī—

बर्जयेत श्रीमानं च प्रेक्षणालम्बम्

"the brahmacārī should avoid looking at a woman or touching her." (Manu 2.179).

(iii) In the Upanayana ceremony—

प्रयास्य (ब्रह्मचारियः) दक्षिणां छ्रीन्द्रयं छ्रालम्बरते

"the teacher touches the heart of the brahmacārī" (Pāraskara-grhyasūtra 2.2.16).

(iv) In the marriage ceremony—

बरो वध्वा दक्षिणांसमु छ्रीन्द्रदयं छ्रालम्बरते

"the bridegroom touches the heart of the bride with his hand over her right shoulder". (Pāraskar-grhyasūtra 1.8.8) etc. etc.

(v) The Bhāgavata-Mahāpurāṇa 11.5.13 also clearly testifies that in yajñā, paśu-ālambhana does not convey the meaning of ‘killing’:

यदू छ्रायापूलो विहितं सृजात्स्तथा पछोरलम्बन न हि द्वारा।

(श्रीमद्भागवतम् ११.५.१३)

"In yajñā, the smelling of wine is prescribed, not its drinking. In yajñā, the touching of an animal is enjoined not its killing."

(vi) The word स्पर्श that is ‘touching’ is used for वान gift as well. The great poet Kālidāsa has गा: कोटिः स्पर्शयता चतुर्वेदी: in Raghuvamśa 2.49 where sparśayatā (स्पर्शयता) means dānam (दानं)—gift.

It is customary even now a days that a donor has to touch the items of gift and then those items are passed on to the persons accepting those gifts. If the items or varieties of gifts are so many that it is not possible to touch them physically, then they are glanced over and thus touched by mere eye-sight,
Were Cows Slaughtered at King Rantideva’s Place? Meanings of ‘Alabhyanta’, Álambha’, etc.

Chapter 29 of the Śāntiparva (Rājadharma) of the Mahābhārata enumerates the the names of kings who became famous by giving away cows in donation; hence the context of the word ālabhyanta in प्रालम्ब्यः ित गाव: of verse 127 of Gita Press and Chitrashala editions and verse 119 of the edition of Bhandarkar Research Institute, Pōona, can mean only ‘obtaining’ (प्राप्ति) or ‘touching’ (स्पर्श) in relation to the donation of cows. Similarly the meaning of the word ālambha in पुरविनय प्रालम्ब्य रत्नवेष्वय कौतिम of Pūrvamegha in the Meghadūta of the great poet Kālidāsa also relates to the donation of cows and not their killing.
IS BEEF POSSIBLE IN MADHUPARKA?

Raja Rajendra Lala Mitra in his book ‘Beef in Ancient India’ and Pandurang Vaman Kane in his book ‘History of Dharma-sastra’ Vol. II, Part I, Chapter 10 (Madhuparka and Other Usages); and Vol. II, Part II, Chapter 12 (Bhojana—Flesh-eating) have tried to prove that madhuparka contained meat and that too beef. Besides foreigners, a number of other Indian writers too have at times described and referred to it in their articles. Let us consider it.

MADHUPARKA IN THE VEDAS

The famous Vedic scholar of modern times, the late Pandit Shripad Damodar Satavalekar writes in his Go-Jñāna-Kośa, Ancient Period, Vedic section, Part I:

“Several people say that the rite of madhuparka is Vedic and meat is its essential ingredient. But the word madhuparka itself is not found in the Rgveda, Yajurveda and Sāmaveda; it is also not found in the Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads. It occurs only once in the Atharvaveda Samhita. This mantra is:

यथा यश: सोमपीथेः मधुपक्तं यथा यश: ।
(Atharvaveda 10.3.21)
“May I be blessed by the glory that dwells in the draught of soma and in madhuparka.”

This is all that is found about madhuparka in all the four Samhitas of the Vedas. Therefore it is not possible to ascertain as to what should be the ingredients of madhuparka, and what not. But this is a fact thatwhosoever claim that meat is a necessary ingredient of madhuparka, their view point cannot be proved by the Vedic mantras. Beyond this, even in the Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads, no text has any mention of madhuparka. Therefore it is impossible to
prove by Vedic testimony that meat is necessary in the Vedic madhuparka.

Although the word madhuparka is not found in the Vedas anywhere else, yet the word madhupeya (मधुपेय) occurs. This too can be taken as its synonym. This is a good, delicious i.e., sweet drink, as it appears from the following mantra of Rgveda 6.44.21:

इन्द्रवेद ६.४४.२१

In the last quartet of this mantra we find the words स्वादु रसो मधुपेयो. They mean ‘sweet drink madhupeya’. But this is not any independent drink, it is the soma juice itself, to indicate which, the word indu is there in this very mantra. Vṛṣa (वृष) vṛṣabhah (वृषम:) in this mantra signify an ‘ox’.

Seeing these words, many seem to have conjectured the meat of an ox as an ingredient of madhupeya. But this mantra is in praise of god Indra and it means: “O, God Indra! thou art the giver of strength to earth, heavens, rivers, moveables and immovable, so come here at the time of drinking madhu.” Though Mr. Griffith has translated it into English as: “Though art the ‘bull’ of earth, the ‘bull’ of heaven”; the meaning here is not ‘the bull’ but ‘the giver of strength’,—this need not be explained to those who comprehend the meanings inherent in English words. If anyone insists that as the two words vṛṣa and madhupeya occur in this mantra, therefore meat of a bull is required in madhuparka, then his contention will not be credible because to thrust on the mantra a sense which is not therein—is not a learned person’s work.

Following are the meanings of vṛṣa (वृष), vṛṣabh (वृषम:) and
vrṣakarma (वृषकर्म) found in the Sanskrit-English Dictionary of Monier-Williams:

vrṣa (वृष)  
(i) A strong or a potent man;
(ii) The chief of the class or anything the most excellent or prominent or best of its kind.

vrṣabha (वृषभ) — Bull (in Veda, epithet of various gods, as of Indra),
vrṣakarma (वृषकर्म) — Doing manly deeds as Indra (Ṛgveda).

Thus it is proved that there is no mention of madhuparka in the Vedas except in one passage in the Atharvaveda. Madhupeya is mentioned in the Ṛgveda. The ingredients of madhuparka are not specified anywhere in the Vedas. The name only indicates that it is something sweet. Therefore it cannot be proved from the Vedas that there is any possibility of any type of meat in madhuparka according to the Vedas. Let us now consider as to what are the ingredients of madhuparka according to the other texts.

INGREDIENTS OF MADHUPARKA

Madhuparka has been prescribed for special honoured guests who have come from far-off places. Wherever the ingredients of madhuparka have been described in the scriptures, nowhere has meat been included in them. Curd, ghee, milk, honey and candysugar are the main constituents of madhuparka. Some have not taken all of them but mentioned only a few of them. In some sources, parched barley powder (sattu) has also been mentioned as one of the ingredients of madhuparka.

Now let us see what are the ingredients of madhuparka in the various texts:

1. TANTRASĀRA (Chowkhambā Sanskrit Series, Varānasi, November 1938, Chapter I, page 53):

   प्राण्य दत्तस्थुर्मितं मधुपकं विदुयत्याः।
"Wise men prescribe the mixture of ghee, curd and honey in madhuparka."

The same has been quoted in Śabda-kalpadruma (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, Varanasi, 1961, Part III, page 599, column 2) while explaining the word madhuparka.

2. At the same place in Śabdakalpadruma in the meanings of madhuparka, the following has been quoted from the KĀLIKĀ-PURĀNA, chapter 7:

दधि सपिर्जलें शोंद्र सितेलांभितु पञ्चांभिः:
प्रोच्चयते मधुपकस्तु सर्वदेवोपुष्टधे ॥

"Curd, ghee, milk, honey and candy-sugar—all these five constitute madhuparka which satisfies all the gods."


कांस्यपात्रेः समायुक्तं दधिमघुङ्गुरं तन्तुम्:
मधुपक्तः स विज्ञया भिन्नस्य त्वा प्रतिवक्षणी ॥

"The preparation with curd, honey and ghee in a bronze vessel is called madhuparka."

4. ĀŚVALĀYANA-GṛHYA-SŪTRA 1.24.5,6:

वधलि मध्वानीय, सपिर्वा मध्वलामे ।

"One should mix curd and honey, and ghee if honey is not available."

5. PĀRASKARA-GṛHYA-SŪTRA chapter on marriage, 1.3.5:

श्राहर्नितिक विष्टरं पापं पादार्यमुदकामध्यमाचनमियम्
मधुपक्तं दधिमघुङ्गुरं मपिहितं कांस्ये कांस्येन ॥

After describing other items in the first line, the ingredients of madhuparka have been detailed in the second line:
“Madhuparka is made of curd, honey and ghee in a bronze vessel covered with a bronze lid.

6. VĀRĀHA-GRHYA-SŪTRA 12.4 :

कांस्ये कमसे वा सदहि मध्वाचिच्यः
बर्षीयसा विधायाच्छन्नीय प्रथमेण प्रतिप्रणते ।

“The celebrant should come for worship with mixture of honey and curd in a bronze vessel or in a camasa vessel shaped like the pranita covered with a big lid, along with the sipping water.”

7. ĀPASTAMBĪYA-DHARMA-SŪTRA 2.4.8.8, 9 :

वधिंमधुसूदनं मधुपर्कं पयो वा मधुसूदनम्।
ग्रामावे उदकम्।

“Madhuparka should be prepared by mixing curd and honey or by mixing milk and honey, and if they are not available, water should be mixed with honey.”

8. BAUDHĀYNA-GRHYA-SŪTRA 1.2.10—13 :

In sutra 9, bringing of madhu has been described. In sutras 10 to 13 the ingredients to be mixed with honey have been described as follows :

वधि पयो वा त्रितीयं स द्वितृत ।

“if curd or milk is mixed with honey, it is called dvivrt (द्वितृत्)”

गृहं तृतीयं वा त्रितृत ।

“if the third ingredient ghee is added, it is called trivrt (त्रितृत्)”

यद्र तृतीयं तथचतुर्थं स चतुर्वृत्त ।

“by mixing the second ingredient i.e. if firstly milk has been
mixed then curd and if firstly curd has been mixed then by mixing milk, it is called caturvṛt (चतुर्वृत्त)

"by mixing the fifth ingredient, i.e. water, it is called pāṅkta (पाङ्खः)

9. JAIMNIYA-GRHYA-SŪTRA 1.19:

तयोदेविंच मधु संनिहिते भवतो, चव्ना चेत
दधिमन्योऽद्धस्चेत्र उदमन्यः, पवसा चेत पवस्यः ।

"Curd and honey are mixed in it. With curd it is called dadhimanthana (दधिमन्यः); with water it is termed udamanth (उदमन्यः) and with milk it is designated as payasya (पवस्य)

10. HIRANYAKEŚI-GRIHYA-SŪTRA 1.12.10:

The text of Hiranyakesi-grihya-sūtra was neither available with any book-seller nor in any library. But its evidence was found in the German book: ‘Ritual Literatur Vedische Opfer und Zauber’ by Alfred Hillebrandt, published by Verlag von Karl. J. Trubner, Strassburg, in 1897. It is cited below in the original German, with an interlinear English word-for-word translation:

Hierauf folgt die Darbietung des Spulwassers und des Madhuparka. Hereafter follows the offering of rinsing water and of Madhuparka.

Dieser bestecht nach Hiranyakesi 1.12.10 aus drei
These comprise according to Hiranyakeshi 1,12.10 of three

oder fünf Bestandteilen, naemlich dadhi, madhu, ghṛta
or five components, namely curd, honey, ghee which can be
wozu noch āpah und saktu’s treten können
mixed with water and saktus (flour of barley, parched in hot sand)

According to Hiranyakesī 1.12.10—firstly water should be offered for washing and then madhuparka which contains three or five ingredients—curd, honey and ghee; to which water and groats of barley meal (saktu) can be added.


(i) A mixture of honey;

(ii) An offering of honey and milk;

(iii) A respectful offering to a guest, or to the bridegroom on his arrival at the door of the father of the bride, sometimes consisting of equal parts of curd, honey and clarified butter.

At other places too wherever the ingredients of madhuparka have been detailed, what to talk of beef, there is not even the slightest indication of meat. When meat has nowhere been included in the ingredients of madhuparka, then how is it alleged that meat is essential in madhuparka or that there can be no madhuparka without meat. The most essential ingredient of madhuparka is honey, without which there can be no madhuparka. Only the Āsvalāyana-grhya-sūtra prescribes that ghee can be taken if honey is not available, nowhere else such a prescription has been made; though other ingredients in place of milk, curd or ghee have been prescribed. Āpastambīya-dharma-sūtra has even prescribed that if neither milk nor curd is available, then madhuparka can be prepared by mixing honey in water. It is not understandable as to how the Āsvalāyana-grhya-sūtra has accepted madhuparka without honey when the name madhuparka itself indicates the essentiality of honey in it. There appears to be some transgression. It is probably due to a pressing occasion when some followers of
Is Beef Possible in Madhuparka?
Impracticability of Beef in Madhuparka

Āśvalāyana must have ruled in a hurry that ghee could be mixed in place of honey when it is not available, to avoid inconvenience of waiting to the guest. From that very time onwards the followers of Āśvalāyana would have recognised the convention of mixing ghee in place of honey when it was not available. Whatever it be, meat is not mentioned anywhere in the ingredients of madhuparka, inspite of ransacking searches.

The descriptions of the ingredients of madhuparka in the various scriptures prove that there is not even an inkling of meat in madhuparka. So it is firmly proved that madhuparka contains no meat. Whichever passages are referred to as prescribing meat in madhuparka, such as:

1. नामांसो मधुपकों भवति भवति। (Āśvalāyana-Gṛhya-Sūtra 1.24.26)
2. न एवांसोंसोधं: स्थाय। (Pāraskara-Gṛhya-Sūtra 1,3.29)
3. मधुपकं च यलं च पितुदेवतकर्मिण।

will be discussed later on.

IMPRacticability of BEEF IN THE RECEPTION OF A GUEST WITH MADHUPARKA

The rites of receiving an honourable guest with madhuparka have been detailed in the Āśvalāyana-grhya-sūtra 1.24 and Pāraskara-grhya-sūtra 1.3. Only on the basis of these two grhya-sūtras, people opine that meat (beef) is essential in madhuparka. Let us now consider the possibility of meat in madhuparka according to the rites described in them.

The sequence of rites given in these grhya-sūtras is as follows;

1. Offering of a seat and its acceptance;
2. Offering of water for washing the feet;
3. Offering of arghya (अर्घ्य) and its acceptance;

4. Offering of sipping water (ācamanīya) and its acceptance;

5. Accepting madhuparka, mixing it with the thumb and third finger, sprinkling madhuparka in the four directions by these very fingers, taking madhuparka thrice from its middle by these very fingers, and leaving the residue;

6. Cleaning the mouth by sipping water.

The rites upto here are almost identical in the Āśvalāyana and Pāraskara-grhyā-sūtras. Till this place there is no point for difference of opinion. Hereafter interpretations differ, which will be discussed separately according to both the grhyā-sūtras in the forthcoming sections. Here it will suffice to point out that there is no mention of meat in the ingredients of madhuparka, nor is meat mentioned till the completion of the rite by cleansing the mouth with sipping water. When a guest arrives, all the rites in the chain of his honoured reception by madhuparka are performed one after the other in a regular sequence and without interruption. There is no waiting for any length of time. Therefore, it does not seem possible that a cow could be slaughtered instantaneously, her meat taken out, be cooked, be mixed with madhuparka and then it could be served to the guest. It takes a long time to slaughter a cow, to extract her meat and then to cook it. It does not seem possible that an honoured guest was required to wait for such a long time. The followers of Āśvalāyana do not let an honourable guest wait even for honey and hence accept ghee in its place.

Moreover, a guest cannot consume the entire meat of a cow. The quantity of madhuparka for the occasion can permit only a fraction of an ounce of meat in it. How can it be desirable to slaughter a cow for such a little quantity of meat? Therefore, when a cow is brought after the guest has partaken of madhuparka and has cleansed his mouth by sipping water, her bringing in can be either for gifting her to the guest, or for offering instantaneously drawn milk to the guest for which he will not have to wait.
GIFT OF A COW IN MADHUPARKA

Some scriptures specifically prescribe that a cow should be gifted in madhuparka.

1. Arupa-smṛti, chapter 11 (published by Mansukhrai Mor, 5, Clive Row, Calcutta):

यज्ञकर्मिः या चेतुर्या चेनुर्धर्मकर्मिः ॥११६॥
प्रायकिततनिमित्ते वा होमायुः दुर्वान्य वा ।
मधुपक्षः च या चेतुः या चेतुः कर्मसिद्धे ॥११७॥
एता: सर्वा हिजो विद्रान् प्रतिगृहा यत्स्ततः ।
न स पापेन लिप्येत् पद्यप्रवदिव्यमत्सा ॥११८॥

“As there is no effect of water on a lotus leaf, similarly sin does not effect a learned dwīja who accepts a cow gifted at the time of a yajña, in a religious performance, on performing expiation rites, for offerings (homa), for regaining his lost health, in the rites of madhuparka, and on fulfilment of desire (karma-siddhi).”

2. Manu-smṛti 3.3:

तं प्रतीतं स्वर्णमाणं श्रवावर्यायं चिन्तुः ॥
स्वित्वं तत्थः प्रार्थनम् यशेऽयेऽयम् गुहा ॥

“Being justly applauded for his strict performance of his duty, and having received from his natural or spiritual father the sacred gift of the Vedas, let him on an elegant bed, decked with a garland of flowers, and let his father honour him before his nuptials with the present of a cow according to the Madhuparka rite.” (translated by Raja Rajendra Lala Mitra in ‘Beef in Ancient India’)

Manu-smṛti 3.119,120 prescribes that ordained person who has finished his studies should be honoured by madhuparka and Manu-smṛti 3,3 prescribes that a cow should be gifted to such an ordained one; and in the succeeding stanzas he has been permitted
to marry an auspicious girl. It is clear from this that an ordained brahmacari should first be honoured with madhuparka along with an offer of a cow. Probably its reason is that one who has been physically weakened by the hard labours of studies and by performing the strict duties of a brahmacari should increase his vigour and regain his health by drinking cow's milk before marriage so that he may be able to carry on with married life without adverse effect.

3. The following sutras of the Āpastamba-dharma-sūtra 2.4.8 are also indicative of the offering or gifting of a cow:

(i) गोमुखपक्तः वटस्यायः
"One who studies the Vedas is eligible to a cow and madhuparka." (5)

(ii) प्राचार्यवृत्तिः हवयुक्तः राजा इति परिसंवत्तरात्रातिष्ठतः यो गोमुखपक्ताः
"A teacher, priest, father-in-law, king—if they come once a year they should be offered a cow and madhuparka."

Immediately after these sutras follows the enumeration of the ingredients of madhuparka:

वधि मध्यसंधुष्टः मधुक्तः पयो वा मध्यसंधुष्टा वा ग्रामाये उदकम् ॥

If the sense of a 'cow' would have been its beef, then it would have surely been included in the enumeration of ingredients. Evidently therefore, only the gifting of a cow is desired in these sutras.

ĀŚVALĀYANA-GRHYA-SŪTRA

Pandurang Vaman Kane in his book ‘History of Dharmaśāstra’ Vol. II, Part I, Chapter 10, page 543, lines 22-23 says—“the procedure of madhuparka is set out in the Āśvalayana-grhya-sūtra 1.24, which is correct. In the ingredients of madhuparka it prescribes a mixture of curd and honey and if honey is not available then ghee can be mixed. This has been described before. There is no difference of opinion regarding the subsequent rites
described and in their interpretation. After partaking of madhuparka and rinsing the mouth with sipping water, the subsequent rites are described by Panduranga Vaman Kane as follows on page 545, lines 3–8:

“When he has sipped water, they announce to him the cow. Having muttered the words ‘destroyed is my sin, my sin is destroyed’, he says ‘Om, do it’, if he desired to have the cow killed; if he is desirous of letting her go, he mutters the verse (Rig. VIII, 101, 15) the mother of Rudras and daughter of Vasus and says ‘let her go’,”

The original sūtras are:

आच्छतोत्सवकाय गां बेदयते ।
हुते मेपाप्ना मेवहत इति जयित्वा कुरुतत्ति कारविध्यन् ।

Its simple, straight-forward and word-to-word meaning is:

‘आच्छतोत्सवकाय (When the mouth has been rinsed with sipping water) गां बेदयते (a cow is gifted), मेवहताः (my) पाप्ना (sin) हुत: (is destroyed) इति (thus) जयित्वा (uttering) ओ (pronouncing Om) इति (thus he says) कुरुत (do it) कारविध्यन्त (if he wants to get it done).

In the contents of Asvalayana-grhya-sūtra with the commentary of Garga Narāyana published in 1893 by Jivanand Vidyasagar, No. 2, Ramanath Mazumdar Street, Calcutta, the heading of this 23rd sūtra has been given as आच्छतोत्सवकाय नोदतात् which means ‘gift of cow after rinsing mouth with sipping water’, which has been interpreted by Pandurang Vaman Kane as ‘they announce to him the cow’.

The meaning of the word kuruta (कुरुत) in the 24th sūtra has been taken by Pandurang Vaman Kane as ‘do it’ that is ‘perform the duty that should be done’ but it is not understandable wherefrom he has inserted later on “if he desires to have it killed”. When the madhuparka has been taken, the mouth has been purified
with sipping water, and the cow has been announced for gift, then the reply comes: ‘I accept it’ preceded by Om, the rite of gift be performed, and if it is not acceptable then the following sūtra prescribes that the mantra of Rgveda 8.101.15 should be pronounced:

माता ख्याणं दुहिता बसुनाम्—इति जपित्वोमेवत्तुजैत्युत्तक्ययन् ॥२५॥

“He mutters: ‘The mother of Rudras and the daughter of Vasus’ and says: ‘Let her go’ (to her place as I will not take her along). This mantra is also not suited to this context. We shall discuss it later. The sense ‘if he desires to have the cow killed’ is nowhere in the original sūtra. It is understandable that the cow was gifted* after all the rites of welcome were effected i.e. offering of water for washing the feet, offering scented water for cleaning hands, offering and acceptance of madhuparka, and the purification of mouth with sipping water but it is hard even to imagine her slaughter.

After it, Pandurang Vaman Kane writes on page 545, lines 8-9: ‘Let the madhuparka not be without flesh’, which seems to be the meaning of the last sūtra of Āśvalāyana-grhya-sūtra 1.24

नामांसो मद्धुपकों भवति भवति ॥२६॥

In the present day printed texts, this sūtra is found which is interpreted by the supporters of meat-eaters as ‘Madhuparka is not devoid of flesh’. The sandhi can be resolved in two ways, giving two interpretations: (1) Madhuparka is never devoid of flesh; and (2) Madhuparka is never with flesh, which will be discussed in details later on. ‘Madhuparka is never devoid of flesh’ is not relevant.

In the madhuparka rite, curd and honey or curd and ghee have been prescribed as its ingredients and there is not even an inkling of flesh. After the rite of madhuparka has been completed, which means that after the mouth has been rinsed with sipping water taking madhuparka and if then the guest mutters Om

*See the prescriptions of Scriptures regarding it under the heading ‘Gift of A Cow in Madhuparka’.
and says 'kill it' and 'the madhuparka is not without flesh’—these things can neither be reconciled because of the sequence of their occurrence and nor are they correct as a matter of principle. If flesh would have been essential in madhuparka, then it would have been mentioned among the ingredients of madhuparka and the announcement of the offering of the cow would have been before the offering and acceptance of madhuparka and if the guest would have had a longing for madhuparka with flesh, he would have muttered Om and said 'do (kill) it' before accepting madhuparka. Then madhuparka would have been prepared, offered, accepted and the mouth rinsed with sipping water. Therefore, it is certain that the announcement of the offering of cow is only for gift and if the guest does not like to take along the cow, he can say 'let her go to her place, I will not take her'. It is impossible to fancy the presence of flesh in madhuparka, because when a guest who has already arrived at one's door has to be honoured, there is not so much scope of time that a cow be slaughtered, her flesh extracted and then it be cooked. Therefore, the fancy that 'Madhuparka is never without meat' is entirely unjustified and improper. It cannot be conceded that such a point would not have occured to a jurist of the stature of Pandurang Vaman Kane (M.A., LL.M., Advocate). It is a different thing that he should knowingly close his eyes to it with some other end in view and that he should try to conceal it even from other people for the attainment of his objective.

Let us now consider Āśvalāyana-grhya-sūtra 1.24.25 which is incongruent and which we had promised to discuss later on:

माता ख्राणां ब्रह्मिता बस्नाम्-हि जित्वायोमुःज्ञेतस्वस्थक्षणः ||२५५॥

It means that the leaving or taking away of the cow may be permitted by uttering the mantra ‘mārā rudrānām…………….’. This is the Rigvedic mantra 8.101.15 and its full text is as follows:

माता ख्राणां ब्रह्मिता बस्नां स्वसारवित्यानामतृतवः नामिः ।
प्र नु बोच चिलितुष्ये जनाय मा गामनां अरवित विष्णु ॥
Its word-to-word meaning is:

चराणां माता (mother of the brave Maruts who make the enemies wail), बसूरां दुखिता (the daughter of Vasus), ग्राहित्यानां र्वता (sister of the sons of Aditi) and श्रवृत्तम नानिः (the focal point of ambrosia is the cow, therefore) विकितवें सनाय (to the wise man) प्र वोचन तु (I announce) मा बनिष्ठ (do not kill) प्रपानां ग्रन्धित (the innocent and inviolable cow). Here aditi has double meaning—one which has been given above and the other प्रपानां ग्रन्धित: i.e., one who produces consumables like milk, card, butter ghee etc. Both the meanings are appropriate and acceptable. मा गां बनिष्ठ (do not kill the cow—this is injunction of the Veda contained in this mantra. (See Go-jhâna-kośa, Ancient Section, Vedic Age, Part I, page 3 edited by Pt. Shripad Damodar Satavalekar).

How impossible a conjecture it is and in total contradiction to the injunction of the above Vedic mantra that after the completion of the rites of madhuparka, the guest by muttering the sacred Om should say: do it (kill it) if he (the honoured guest, who has been offered madhuparka and who has completed the madhuparka ceremony), desires to have the cow killed. Then imagine how improbable it is to mention नामांसो महुपको महान (the madhuparka is never without meat) when the madhuparka rites have been completed without meat.

Besides the above reasons, another point deserves consideration, i.e., when the madhuparka rites have been completed, is it desirable to feed uncooked meat of an instantaneously slaughtered cow to the guest? Even if it is accepted that the cow is killed then and there and that uncooked flesh is served, then has it to be enquired from an honoured guest whether he will eat a certain thing or not? Whatever is the best, is put before an honoured guest and it is up to him to accept it if he so desires or to leave it if he does not relish it.

Furthermore, even at present, people who take meat, never like the heinous act of slaughtering an animal in their presence.
Slaughtering is done only where they cannot witness it and thence meat comes for the consumption of these meat-eating people belonging to a civilised society. Then how can one imagine something contradictory to this generality and that too about the great saints and sages dwelling in the forests?

Therefore, if the meaning of Āśvalāyana-grhya-sūtra I.24.26 नामांसो मधुपक्को सङ्ख्यति be taken as 'there is no madhuparka without animal flesh', then it will be contrary to the context and because of its being unsuitable, it can never be relevant to the sense. Therefore, it will have to be accepted as an interpolation. Other interpretations of this sūtra are given below:

1. In नामांसो मधुपक्को सङ्ख्यति the sandhi of नामांसो can also be resolved as न+प्रामांसो. By resolution in this manner, the prefix प्रा in प्रामांसो may be taken in the following sense according to Amarakośa 3.3.239:

प्रामांसो प्रभिव्याधति सीमायः धातुयोगः।
Its breaking of words is आइवत् प्रावं प्रभिव्याधति सीमा-प्रावं धातुयोगः।
It means that the prefix प्रा is used in the senses of little, pervading, limitation and addition to the root.

The meaning of आमांसो of नामांसो मधुपक्को सङ्ख्यति will be ‘pervaded with flesh’ and its sense comes to ‘containing flesh’ only. The whole sūtra will mean मधुपक्को प्रामांसो न सङ्ख्यति ‘madhuparka’ is not pervaded with—not containing i.e., devoid of flesh’

This clarifies and removes any misapprehension that the cow was brought for killing. So it is explicitly pointed out that madhuparka is never with meat. The bringing in of the cow is not for slaughter, but for offering or gifting away. If the guest desires to take away the gifted cow he says ‘Om, do it’ and if he does not want to take her away, he says ‘let her go’.

2. Padidit Dinanath Sastri, in his book ‘Sanātana-Dharmālok’ Vol. 6, pages 337-338, has interpreted the word māhisa (माहिस) in relation to madhuparka as under:
"The above-stated ingredients of madhuparka should be मांसल i.e. rich in fats, nourishing and should not be devoid of substance. To the word māṁsa (मांस), प्रच्छ has been suffixed in accordance with प्रच्छ आदित्योद्ध (Aṣṭādhyāyī 5.2.127) in the sense of ‘with, together’ and it gives the meaning of ‘rich in fats’.

This meaning is also relevant to the present context. In practice it means that the milk and curd used in madhuparka should not be that from which butter or cream has been extracted. Milk or curd from which butter, cream has been extracted will neither be rich in fats, nor delicious and tasty, nor well nourishing, rather it will be devoid of substance. Only good things should be used for an honoured guest and not things devoid of substance.

3. Pandit Madhavacharya Sastri has interpreted the word māṁsa (मांस) on page 39 of the ‘Removal of Doubts’ Number (शास्त्र समाधान अंश) of his monthly magazine ‘Lokālok’ (published by Madhava Pustakalaya, Dharmadham, Kamla Nagar, Delhi-7). There he says that in the context of madhuparka, māṁsa (मांस) means the fleshy part of fruits, kernels of dry fruits like almonds etc., fresh newly milked warm milk, or substantial milkproducts thickened by boiling and sweetened like रकड़ी, खोया, सिखरन etc. This meaning is also not irrelevant as it is not contradictory to principles. Incongruence, if any, is that fruits, etc. are not mentioned anywhere in the ingredients of madhuparka, but curd and milk do figure among the ingredients and newly-milked fresh warm milk of a cow is desirable to remove the fatigue of the honoured guest.

These discussions make it clear that there is no place even for any surmise of animal-flesh in madhuparka.

PĀRAŚKARA-GRHYA-SŪTRA

In continuance of the aforesaid description of the rites, the cow is mentioned only after madhuparka has been taken and the
mouth has been purified with sipping water. Mention of a cow after the madhuparka has been taken, clearly indicates that there is no possibility of beef in madhuparka.

Mr. E.W. Hopkins writes about madhuparka in the “Cambridge History of India” Vol. 1 Chapter 10, page 208 (second edition, 1962, published by S. Chand & Co., Delhi) :-

“But it is an old rite of hospitality to kill a cow for a guest and as a matter of form, each honoured guest is actually offered a cow.”

Mr. E.W. Hopkins further continues :-

“The host says to the guest, holding the knife ready to slay the cow that he has the cow for him but the guest is directed to say—“Mother of Rudras, daughter of Vasus, sister of Adityas, Navel of immortality (is she), do not kill the guiltless cow; she is (earth itself), Aditi the goddess.” I speak to them that understand. He adds, “My sin has been killed and that of so and so, let her go and eat grass.” But if he really wants to have her eaten, he says, “I kill my sin and the sin of so and so, (in killing her)”, and though in many cases, the offer of the cow is thus plainly a formal piece of etiquette, yet the offering to the guest was not complete without flesh of some sort; and it is clear from the formulas, any of the worthiest guests might demand cow’s death.”

Such a statement seems to be based on Pāraskara-grhya-sūtra 1.3.26 which reads :

प्राचालोककाय शासमावाय गौरिति त्रिः प्राह ||

It means that after the guest has taken madhuparka and rinsed his mouth with sipping water, holding the śāsa (शास) the host says thrice : ‘this cow is (for you)’. There is no such word in the original text which refers to killing or slaughtering. It
seems that Mr. E.W. Hopkins has taken the meaning of शास धारण as ‘holding the knife ready to slay the cow’.

In Yājñavalkyāsāṃhitā as told by Brahmadevī 8.212 (Smṛti-Sandarbha, part 4, published by Mansukh Rai Mor, 5-Clive Row, Calcutta, first edition) the meaning of śāsa (शास) has been given धारण: शाससर्वेष शास शासि उच्चाये i.e. after cleaning the mouth with sipping water, the meaning of holding a śāsa (शास) is “to control with a śāsa (शास)”.

The meaning of the word शासि is to control by the use of some object. Here a cow is brought for a guest who has just arrived and this cow is intended only to be gifted (see the heading ‘Gift of a Cow in Madhuparka’). The nature of a cow is that she does not easily go to the house of a new owner from that of her previous owner. Even nowadays it is seen that if a cow is sent to a new place then she returns to the place of her old owner at the end of the day while returning after grazing in the forest and it is only with some efforts that she gets accustomed to and intimate with new owner. In such efforts one may sometimes have to control the cow by the fear of a stick or a rod. Likewise it has been said that a stick or a rod should be held in one’s hand to keep the cow under control so that she does not back at going with a new guest. It is not said here that one should hold a knife in hand, to kill the cow. It is not understandable as to wherefrom Mr. E.W. Hopkins has brought the meaning ‘holding the knife ready to slay the cow’ when in the original text there is no indication of slaying or slaughtering.

In Monier Williams’ Sanskrit-English Dictionary the meanings of the root śās (शास) have been given as under:

to chastise; to correct; to censure; to punish;
to restrain; to control; to rule; to govern;
to administer the law; to direct; to bid;
to order; to command; to teach, etc.

The verbal noun from the root śās (शास) has the form शास्त्र in the accusative singular which means ‘to an object of controlling’,
With reference to one whom the Government has sentenced to
death, the meaning of the word श्रां त can be taken as a knife or
a sword, but here the meaning ‘knife’ or ‘sword’ does not fit-in.

The meaning of Pāraskara-grhya-sūtra 1.3:

Pत्तयाद्। माता खद्राणां उःहिता चन्द्रनां स्वसावित्रियामामृतस्य नामि:।
प्रज्ञेश्वरि द्रिकृते जनाय मागामनागामवर्तित बचित्त। ष्ट चामुख्य च
पाप्मानं हनोभीति यामालेत। ॥२७॥ ग्राहय यद्यंत्तिसक्षेपनम चामुख्य च पाप्मा
हुत इत्त उत्तमात तुस्तेताय त्वमिति ब्रूयात्। ॥२८॥ न त्रेवारांसांसिर्द्वः स्वातः। ॥२९॥
is almost the same as that of Āśvalāyana-grhya-sūtra 1.24:
हतो मेम पाप्मा पाप्मा मे हुत इति जप्तवोधकुतम्यते कारविश्वन। ॥२४॥
माता खद्राणां उःहिता चन्द्रनामामृतिः जप्तवोधकुतम्यतुश्वनक्षन। ॥२५॥
नामामं च त्रुप्तकां भवति भवति। ॥२६॥
which has already been considered under the heading, ‘Āśvalāyana-
grhya-sūtra’. Only the 28th sūtra is slightly different, whose
simple and straight-forward meaning is given hereunder for the
information of our readers, wherein the mention of ‘leaving the
cow for grazing’ also proves that the cow was meant for gifting.
The meaning of 28th sūtra is:

(श्रां यति) If (तत्सत्तक्षेत) he desires to leave her (ब्रूयात्) he
should say—(मम च) mine and (अनुष्ठय च) his i.e. host’s (पाप्मा)
sin (हुतः) has ended, (अंश उत्तमः) yes, leave her, (तुस्तानि ब्रात्)
let her graze.

The meaning of न्त्रेवारांसांसिर्द्वः स्वातः the 29th sūtra of the
Pāraskara-grhya-sūtra can be taken in two ways like that of
नामामसो त्रुप्तकांभवति—

(1) न तु एव नामां सो ग्राथ्यः स्वातः
(2) न तु एव नामां सो ग्राथ्यः स्वातः

The meaning in the first case is: ‘Madhuparka (ग्राथ्यः)’ is
never devoid of flesh (नामांसः), while in the second case the
meaning is: ‘Madhuparka (मधुपर्क) never contains flesh (ग्रामांस).’ The coherence and incoherence of both these renderings together with the meaning of mānsa (मांस) as fleshy fruit have been discussed under Āśvalāyana-ग्रह्य-सूत्र.

VASISTHA-DHARMA-SŪTRA, ŚĀṆKHĀYANA-GRHYA-SŪTRA


“Manu (V. 27-44) at first contains a permission to kill animals only in Madhuparka, in sacrifice (yajña) and in rites for gods and manes and on no other occasion. This is same as Vasiṣṭha IV.6, Viṣṇu-dharma-sūtra 51.64, Śāṅkhāyana-grhīya-sūtra II.16.1, (Śāṅkhāyana-grhīya-sūtra reads होमे for यज्ञ).”

In the extant Manusmṛti, meat in madhuparka has been mentioned only in 5.41 which has been considered under the heading “Manusmṛti”. The very same text is also found in the extant Vasiṣṭha-dharma-sūtra (Vasiṣṭha-dharmaśāstra or Vasiṣṭha-smṛti) 4.6 and in Śāṅkhāyana-grhīya-sūtra 2.16.1:

मधुपर्कम् च यज्ञैः च पितृद्वकर्मरैः ।
प्राणांवच पशुः हिस्यात्माण्यथेत्यपपवीमन्नन्: ॥

It has not been separately and specifically prescribed in the Vasiṣṭha-dharma-sūtra or the Śāṅkhāyana-grhīya-sūtra that animal-slaughter is permitted in madhuparka, yajña and rites of the manes and gods and nowhere else; but it has been quoted in passing as an opinion of Manu.

As has been proved under the heading ‘Manuṣmṛti’, the above-mentioned stanza cannot be that of the Manu-smṛti 5.41. Moreover an independent prescription of this intent is found nowhere else in the Manu-smṛti. Therefore, it is also proved that the citing of
Is Beef Possible in Madhuparka?
Baudhāyana-Grhyasūtra

such a stanza from the Vasiṣṭha-dharma-sūtra or Śāṅkhāyana-grhyasūtra or from another scriptural text by Pandurang Vaman Kane is not genuine but imaginary and spurious, specially when such a specific prescription is not available elsewhere in the Manu-smṛti.

In the fourth chapter of the Vasiṣṭha-dharma-sūtra, the seventh stanza after the sixth one reads:

नाकुत्वा प्राणिनां हिसा मात्स्युपपत्त्वते कवचित ।
न च प्राणिवधः: स्वार्थस्तत्त्वाद्याने वधोवधः: ॥

This stanza tallies with Manu-smṛti 5.48; only the fourth quartet differs. Here it is तत्सङ्गाद्यने वधो वधः which means that ‘violence in a yajña is considered non-violence’, while the Manu-smṛti reads तत्सङ्गाद्यां विवच्छेदू which means ‘therefore, one should avoid meat’. The text of this stanza of the Manu-smṛti is valid by virtue of its being in conformity with the Vedas; and the reading of Vasiṣṭha-dhatma-sūtra is invalid being against the Vedas.

BAUDHĀYANA-GRHYA-SŪTRA


“The Baudhāyana-grhyasūtra says (I.2.51-54) that when the cow is let off, the flesh of a goat or ram may be offered, or some forest flesh (of a deer etc.) may be offered, as there can be no madhupakra without flesh or if one is unable to offer flesh, one may cook ground grain.”

The original reading of these Sūtras is as under:—
तत्सङ्गाद्यां विवच्छेदू तत्सङ्गाद्यां विवच्छेदू मेघमांव वासुकिमन्ते ॥५३॥

According to the Baudhāyana-grhyasūtra, honey, curd, milk, ghee and water—only these five are the ingredients of madhuparka. It has been discussed already that meat has not been mentioned in
the ingredients of madhuparka, neither there is any scope for serving meat after slaughtering an animal within the time for the rites of welcoming a guest (it takes even more time in bringing the meat of a wild animal, like deer etc. after hunting it); and nor is meat desirable according to the principle. Therefore, the contention that madhuparka is not without meat is incorrect and unfounded. If there can be no madhuparka without meat, then why a prescription of offering 'cooked ground grain'? This affirms that the contention that madhuparka cannot be without meat' is not true.

MĀṆAVA-GRHYA-SŪTRA

Pandurang Vaman Kane in his 'History of Dharmasastra' Vol. 2, part I, chapter 10, 'Madhuparka & other Usages', page 545, lines 28-31, writes:

"Māṇava-grhya-sūtra 19.2.2 says that the Veda declares that the Madhuparka must not be without flesh and so it recommends that if the cow is let loose, goat's meat or Payasa (rice cooked in milk) may be offered."

The original sūtra reads:—

शस्वप्प यायसं वा कारवेत् नामांसो मद्वपर्कों हिति भूति।।

Shri Bhimsen Sharma, editor of the monthly 'Brahmana-sarvasva' (published by Satyavrata Sharma Dwivedi, printed by Veda Prakash Press, available from Sanatana Dharma Pustakalaya, Btawāh, pages 19-20) has translated it into Hindi, which can be rendered into English as follows:

"One should offer madhuparka with milk-rice pudding (pāyasa) which is symbolic of cattle; as milk is a part or product of cattle, they are causally present therein. It is written in Śruti that madhuparka is not without meat, so when milk-rice pudding has been prepared and milk being part of cattle, words of the śruti are fulfilled."

Under the heading 'Madhuparka in the Vedas' on page 88 it has already been pointed out that according to Pändit Shripad Daṇḍodār Satavalekar even the word madhuparka is not found in
the Vedas. The author or commentator of Mānava-grhya-sūtra has not quoted any Vedic mantra; therefore, it is not a fact that the Vedas mention that there is no madhuparka without meat. If māṁsa (मांस) is interpreted to be a pudding (पावस) prepared by admixing milk obtained from cattle and rice, then this will not be acceptable to the propagators of meat and if they accept it then we have no objection because it involves no violence. Even in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa 11.7.1.3 meat (māṁsa) has been termed paramāṇa परमाणु (एतत्र हेतु परममन्नाथ यन्नासय) and according to Amarakośa 2.7.24 paramāṇa परमाणु is a synonym of pāyasa पायस or a pudding of milk and rice with sugar added to it (परमाणुं तु पायसम्). But it takes time in preparing a milk-rice pudding (pāyasa). Such a scope of time does not exist in the madhuparka rites; and therefore, it seems more appropriate that instead of milk-rice pudding (pāyasa) fresh warm milk was served. In the original text of the Mānava-grhya-sūtra, there is no mention of the meat of a he-goat as alleged by Pandurang Vaman Kane, and wherefrom he has got this he alone knows.

MANU-SMRTI

On page 6 of his afore-mentioned ‘Beef in Ancient India’ Raja Rajendra Lala Mitra mentions:

"Being justly applauded for his strict performance of his duty, and having received from his natural or spiritual father the sacred gift of the Vedas, let him on an elegant bed, decked with a garland of flowers, and let his father honour him, before his nuptials, with the present of a cow, according to the madhuparka rite."

There is no difference of opinion here. Raja Rajendra Lala Mitra writes further:

"In a subsequent passage (Manu III.119-120) he (Manu) recommends the madhuparka or the ‘honeyed meal’ with
beef for the reception of kings and other great dignitaries."

The stanzas of Manu-smṛti (3.119-120) read:

राजा च भोजियश्चैव यज्ञकर्मणाप्रस्त्वतिः
मधुपकरण संपूर्णं न त्वयं इति स्वतिः

In the above first stanza it has been said that a king, priest, graduate teacher, son-in-law, father-in-law and maternal uncle should be honoured by madhuparka if they come once a year. In the second stanza it has been said that a king and a scholar of Vedas should be honoured by madhuparka whenever they are present at the performance of yajña. In both these stanzas honouring by madhuparka has been mentioned, but there is no inkling of beef anywhere in them. We are at a loss to understand wherefrom Raja Rajendra Lala Mitra or others, whosoever they may be, scent beef in these stanza while citing them.

On page 29 of the same book, Raja Rajendra Lala Mitra writes:

"Āśvalāyana emphatically ordains that no Madhuparka should be celebrated without flesh."

This has already been discussed at length under the heading ‘Ingredients of Madhuparka’, ‘Practicability of Beef in Reception of Guest with Madhuparka’ and ‘Āśvalāyana-grhya-sūtra’.


"Manu (V.41) contains a permission to kill animals only in madhuparka and in sacrifice (yajña) and rites for gods and manes and no other occasions."
The text of the above-mentioned stanza in the Manu-smṛti editions available now-a-days reads:—

मधुपकः च यज्ञः च पितुदैवतकर्मणि ।
प्रात्र वव पशवो हिष्या नान्यज्ञेयन्यज्ञवीन्मन: || (मु० ६.४१)

The meaning of this stanza is: "An animal can be slain on the occasions of madhuparka, yajña, rites for the manes and gods and nowhere else—this has been said by Manu."

The final words of this stanza इत्यज्ञवीन्मन: (इति ज्ञवीन्मन:)—'this has been said by Manu' are indicative of the fact that this the stanza as a whole does not belong to the Manu-smṛti. All the injunctions given in the Manu-smṛti are by Manu and as such it is not necessary to specify that this has been said by Manu. If Manu's injunctions are quoted in another work, then it can be specified that thus it has been said by Manu—Manu has thus ordained. This also goes to prove that this injunction does not form an integral part of the Manu-smṛti as propounded by Manu.

It seems that the above quoted stanza is the basis for the following attribution in the Cambridge History of India, Vol. I, Chapter X (by E. W. Hopkins), page 208, (2nd edition of 1962, published by S. Chand & Co., Delhi):

"The general rule in this regard is that attributed to Manu—'Animals may be killed (so said Manu) at the Madhuparka and soma sacrifice (yajña) and at the rite for manes and gods.'"

As proved on the basis of arguments given above, this stanza should not belong to the Manu-smṛti and hence this statement is also baseless.

In the same fifth Chapter of Manu-smṛti, the 27th stanza reads:

प्रोक्तितं मश्ये वस्तुं ब्राह्मणां च काम्ययम ।
यथाविधि निषुकस्तुं प्रात्यायामेव चाल्ये ||
Its correct word-to-word meaning in prose order is as under:

(प्राणानां गत्ये) At the time of impending death (एव) only
(i.e. only when death is imminent and under no other circumstance), (च) and (प्राणानार्थ काम्याः) at the desire of—by
the permission of Brahmanas (i.e. if the Brahmanas feel that
it is essential for the person to live, then only), (नियुक्तस्तु)
directed (यथाविधि) according to the rites, (मक्षयेत्) one may
take (मांस) meat (प्रोक्तत) which has been sanctified (but
under no other circumstance or in no other way)."

It is clear that meat can be taken by those, whose death is
imminent and who do not want to give up life, as on the non-
availability of cereals during famine or in some fatal disease when
no other cure is possible, but in no other circumstances is the
taking of meat prescribed. According to this prescription of
Manu also, meat is not possible in madhuparka.

The following stanzas are also from the fifth Chapter of
Manu-smṛti:

यो दहस्काति भूतानि हिन्त्यात्मसुखे च यः
स जो वांकच सूक्ताचि न कवित्सखे मेधाते ||45||

“He who slays innoxious beings with the intention of one’s
own pleasure, attains happiness neither in this world nor in
the world hereafter.” (45)

यो बल्भनवध्यलेखाध्रातिसानां न चिकिर्धति
स सर्वेष्य हिन्त्यप्रेयुः सुखमत्तममन्वते ||46||

“He who does not seek to keep the animals under detention,
to slay or to cause suffering to them, and who desires the
good of all, attains endless bliss.” (46)

यद्या यथः यत्रुक्ते धृति च भव्याति यत्र च ।
तद्यथायत्यन्यन्यलेख यो हिन्त्यति न किचन ||47||

“He who does not injure or slay anyone, whatever he wants,
whatever he thinks of, whatsoever he fixes his mind on, he
attains all that without any effort.” (47)
Flesh can never be obtained without slaughtering a living creature. As animal-slaughter cannot cause attainment of heaven, so one should abstain from meat.” 

(48)

“One should abstain from eating all kinds of flesh having well considered the origin of flesh and the cruelty of fettering and slaying animals.” 

(49)

“(y:) He who (न सक्षयति) does not eat (मांसः) meat (हिवा) disregarding (विविध) the rule of (what is eatable and what is not) like a (पिशाचः) pśāca, that is, a person who does not follow the pśācas who disregard all the rules of what is to be eaten and what is not to be eaten, (स) he (प्रियत् याति) becomes dear (लोके) to all (च) and (न) he is not (पोष्यते) tormented (व्याधिम्:) by diseases. 

(50)

抽查 studying विशालिता निहत्ता क्रयविक्रयोऽ। संस्कर्ता चोपहर्षार्च खादकवेति घातकाः। 115111

“He who permits slaughter, he who cuts it into bits, he who kills it, he who buys or sells it, he who cooks it, he who serves it, and he who eats it—all these are slayers (butchers).” 

(51)

“He who performs an Āsvamedha yajña annually during a hundred years and he who does not take meat altogether, both obtains the similar reward for their respective merits.” 

(53)
“By taking fruits and roots and the food fit for ascetics, one does not gain the reward which is attained by entirely giving up meat.” (54)

“Me (मै) he (स:) will eat in the next world, whose meat I am eating in this (life). This is the real meaning of the word मांस-स—मांस (me-eat) (i.e. this is the etymology of the word मांसा मांस—meat).”

Again in the 11th Chapter of the Manu-smṛti we find:

हिस्या व्याधिसृष्टिस्वभावं ११२१॥

Violence (i.e. eating of meat) gives rise to diseases.

(“Please see Sub-heading ‘Prohibition of Beef-eating in Islam’ under Chapter: ‘Were Cow-slaughter, Meat Sacrifice and Meat-eating Prevalent in the Vedic Age?’)

रक्षसः पिठाजातः मद्रो संस्मृतस्वभावं ११४॥

Intoxicating drinks, flesh and wine are the food of yakṣas, rākṣas and pīṣācas.

(Please see sub-heading ‘Punishment for Meat-Eating’

Those who are ignorant of this real धर्म and, though wicked and haughty, account themselves virtuous, kill animals without any feeling of remorse or fear of punishment, and are devoured by those very animals in their next birth,

(Srimad Bhāgavata 11.5.14)
under Chapter: ‘Were Cow-slaughter, Meat Sacrifice and Meat-eating Prevalent in the Vedic Age?’

It is a matter of great surprise and regret, as to why learned lawyers like Raja Rajendra Lala Mitra (Doctor of Law, LL.D.) and Pandurang Vaman Kane (M.A., LL.M., Advocate) had closed their eyes to afore-cited clear injunctions of Manu against flesh-eating and why did they indulge in such condemnable efforts of propagating flesh-eating.

The above quoted Manu-smṛti 5.55 is attested by Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa 4.25 which narrates the episode of King Prācinabarhi, who used to perform yajñas by slaying animals. Holy Nārada told him:

भो भो प्रजापते राजनू पशुनू पक्षय त्वयाधवरे ।
संज्ञापिताज्जीवसंडघासिचुः गोन सहलया: ॥ ७ ॥
पुते त्वां सम्प्रतीक्षते स्मरन्तो बृंबसे तथ।
सम्परेतमयः कूटाद्यान्वयन्वित्यतममथवः ॥ ८ ॥

“Nārada said: O Ruler of men! O King! behold the multitudes of creatures slaughtered by you in thousands as animals for sacrifice, merciless that you are (7). Retaining the memory of your cruelty, they eagerly wait for you, their anger having been roused (by the recollection), and will tear you with their horns, made of steel, when you have departed to the other world (8).”

When venerable Nārada gave a glimpse of such retributions, King Prācinabarhi was enlightened; he gave up yajñas with violence and went away to perform penances.

How can the slaughter of animals be justified in madhuparka and in rites of the manes and gods in face of such historical truth?

UTTARA-RĀMA-CARITA AND MAHĀVĪRA-CARITA

Raja Rajendra Lala Mitra writes on page 3 of his above quoted booklet ‘Beef in Ancient India’:
“The passage in which Vālmīki’s preparation for the reception of Vasiṣṭha is described in Uttara-Rāma-carita, is so remarkable, that I need not offer any apology to quote it entire. The scene is laid in front of hermitage of Vālmīki....”

After this he has given the running sense of that passage from the play Uttara-Rāma-Carita, which need not be quoted. Let us consider the original text itself.

Bhāvabhūti’s ‘Uttara-Rāma-Carita’ is a drama in which the sentiment of pathos (karuṇā) dominates. It relates to the renouncing of Sītā Mahārani by Lord Śrī Rāma sometime after his coronation. The plot is not based on any ancient history but it has been supplemented by a number of fancies. It has been considered excusable to add imaginative fancies even in a historical play to augment its aesthetic appeal. But fancies which mar the aesthetic sentiment and which are contrary to the scriptures cannot be considered pardonable. The playwright sends off the preceptor Vasiṣṭha, his wife Arundhatī and Kauśalyā, the mother of Śrī Rāma, to the twelve-year yajña in the hermitage of Rṣyaśṛṅga before Lord Śrī Rāma renounces Sītā Maharani who is pregnant, so that no elders may be present to hinder renouncing of Sītā Mahārani. This event is not supported by any Purāṇa. This fancy can be held pardonable till here.

After about twelve years, on their return journey, they stop at the hermitage of Vālmīki.

Report of the renouncing of Sītā Mahārani spreads like lightning in all directions. Grieved at it, King Janaka, the father of Sītā Mahārani takes up the third asrama of Vānaprastha and goes for penance to the forest, hermitage of Candradvīpa. At the time when Holy Vasiṣṭha, along with Arundhatī and the Royal Mother Kauśalyā, reaches the hermitage of Vālmīki, King Janaka also comes there to meet his friend Vālmīki after interrupting his penances.
Sitā Mahārāni was pregnant and about to give birth before her renouncement. Readers may themselves consider how appropriate and justified is the dramatist’s innovation to send away the mother-in-law, Royal Mother Kauśalyā, to a far-off place leaving behind her daughter-in-law Sitā Mahārāni in such a state; then to keep Kauśalyā there for twelve years, to deprive her of the likely pleasure at the birth of grandsons, to make all of them reside for twelve years at the hermitage of Rṣyaśṛṅga even after the renouncing of Sitā Maharani by her husband had become known to all. It is not found possible even today in a society over-whelmed by modern civilization.

In such a situation of bereavement, the reception with beefy madhuparka by sage Vālmīki in his hermitage, Janaka refusing the beefy madhuparka and the great sage Vasiṣṭha accepting the beefy madhuparka,—can all these innovations in the plot be said to promote the sentiment of karunā or pathos, to further which this play has been written? If such are the imaginations of Bhavabhūti, then it hardly spells well of his genius; and if somebody has interpolated it later, then he has committed an unexcusable and heinous crime. It has also to be noted that when Lord Rāma arrives there, he has not been welcomed with madhuparka in compliance with the injunction of the scriptures.

Even today Western oriented people will not like intoxicants or meat in such an agonising situation; then readers may themselves judge how debased and vile is the conjuring up of getting beefy madhuparka accepted by Sage Vasiṣṭha at the sorrowful occasion of the sad renouncement of Sitā Mahārāni and when her father, King Janaka, is present in that very hermitage.

Once when a lion had attacked the Nandini cow of the great sage Vasiṣṭha, King Dilīpa, an ancestor of Śrī Rāma, was ready to offer his life to the lion to save that cow. It is an impossible fancy that the hereditary royal preceptor of such a dynasty as of the Raghus, the great Sage Vasiṣṭha, should accept beef and that too at a time of grief and sorrow.
Because the incident is imaginary, therefore getting beefy madhuparka served to sage Vasiṣṭha by sage Vālmīki and getting it accepted, is also imaginary and unreal. Therefore, it is proved that the incident of madhuparka with beef freshly obtained by slaying a cow, in the fourth act of the Uttara-Rāma-Carita is imaginary and false and it is not a historical truth.

The above incident is presented by two disciples of Vālmīki as a comic interlude. Readers may themselves judge as to what is the value as to the reality of a comic. Furthermore, it has already been discussed above that there is no possibility of meat in the ingredients of madhuparka or in the madhuparka rites.

Further Raja Rajendra Lala Mitra tries to prove beef in madhuparka from the Mahāvīra-Carita of Bhavabhūti. Let us now consider it too.

Bhavabhūti’s Mahāvīra-Carita is the anterior story of Lord Rāma. The sage Viśvāmitra took Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa for protecting his yajña. The plot of the play begins hereafter. It continues to the exile of Rāma, killing of Rāvana and other demons and coronation of Lord Rāma on his return to Ayodhya. This is the span of events covered in this play. The plot has not been based on the history available in the Purāṇas. Dramatists usually seem to follow an independent course in this direction. Thus no play can be accepted as history. In short, the plot of the play is:

“When Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa reach the hermitage of Sage Viśvāmitra for the protection on his yajña, at that very time, Kuśadhvaja, the brother of King Janaka, also reaches there along with Śtā and Urmilā, as a representative of King Janaka who had been invited. Seeing Rāma, he is so attracted towards him that he thinks that if there had not been the condition of breaking the bow, then Rāma and Śtā would have been married. There itself comes Sarvamāya, the royal chaplain of Rāvana, with the proposal of Śtā’s marriage to Rāvana. The proposal is evaded. In his
very presence, demoness Tārakā comes to disturb the yajña. Rāma kills her in everybody’s presence. Viśvāmitra blesses Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa with divine weapons. Viśvāmitra gets the bow of Śiva there itself by the virtue of his meditative powers and gets it broken by Rāma. Then and there Rāma and Śitā; Lakṣmaṇa and Urmilā; Bharata-Mañḍavi; and Śatrughna-Śrutakīrti are engaged. Thereafter Subāhu and Mārica come to create havoc but they are killed.

“The demon Sarvamāya takes all this information to Laṅkā. At the same time, Rāvaṇa gets a letter from Jāmadagnya Parasurāma that demons are creating havoc in Daṇḍakāranya and it should be stopped. As Rāma has broken the bow of Lord Śiva, the preceptor of Parasurāma, Rāvaṇa plans to incite Parasurāma to collide with Rāma and sends him to Janakapura where marriage preparations are being made. Parasurāma is surprised on seeing the handsome figure of Rāma, but feigns anger as before. King Janaka comes and says that if he has come as a guest then he should be served madhuparka, fit for a śrotriya and if he has come as an enemy then he should be faced. After some heroic utterances, Rāma goes inside for the marriage ceremony. Vasiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra try to pacify Parasurāma. Daśaratha gets ready to face Parasurāma, when his anger is not pacified. After the marriage-rites are over, Rāma comes there, defeats Parasurāma, who then goes away.

“Mantharā, the maid-servant of Kaikeyī comes to Rāma with a letter of Kaikeyī from Ayodhyā. In the letter, Kaikeyī reminds of two boons given to her, and in this context expresses her wish that Rāma should go in exile for fourteen years together with Lakṣmaṇa and Śitā and that Bharata should get the throne.

“Lord Rāma goes to his father Daśaratha and seeks permission to go in exile. From Janakapura itself Rāma, along with Śitā and Lakṣmaṇa, goes to the forest leaving behind all the relatives wailing, including Yudhājīt the brother of Kaikeyī. On the insistence of Bharata, Rāma leaves for him his golden sandals sent by Śarabhaṅga.
“Bharata, after establishing the sandals of Śrī Rāma at Nandigrāma, starts following the directions of Śrī Rāma. With Lakṣmana and Sitā, Rāma reaches Daṇḍakāraṇya, killing Vīraḍha and other demons, passing through Citrakūṭa and meeting sages on his way. Khara, Dūṣana, Triśira etc. 14000 demons are killed by him on the way. Jaṭāyu is wounded in an encounter with Rāvana while he is carrying away Sitā.

From the narration of Bharata’s going to Nandigrāma upto here is covered by an interlude.

“Rāma meets Jaṭāyu who informs him of the kidnapping of Sitā and passes away. Then comes Śramaṇā with a letter of Vibhiṣaṇa seeking refuge, and Vibhiṣaṇa surrenders himself for asylum. Afterwards takes place the meeting with Bali, who challenges to encounter, in which he is killed by Rāma, leaving his kingdom etc. to Sugrīva.

“Lanka is ablaze. Trijata informs Mālayavān about the death of Aksayakumāra. Kumbhakarṇa is awakened. Battle ensues. In the fight, Lakṣmana becomes unconscious. Lakṣmana regains consciousness by the herb Saṇjīvanī. Meghanāda, Kumbhakarṇa and others are killed. The fire-ordeal of Sitā takes place.

All this has been told in conversation in the form of an interlude.

“Lord Rāma, Sitā and Lakṣmana return to Ayodhyā by an aeroplane. All meet in re-union and Rāma is coronated King.”

We can imagine from the above plot as to how imaginary it is and how different from the historical facts in the Purāṇas.

On page 5 of his above quoted book ‘Beef in Ancient India’, Raja Rajendra Lala Mitra mentions beef in the Mahāvīra-carita:

“Vasiṣṭha, in his turn, likewise, slaughtered the ‘fattened-calf’ when entertaining Viśvāmitra, Janaka, Śatānanda, Jāmadagnya and other sages and friends, and in the Mahāvīra-carita, when pacifying Jāmadagnya, tempted him
by saying, “The heifer is ready for sacrifice, and the food is cooked in ghee. Thou art a learned man, come to the house of the learned; favour us (by joining in the entertainment).”

In support, the original stanza of the third act of the Mahāvīra-carita has been quoted there in a footnote:

संज्ञाप्यते वस्तरी सर्पिय्युथः पञच्यते ।
श्रोत्रियः श्रोत्रियैवङ्गनागतोसि जुपस्व नः ॥

It seems that संज्ञाप्यते वस्तरी has been taken here as ‘the heifer is ready for sacrifice’. Raja Rajendra Lala Mitra has said before that Vasiṣṭha slaughtered a fattened calf to entertain Viśvāmitra, Janaka, Śatānanda, Jāmadagnya, other sages and friends. In this stanza there is nowhere that a fattened calf was slaughtered, and in the Mahāvīra-carita there is no such indication anywhere before or after this stanza. It is not clear, wherefrom Raja Rajendra Lala Mitra has brought in the ‘slaughter of a fattened calf’. Later on he says ‘the heifer is ready for sacrifice i.e., slaughter’. These two statements in his text, that is (1) Vasiṣṭha slaughtered the fattened calf and (2) the heifer is ready for sacrifice, that is for slaughter, are contradictory. In this way such people try to confuse simple folk by making such absurd antithetical statements.

In the above context, Vasiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra try to pacify Paraśurāma, and in the original text their words are:

इष्टापूर्वविचः सपत्नशमनाद्रेयायामधोनः सखा
वेन झोरिव बविष्णु वस्तुवति बोरेण राजनवति ।
यस्यते वयम्यति किमपरं बंशश्च बंवस्वतः
सोयं ल्वां तनय्यियः परीतो रजा शमं याच्ये ॥
तद्वित्रम शुष्ककलहात्त इवं चास्यु ।

“The aged King Daśaratha, who has become a friend of Indra by performing yajñās, by constructing temples and by vanquishing enemies, who has become famous on earth as a good King like the divine King Indra in heaven, with whom
we are allied and who is a scion of the Soiar Race, moved by affection for his son, he requests you to be calm. So give up this futile quarrel.”

We have already discussed the stanza cited by Raja Rajendra Lala Mitra in support of his contention in a footnote of his book. Neither is there any mention in the Mahāvīra-carītha that Vasiṣṭha slaughtered a fattened calf for Viśvāmitra, Janaka, Śatānanda, Jāmadagnya, other sages and friends, nor is there any mention of the entertainment of them all by Vasiṣṭha.

How surprising and shocking it is that men like Raja Rajendra Lala Mitra who are considered well-read and learned, should lead astray their simple countrymen, who respect their learning, by such imagined contentions and by twisting them according to their fancy. Its reasons have been enunciated very clearly in the ‘Introduction.’ To this day his book is quoted with great pride by the Government of India to mislead the people that beef was taken in ancient India.

**MAHOKŚAM, MAHĀJAM AND VEHATICM IN THE RECEPTION TO A GUEST**

In his “History of Dharmāstra”, Vol. II, Part 2, page 750, lines 8-17, in the Chapter on Nṛyajñ, or Manuṣya-yajñ P. V. Kane writes:

“Yājñavalkya-Smṛti 1.109 also says that a big ox or a goat was to be kept apart for a guest learned in Veda. But the commentary Mitāksāra on Yājñavalkya-Smṛti and other medieval writers to whom flesh-eating was an anathema and an unspeakable sin for a Brahman remark that an ox or a goat was to be understood as set apart for the guest to flatter him (with the words ‘this ox is yours’) just as one says in humility ‘all this house is yours’ and that the ox or goat was not meant to be given in gift or to be killed since it would be impossible to find an ox each time a śrotriya guest comes.”
Is Beef Possible in Madhuparka?

Mahokṣam, Mahājam and Vehatam in the Reception to a Guest

The relevant stanza of the Yājñavalkya-Smṛti 1.109 occurs in the section on the duties of a householder within the chapter on conduct (ācāra). It runs as follows:

महोक्षं वा महाजं वा श्रोत्रियायोपक्लप्येत् ।
सत्क्षियाज्ञवासं स्वादु भोजनं सून्तं वचः ॥ (YājñavalkyaSmṛti 1.106)

It simply means:

“One should offer a big bull or a big goat before a guest who is versed in the Vedas (śrotriya). (Thereafter) one should welcome him (with pāḍya, arghya, ācamana, a seat etc.). (After he has taken his seat) one should sit down near him; give him delicious food and speak pleasant words.”

In the aforesaid stanza, the original Sanskrit word for offering a big bull or a big goat is upakaḷpayet, which is conjugated from the root klp (क्ल्प) with the prefix upa-.

The meaning of upa-klp (उप-क्ल्प) in Monier-Williams’ Sanskrit-English Dictionary, page 195, column 3 is:

to be fit for;
to serve as;
to become;
to equip;
to allot;
to turn towards;
to assume;
to be ready at hand;
to lead to;
to become;
to take the shape or form of;
to be;
to prepare;
to make ready;
to procure;
to bring near;
to fetch;
to assign;
to put or set up;
to impart;
to arrange;
to communicate;
to suppose,

In carries no nuisance of hīṃsā or killing. It is clear that it does not even imply the killing of these animals and setting the guest with their meat. A śrotriya, i.e. a guest versed in the Vedas, is entertained with madhuparka—thus it is specified in the succeeding stanza number 110. In this context, either in the preceding or succeeding stanzas, there is no mention of offering meat with madhuparka, and nowhere is there any reference to killing.

It proves that animal meat of any kind is not required in madhuparka.
The commentators opine that a big bull (*mahokṣa*) or a big goat (*mahāja*) is brought before a guest, which is just a part of etiquette wherein the host as a matter of courtesy says that this is your house; this thing is yours, etc., etc. In fact, they are not intended to be presented to the guest. New guests, learned in the Vedas, visited people now and then, and if a big bull or a big goat were presented to every one of them, where could one obtain so many big bulls or big goats. Nor, does the original stanza convey such an intention. But, it is simple enough to understand that one who has the means may present the things enjoined, and one who does not possess the means to do so, he need neither offer them nor give them away.

Now we come to words of politeness and courtesy. This is the practice to this very day. Whenever a guest comes, courteous sentences are spoken, such as 'this is your house, please make yourself free and comfortable; such and such a thing is yours, you may feel free to use anything you like' etc., etc.

Whether the offering of a big bull or a big goat is significant or not, will be considered further on.

The alleged offering of a big bull or a big goat to a guest also occurs in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, etc. It may also be taken up for discussion.

In the same section on *Nyaya* or *Manuṣya-yajña* of his "History of Dharmasastra", Vol. 2, Part 2, chapter 21, page 750, lines 4-6, P.V. Kane writes:

"The Śatapatha shows that an ox or a goat was cooked for a guest, either a King or a Brahman (III.4.1.2)."

Its original text is as follows:—

श्रव्य यत्सः वत्तिष्टिव्य नाम । प्रतिचिर्वा एषं एतसः गुण्ड्यति यात्सः
क्रोटसः एतसः राजः वा ब्राह्मणः वा महोकः वा महाजः वा
पवेलवहः मानवः हृदिवेनमेवमस्मा एतवतिव्यः करोति ॥

(शतपथब्राह्मण 3.4.1.2)
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Some people translate the verb *pacet* (पचेत्) in this passage as 'cooking on fire'. The common meaning of *pacet* is 'cooking on fire'. But what is the sense intended here has to be discussed.

According to Chapter 318 of the Śāntiparva of the Mahābhārata, Yājñavalkya obtained the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa from Śūrya. Through such a revelation he must have authored the Yājñavalkya-Smṛti. Thus there should be consonance in both the works in the matter of honouring a guest with a big bull or a big goat. Pandit Dinanath Sharma Shastri has discussed this question at length in the sixth volume of his Hindi book Śri-Sanātana-Dharmālok’ on pages 333-334 and pages 342-343.

It is translated below *in extenso*:

"The meaning of *pacet* in the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa is not ‘cooking’, but it is ‘presenting; offering’ (*vyaktikuryāt व्यक्तीकर्यात्*). Here the root is *paci vyaktikanepada* (पचि व्यक्तिकर्यात्रो) of the first conjugation, *set*, and *ātmanepada*. In the Bālamanorāma commentary (editions of Guruprasad Shastri and of the Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office) it is said:—*pacetyeke* (पचेतःैके) i.e., there is also the variant *pac* (पच) of the root *paci* (पचि). It signifies to present *vyaktikanepada*. This meaning proves the identical intention of the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa and the Yājñavalkya-Smṛti. Now the question arises that while the aforesaid root is *ātmanepada*, in the Satapatha it is not *ātmanepada*. In this context it should be noted that the *ātmanepada* is not obligatory by the rule *anudātte tvalakṣaṇam ātmanepadāṁ anityam* (ग्रन्थाते त्वलक्षणमात्मनेपदमनिष्ठय:). Hereby it is not *ātmanepada* in the Satapatha or it can also be an ārṣa or aberrational usage.

Our meaning is attested by other texts also.* In the mantra *uksāṇam pṛṣṇim apacanta* (उक्षाः पृशिः आपचन्तः) (Rgveda 1.164.43)

*This interpretation of the root *pac* (पच) is confirmed by the foot-note on page 128*
the root *pac* has been commented upon by Śaṅkara as

उक्षाएँ फलस्य सेर्वां सोमसुः ऋतुवशः प्रचन्त... प्रचन्त्वर्धिकशान्तितस्तः तिष्ठपतिः करोत्यर्थः। ।
स च क्रियासामान्यवचनः। ग्रात्री प्रभित्याः सम्पादितवल्लः इत्यर्थः।

Here the root *pac* signifies 'to effect; to accomplish'. Similarly, in Diś-nāga's drama 'Kundamālā' too:

इश्वाकुष्ठानं च सर्वां क्रियाः पुरस्वानिदिकः। ग्रात्रीमित्रेभ पच्यन्ते (१.२१)

the root *pac* means 'to effect'. Likewise, in the famous Purānic hymn *Deva-stotra* there is the sentence:

नभो मत्याकृः मिनानास्वसंहुऽऽ...भाविक्रियापाककरे...भवह्रः

where *pāka-kartre* means 'one who effects or accomplishes'. So in the passage in Yājñavalkya's Śatapatha also the meaning of the

Mādhavīya-dhātu-vr̥ti of Śaṅkara (Pracyabharati Prakashan, Varanasi, 1964, root no, 107 of the *bhūdi-gaṇa* (स्वाहिक) 1.86-87 *pac* vyaktykarne (पचि व्यक्तीकरणो)) At the end it is stated:

पचि इति कुऽः तथा वर्धिनानिदिकः यदाहृः। ग्रात्रीधिकोऽण चाधिदिसूतः इति। सम्बताय तु वर्धिनानिदिकः इत्यतः।

संबताय तु वर्धिनानिदिकः इत्यतः।

‘तिष्ठो गोत्रिदेशः’ इत्यतः पचि व्यक्तीकरणः। इति पचि व्यक्तिकरणः।

‘Durga has accepted the identity of पचि व्यक्तीकरणोऽण and पचि व्यक्तीकरणोऽण’. Vardhamāna also follows the same interpretation. The book *Sammatā* also expresses the same opinion as Vardhamāna and adds that some others read it as *pacī*. The author of the *Nyāsa* commentary admits the root *paca* vyaktika (पचि व्यक्तीकरणोऽण) according to the Pānini an sūtra 8.1.27 *tino gotrādini* (तिष्ठो गोत्रिदेशः) and considers it *Parasmaipada*. In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa also it is *Parasmaipada* and so the meaning 'to make evident' (व्यक्तीकरणोऽण) suits the context.”
pac is ‘to effect; to accomplish’ etc. and not ‘to cook’. This very meaning is intended by Yaśñavalkya, as it has been expressed by him in his Yaśñavalkya-smṛti.

**

Or, ukṣā also means Soma, for example सोम उक्षासमवत् (Sāyana’s commentary on Rgveda 1.164.43). Its accomplishment is intended here, and it is relevant too. In fact the source of Brāhmaṇic महोक्ष पत्तेत् appears to be the Rgveda mantra उक्षां पुष्किनमचतत् (Rgveda 1.164.43). Here Sāyana has translated it as the preparation of Soma. So it appears to be appropriate in the Brāhmaṇa too i.e. to prepare Soma for the guest. Or ukṣā is also the tuberous plant ṛṣabha. The names of this plant are all synonyms of ṛṣabhya or bull. Because of its succulence, the plant ukṣa is one of the medicinals for long life (Rāja-nighañu, varga 5). There the following synonyms are given for it: ṛṣabhya; ukṣa; gauḥ; ṛṣabhya. Aja also means ajamodā or common carroway. Mahāja means the big carroway. It is probable that these medicinals were offered to a guest after food, as a digestive or invigorating tonic. Or, there’s the sentence अजा ब्रह्मस्ताव्त् सत्तवानिका: in the third story of the Kākolukiya section of the Pañcatantra, and the stanza:

ब्रोज्येर्रेञ्जु यष्टव्यामिति वें चेविकी श्रृतिः।
प्रजासंज्ञानि ब्रीजानि नो च्छायं हनुतमहं॥

(मा भावा शान्तिपर्वं ३३७.४)

In the Mahābhārata (Sāntiparva 337.4), the word aja is clearly stated to mean ‘seven-year old rice’.

The cooking of such rice, or of the ṛṣabhya tuber, or of Soma-juice, might have been intended here.

If we do not accept the aforesaid meanings and insist it to mean that a great bull (mahokṣa) or great goat (mahāja) were slaughtered and their meat was cooked on fire, then it would be
against Vedic principles and thus it will be without sanction and invalid.

The Vasiṣṭha-dharma-sūtra 4.8 also refers to the reception of a guest by a mahokṣa or a mahāja. अयापि ब्राहुणाय वा राजन्याय बायागताय महोक्साय वा महाजाय वा पचेरवस्मा प्रानित्यं कुर्वंतीति। After the foregone discussion, it is not necessary to discuss it over again. Some maintain that the preceding stanzas refer to meat in madhparka and to killing in yajña, but we have discussed it at length under the caption of ‘Vasiṣṭha-dharma-sūtra and Śāṅkhāyana-ghṛhya-sūtra’ in this chapter.

In his ‘History of Dharmaśāstra’, Vol. 2, Part 1, in the section on Madhuparka in Chapter 10, page 542; lines 6-10, P.V. Kane writes:

“It appears that the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa III.4, when it says that ‘if the ruler of men comes as a guest or anyone else deserving of honour comes, people kill a bull or a cow (that has contacted a habit of abortion)’ refers to madhparka, though that word is not actually used.”

The original text of this sentence of Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa III.9 is quoted there in a footnote:

तद्यथावादो मनुश्वराज प्रागतेन्यायस्मिन्वाहृति उक्षाणं वा वेहृतं वा शक्तिते।

It is further stated that this is cited by Medhatithi on Manu-Śṛṣṭi 3.119 and by Haradatta on Gautama-dharma-sūtra 17.30.

In Vol. II, Part 2, in the Section on Nyāya or Manuṣya-yajña in Chapter 21, page 750, lines 6-8 of the same work, P.V. Kane writes:

“Vide also Aitareya Brāhmaṇa III.4, for the offering of an ox of a barren cow to king or another deserving person coming as a guest.”
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We have already discussed Manu-Smṛti 3.119 under caption `Manusmṛti`. It is clear beyond doubt that there is no reference to meat therein, and the question of beef does not arise at all.

In the Gautama-dharma-sūtra 2.8 prohibited foods are listed. The 30th sūtra reads वेन्नवनुहोऽ च, which simply means that the cow (dhenu) and the bullock (anaḍuh) are also among prohibited items and should not be eaten. This does not prove the presence of meat or beef in madhuparka.

The citation of Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa III.4 in a footnote by P. V. Kane is the 15th pada and the whole reads:

श्रविल मन्यन्ति सोमे राजस्याणां तद्यथेवासो मन्तुष्यिर राज श्रापतेन्य- ब्राह्मणो हेस्युक्राणो वा वेलस्व वा अहल्या एवेनास्यं एतास्वर्तं

यदविन मद्युष्यान्त्रिके तेवान्त्य पञुः।

Earlier, it has been established that the word pacet (पचैत) occurring in a similar context in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa corresponds to upakalpayet in the Yājñavalkya-smṛti. Now we have to consider if kṣadante occurring in this context of the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa also corresponds to it. In his Hindi book, ‘Śrī- Sanātana-Dharmāloka’, Vol. 6, pages 360-374, Pandit Dinanath Sharma Shastri has discussed it at length. Hereunder are a few quotations:

"Now we have to consider the root kṣad. The cited Brāhmaṇa passage means: "If a king or a celebrated śrottriya comes, then the kṣadana of a bull or cow should be effected in his honour." The root kṣad does not occur in Pāṇini's Dhātupāṭha. So we cannot know its meaning therefrom. But we find it in the Uṇādi (Pañcapadi) sūtra, trn-ṭrcau śamsi-kṣad-ādibhyah samjñāyāṁ cânīṭau.

(तृण-त्त्रोक वचन-शब्दविश्लेषः संज्ञायो चानितो) (2.94; 251).

So it is clearly a root derived from the sūtras. But its meaning is not clear even from the sūtras." (page 362)
“In the Nighantu 2.8 where roots signifying ‘to eat’ are listed, there is no mention of kṣad—this fact should be noted. In 2.19, which is a list of roots meaning ‘to kill’, the root kṣad is not mentioned—it should also be noted.” (page 363)

“Now we should look into the usage of the root kṣad in the mantras of the Rgveda Samhitā and also consult the commentary of Sāyaṇa on the relevant passages. We should explore the meaning assigned to it by ancient scholars.” (page 363)

“The following passage of the Mahābhāṣya 1.3.1 is well known:

श्रेणेकार्या ग्रन्थि धात्वभवति । तद्र यथा—वपि: प्रकिरशे (वीर्यापाने) हस्तः; हेत्ते चापि वर्तते । …… करोतिहल्लुत-प्राचुर्वचे हस्त्वै निर्मलीकरणे चापि वर्तते, निक्षेपसे चापि वर्तते । एवंविहारे तिर्थितिरेश व्रजिक्रियामाह, तिर्थितिरेश व्रजिक्रियाया निद्रूतितम ।

So it is possible that a single root can have two opposite meanings, e.g., the root sthā means ‘to stay’ and ‘to move’. Then, if for contextual propriety we take an unspecified meaning of a root, then it will not be against grammatical considerations.” (pages 363-364)

“Thus, bhakṣaṇa (consuming) also means ‘to make use of’, ‘to employ’, or ‘to accept’.” (page 364)

“In Rgveda 1.25.18 Ācārya Sāyaṇa has written: हृवि क्षबते—प्रक्षासिः where, after having translated kṣadase as ‘you eat’, he goes on to take asana to mean ‘to accept’ हृवि—स्वीकारतः उखमयः । If the root kṣad means ‘to eat’, does this meaning apply to the Rgvedic Brāhmaṇa passage उष्णां वेहत वा क्षवते । Then it will mean: ‘They eat a bull or a vehata on the arrival of a king or a śrotriya’. But is this meaning applicable here? If we translate it this way, then it will refer not to its partaking by the guest but the eating of the vehata by the host himself. Haridatta has prohibited its eating
by anyone other than the guest. If we take *kṣad* in the meaning ‘to accept’, then it will mean ‘they accept the cow or the bull’, i.e. ‘they bring them for the guest’—this is a relevant meaning. (pages 364-365)

“In the Uṇādi, where a Rgvedic Brāhmaṇa passage is cited to illustrate the usage of the root *kṣad*, there *kṣadanta* means neither ‘to hack to pieces’ nor ‘to eat’. The meaning ‘to hack to pieces’ would be most inappropriate.” (page 365)

“Himśā also refers to ‘goading’ (ताइन). In the Nirukta 1.3.2 *hasta* has been explained as हते : प्रायुःन्ते. Here the meaning of *han* is ‘to goad’ and not to kill or deprive of life. *Kṣattā* in the sense of ‘a charioteer’ (Atharva-veda 5.7.14; 9.11.1) also refers to the goading of the chariot’s horse, and not to its killing. While bringing a cow or bull to a guest, it had to be goaded and this was its himśā.” (Page 366)

“When the root *kṣad* can have a third meaning besides ‘to hack to pieces’, ‘to eat’ as pointed out above, then this sūtra-occurring root can have other meanings too. Views of other learned people should also be taken into consideration in this context.” (Page 366)

“While explaining the word *kṣadma* Skandaswāmi writes: ‘‘शव स्वरेः (सौ)’’. The same view is held by Devarāja-yajvā on Nirukta 1.12 3: स्वकायं र्वयं भवति, बलात्यं व्याय्य र्वयंमवतीति वा. Thus the passage can mean—‘When the guest comes, he should steady the cow or the bull’; this meaning is also relevant here. The author of the Subodhīnī derives *kṣadma* meaning ‘water’ from the root शव गति व्हिन्सति:. In शवति—हिन्सति विपायसामुयतां वा शमनीपति वा पुरुषस्, the root signifies ‘going’, as the killing of the un-killable cow (*aghnyā*) was not possible. *Kṣadanti* can mean रतिविपायव यथा गनयन्ति, i.e. ‘they take the cow near the guest’—a meaning which is also relevant here. One who is dearly loved is never killed, and he certainly is brought near,” (Page 367)
"While explaining the word ksattā in his Sudhā-Vyākhyā on the Amarakośa, Bhānuji-Dikṣita, the son of Bhattōji-Dikṣita, writes: क्षत्रि संबरसे सोच्यः (2.8.59). Here the root ksad has been rendered as 'closing'—saṅvarana. He accepts the same meaning in the word ksatriyāh (2.8.1). Swami Dayananda has also accepted the same meaning in his Uṇādi-kośa." (pages 367-368)

"Bhānuji-Dikṣita has explained ksattā in Amarakośa 2.10.3 as अस्वत, क्षत्रि वा, क्षत्रि तमस्तौ. Here the meaning of the root ksad is indicated as 'bringing up'. As the killing of the unkillable cow (aghnyā) and of the unkillable bull (aghnya) is impossible, the cow and bull were brought up for being donated to a guest—this can also be relevant. In the Brāhmaṇa sentence, the locative case can be considered to be used in the meaning of 'by reason of', 'for'. (page 368)

"The foregoing investigations prove that the root ksad has many meanings; and it does not mean only 'to kill' or 'to eat'. A meaning that is appropriate to the context and one which does not go against the accepted principles, that meaning alone is correct in that context, and not any other meaning. गङ्गायां ग्रोष्या is a case of transferred meaning, then in गङ्गायां महिषास्तरति, it would not be correct to take it in a transferred sense as in the previous case, though there is no technical impropriety. In the Kusumāṇjali 3.12, Udayana Ācārya holds the same view:

श्रुतान्त्यायां श्रुतान्तां क वाक्यं हृत्यवृद्धिः।
पदार्थवृक्षण-वैधुपीयस्तं तवाधिकते साहसितः।। (कुमुमाण्डली 3.92)

i.e., in the case of a logical connection no other signification is required; in the event of an incongruity another meaning appropriate to the context has to be sought. Hence, when the incongruity of killing an aghnya or one who is not to be killed arises, we have to seek a meaning that suits the context."

(pages 368-369)

The readers should consider another piece of evidence from the Vedas and Śāyana's commentary thereon, which clearly fortifies
our interpretation. In the Rgveda 6.13.2 शत्ता वासस्य देव! भूरे, kṣātā is a derivative of the root kṣad. Sāyana comments:

कृतस्य उदकस्य यजस्य वा शत्ता—क्षदतिर्ग्रावदानकर्मी, दाता भवसि।

Here Sāyana has clearly stated that the root kṣad means ‘to give’. It merits consideration as to why Sāyana has translated the root kṣad as ‘to give’ against his own statement that kṣad is primarily used in the sense of ‘killing’. It is clear that here ‘killing’ is not pertinent, hence the meaning ‘giving away’. If it is so, then in the passage of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa too, the ‘giving of a cow or of a bull (aghnya—not to be killed) is intended. It is but natural, as the killing of one who is not to be killed is a contradiction. On setting out for a journey, the meaning of saṁdāvam ānaya as ‘bring salt’ would be unwise; ‘bring a horse’ alone would be the relevant meaning.

Hence, in the sentence उक्तार्य बेहत वा क्षदते of the Rgvedic Brāhmaṇa, the meaning ‘he gives a bull or a cow’ alone is proved and pertinent. Thus its identity with the महौक्ष वा महाज्ञ वा शोतिर्यावोपकल्पयेत of the Yājñavalkya-smṛti (1.5.199) is established. Upakaśpāna also means ‘donating’.

The Mitakṣarā realised the impossibility of such a big donation, and hence it interpreted it as a polite offer by words alone, in honour of the guest. It is indeed impossible to donate bulls every time. How can a person have so many of them? But here an ordinary cow and an ordinary bull are enjoined—hence there is no incongruity even in donating.

The meaning of vehata as a miscarrying cow is not appropriate here, because such cows cannot always be obtained.”

(pages 369-370)

“In this way, by these authoritative proofs it has been settled that in महौक्ष पचेनत, it means ‘he should present’ and in उक्तार्य क्षदते it means ‘he should donate’. Here the root kṣad means ‘to donate’,
When the root *ksad* in the sense of ‘to donate’ is attested by the Vedas, Sāyana also corroborates it, and all the scriptures from the Vedas downwards are replete with the glorious praises of ‘donating a cow’, then this meaning alone is correct from all points of view; it alone is appropriate.” (pages 370-371)

“Scholars mis-understood the root *ksad* as ‘to kill’, ‘to eat’ because they did not find it in the Dhātupāṭha where the meaning of roots are given. Instead, they came across *khad* (क्वद ग्वतेयं हिसायं च, चाकू मक्कले) and they imposed the meanings of *khad* on the root *ksad*. Whatever be the meaning of the root *khad* of the Dhātupāṭha, it does not follow that the *sautra* root with *ks* means the same. When the root *ksad* is attested in the meaning ‘to donate’, and this meaning is also appropriate; when the eating or killing of a cow and bull is prohibited and censured in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa; when Vedas and other scriptures are full of the glories of donating a cow; when Sage Yājñavalkya of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa and the Yājñavalkya-smṛti desires the donation or presenting of a cow or bull in *madhuparka*; when in the Brhadāraṇyaka which is the 14th book (*kānda*) of the Śatapatha, Yājñavalkya clearly wants to perpetuate the cows, गोकामात्र एवं वयं स्मः (14.6.1.4; 11.6.3.2), then the unanimity of all these authorities proves that in the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa passage too *ksadana* means ‘the donation’ of a cow or a bull.” (pages 371-372)

In the reception to a guest, after the offering of *pādya*, *arghya* etc., several Grhya-sūtras and Dharma-sūtras prescribe the *madhuparka* and alongwith it the giving of a cow is also enjoined. The offering of a big bull or a big goat occurs only in the Yājñavalkya-smṛti and Vasiṣṭha-dharma-sūtra, but there is no reference to a miscarrying cow (*vehata*). Its relevance is not clear. In the Śatapatha and Aitareya Brāhmaṇas, there is no imperative injunction, but there it is stated as an illustration that as on the arrival of a human king or of a learned Brahmana, one would महोप सा महाजान वा पुस्तु (Śatapatha), or उपास्य वा बेहतर वा शदन्ते (Aitareya), likewise one should duly offer all the courtesies to King Soma who has
arrived as a guest. It means that the followers of Yājñavalkya used to present a mahokṣa or a mahāja in the reception to a guest along with pāḍya, arghya, madhuparka, etc. If this is correct, then the intention of the Śatapatha and Aitareya Brāhmaṇas regarding the mahokṣa or mahāja is probably the same as that of Yājñavalkya-smṛti or of the Vasiṣṭha-dharma-sūtra; for such a reference has not been found in any other book. Then how can it be that the word pacet in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa and kṣadante in the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa carry the sense of killing (ḥiṁsā) when the meaning of Yājñavalkya-smṛti is clearly of non-killing? Hence those who impart the sense of killing to pacet or kṣadante, they do so without considering the context, which is altogether inappropriate.

Another point also deserves consideration. Ukṣā is a bull for breeding. High pedigree stud bulls are very few in number. Everyone does not own such a bull. One stud bull suffices for a village. If a śrotiṣya guest does not own several cows, the presentation of a stud bull will be of no use to him, and the host giver will render great disservice to the community of cows. Thus, bringing a big stud-bull for presentation to a guest in his reception, does not make sense, and much less so killing it. Bringing a stud-bull to receive a king also makes no sense, because the king normally owns several cows along with proportionate number of bulls in a royal cow-stall.

If we try to translate ukṣā as a draught bull, then such a meaning is not attested by usage. The word for a draught bull is anāduḥ. Secondly, if one does not present so many and such heavy things to a guest as to require a bull to carry them, then one cannot understand the propriety of such a presentation. If the bull presented is intended for agricultural purposes, it may be appropriate for a śrotiṣya, but not for a king.

The presentation of a big goat can be only for carrying burden, but that too does not seem to be proper.
It is likely that महोक्ति वा महाजं वा has a spiritual signification, which has not been elucidated so far. Scholars should investigate it.

It is certain that the महोक्ति वा महाजं वा are not intended to be slaughtered. Those who try to force such a meaning, they are in the wrong.

MEANING OF GOGHNO'TITHIH

Raja Rajendra Lala Mitra quotes Colebrooke in his aforesaid book ‘Beef in Ancient India’, page 5, lines 20–24:

“Colebrooke noticed the subject in his essay on ‘the religious ceremonies of the Hindus’, in which he says, “it seems to have been ancienly the custom to slay a cow on this occasion (the reception of a guest), and a guest was therefore called GOGHNA or cow-killer.”

Goghnaḥ (गोघनः) has been explained as गोघनस्य तत्समे गोघन:। There is no scope for difference of opinion in this etymology. There certainly is difference in the interpretation of हन्यते. Those, who propagate beef-eating, find it handy and interpret goghnaḥ (गोघनः) as ‘the killer of a cow’, inspite of the fact that they are aware of the multiple meanings of the root han:

हन—हिसागत्योः। गतेस्त्रयोऽयोः—ज्ञानं, गमनं, प्राप्तिस्वचिति।

Besides the meaning ‘to kill’, the root हन in हन्यते also means ‘to multiply; to go; to move; to obtain; to attain; to get; to touch; to come into contact; etc. (see the Sanskrit-English dictionaries of Monier-Williams and V. S. Apte). But they do not want to take these meanings into account because by them their main purpose of the propagation of beef-eating is not served. According to the previous discussions, when any possibility of beef or any other kind of meat cannot be proved in the madhuparka rites to entertain a
guest, but what can be proved is the gifting of a cow, then it is clear that the meanings of goghnaḥ (गोधनः) can only be—one who 'touches' the cow for accepting her in gift and by drinking her milk; or one who 'multiplies' the number of his cows by taking the cow in gift, etc.

According to the Dhātupātha (दातुपाठ) of Ācārya Pāṇini which reads हन हिल्लागस्यो: the meanings of the root han (हन्) are himśā (violence) and gati (movement). Gati (गति) has three meanings: (i) jñāna (learning); (ii) gamana (going or moving); and (iii) prāpi (obtaining, attaining, getting). The meaning of हन्यते in गोष्ठ्यते तस्म गोधनः is गोष्ठ्यते, प्राप्यते i.e. 'attained, obtained',

Scriptural proof has been adduced under the heading ‘Gift of a Cow in Madhuparka’, which makes it clear that there can be no other meaning of goghnaḥ (गोधनः) except ‘one who gets a cow in gift’, or ‘one who takes a cow with him after obtaining her in gift’.

Pāṇini’s sūtra दातागोधनं सम्प्रवाने 3.4.73 also makes it clear that the words बाण and गोधन are formed irregularly in the sense of the dative (सम्प्रवाने). If the dative case (चतुर्थि) alone had been intended here, i.e. if the aim had been to convey that the cow was killed for a guest, then the word सम्प्रवाने would not have been used, but तस्मां would have been employed instead, i.e. an indeclinable (प्रत्वत्व) indicative of the dative case would have been used. But, as it is phrased सम्प्रवाने, the only sense expressed here is that of gifting. Therefore, the correct and genuine signification of गोधनोतिवि: is ‘a person to whom a cow is gifted’.

The word हस्तन्ध्न occurs in the mantra beginning बहिरः नोयः: in the Rgveda and Yajurveda. Its meaning has been given in Monier-Williams’ Sanskrit-English Dictionary on page 1295, column 1, as follows:
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हस्तध्वनि—a kind of hand-guard (protecting the hand in archery RV.)

When the word (हस्तध्वनि) hastaghna can mean ‘a kind of hand-guard’ then why can the meaning of गोपनोतिथिणि: not be ‘a guest who protects a cow’?

THE MEANING OF ATITHINIR-GĀH (अतिथिनीर्गाह:) AND ATITHIGVA (अतिथिगव)

Under the sub-heading ‘Food and Drink’ in Chapter 19 ‘Social and Economic Conditions’ of ‘The History and Culture of the Indian People’, Vol. I, The Vedic Age, page 393, lines 20-22, Dr, V.M. Apte mentions the expression अतिथिनीर्गाह: (अतिथिनी: + गार:) and asserts that its only meaning is that the cow was slaughtered for a guest. In support he cites Rgveda 10.68.3.

Macdonell and Keith also write under the entry māmsa in the Vedic Index, part II, page 145:


Prof. Bloomfield has also written on the problem in the Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 16 (1896), page cxxiv line 12 to page cxxv line 6, in the proceedings of the American Oriental Society’s meeting in New York N.Y. on March 29th, 30th and 31st, 1894, Item No. 17 “On the group of Vedic Words ending in gva and gvin”:

“The proper name Atithigva has so far as is known, never been translated. Grassmann’s gwa ‘going’ does not yield appreciable sense.

If we analyze structurally atithi-gv-a ‘he who has or offers a cow for the guest’, ‘he who is hospitable’, we have a normal
compound, normal sense, and a valuable glimpse of Vedic house-practices, known hitherto only in the Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras. At the arghya ceremony, which is performed on the arrival of an honoured guest, the ‘preparation’ of a cow is the central feature. The technical expression is gām kurute: see CGS. ii.15.1; AGS. i.24.30.31; PGS. i.3.26.30; Gobh. iv.10.1; ApGS. 13.15; HGS. i.13.10; ApDhs. ii.4.8.5. In TS. vi.1.10.1 the ceremony goes by the name go-argha. There is no reason why this simple and natural practice should not be reflected by the hymns, and it comports with the character of Atithigva as a generous giver: cf. vi.47.22; x.48.8; i.130.7; also similar statements in reference to descendants of Atithigva in viii.68.16.17. The adjective atithin is a hapax legamenon in RV. x.68.3; it occurs in the expression atithinir gāh; and, whatever it may mean, it suggests forcibly the proper name in question. The rendering of atithin by ‘wandering’, as given by the Petersburg lexicons and Grassmann, is based upon the supposed etymology (root at ‘wander’), and reflects the vagueness usual with such interpretations. Ludwig’s translation (972) ‘wie gaste kommend’ is a compromise between the etymology and the ordinary meaning of atithi. The passage in question reads: ‘Bṛhaspati has divided out like barley from bushels the (rain-)cows propitious to the pious, fit for guests (atithin), strong, desirable, beautiful in colour, faultless in form, after having conquered them from the clouds.’ The proper name atithi-gv-a means therefore precisely one who has atithinir gāh.”

Prof. Bloomfield gives the technical term गातुः कुस्ते for the ‘preparation of a cow’ in the arghya rites; and in support thereof he has cited a number of sūtra texts. The expression गातुः कुस्ते is not found in those sūtra texts. It is just possible that the references of Gṛhya-sūtras through oversight are not correctly recorded and/or printed or the wordings in place of गातुः कुस्ते may slightly differ in the original texts; for example: Āsvalāyana-ṛghya-sūtra 1.24.23 reads प्राचासोककाय गातुः बेरवते, Gobhila-ṛghya-sūtra reads मुक्तो गातुः वेदानासान्त्रिकभि मेदिमेदिहि (4.10.19) and कुस्तेरण्यवयनमृ (4.10.22);
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Ápastambîya-Dharma-sûtra 2.4.8.5 reads गोमछुपकर्त्तृ के वेदाध्याय: But a number of sûtra texts from among them have been interpreted as putting forth madhuparka with meat. These passages have already been discussed under the headings ‘Paraskara-grhya-sûtra’ and Ásvalâyana-grhya-sûtra’.

Prof. Bloomfield has taken Atithigva प्रतिनिधियम as the proper name of a person who is described as a noble generous giver, and he has cited Rgveda 6.47.22 (6.4.4.22), 10.48.8 (10.4.6.8) and 1.130.7 (1.19.4.7) in support. In the English translations of these mantras Griffith and Wilson have also taken it as the name of a person and not as ‘cow-slaughterer’. Their English translations are as quoted below:

RV. 6.47.22 (6.4.4.20)

Griffith: Out of the bounty, Indra, hath Prastoka bestowed ten coffers and ten mettled horses. We have received in turn from Divodâsa Sambara’s wealth, the gift of Atithigva.

Wilson: Prastoka has given to thy worshipper, Indra, ten purses of gold, and ten horses, and we have accepted this treasure from Divodâsa, the spoil won by Atithigvan from Shambara.

RV. 10.48.8 (10.4.6.8)

Griffith: Against the Guňgus I made Atithigva strong, and kept him mid the folk like Vṛtra-conquering strength; when I won glory in the great foeslaying fight, in battle where Karaňja fell, and Parnaya.

Wilson: I prepared Atithigva for (the protection of) the Guňgus, I upheld him, the destroyer of enemies, as sustance amongst the people; when I gained renown in the great Vṛtra-battle, in which Parnaya and Karaňja were slain.
RV. 1.130.7 (1.19.4.7)

Griffith : For Puru thou hast shattered, Indra, ninety forts, for Divodāsa thy boon servant with thy bolt, O Dancer, for thy worshipper.

For Atithigva he, the Strong, brought Śambara from the mountain down,

Distributing the mighty treasure with his strength, parting all treasures with his strength.

Wilson : For Puru, the giver of offerings, for the mighty Divodāsa; thou, Indra the dancer (with delight in battle), hast destroyed ninety cities, dancer (in battle), thou hast destroyed them with (thy thunderbolt) for (the sake of) the giver of offerings. For (the sake of) Atithigva, the fierce (Indra) hurled Śambara from off the mountain bestowing (upon the prince) immense treasure, (acquired) by (his) prowess; all kinds of wealth (acquired) by (his) prowess.

The meaning of the word atithigva (अतिथिग्व) has been given in Monier-Williams' Sanskrit-English Dictionary as under:

‘To whom guests should go’

Besides this, no other meaning has been given. There is not even the slightest inkling of cow-slaughter in this meaning. Therefore, the noun atithigva (अतिथिग्व) can never imply ‘to slaughter a cow for a guest’; or ‘a guest who gets a cow slaughtered’.

Shri Kanahayyalal Maniklal Munshi, Chairman of Bharatiya Vidya Bhawan, Bombay, in his Hindi novel ‘Lopāmudrā’, page 34, lines 16-17 has indicated Atithi₂ga as a particular person and has interpreted this word as ‘one who serves beef to a guest’, while Prof. Bloomfield, after analysing this word structurally atithi-gv-a has interpreted it as ‘he who has or offers a cow for the guest’ or ‘he who is hospitable’ and Monier-Williams has
interpreted it in his Dictionary as ‘to whom guest should go’. Shri K. M. Munshi in interpreting it as ‘one who serves beef to a guest’ has given neither any etymology nor other testimony nor has Atithigya been shown in the story as actually serving beef to a guest. When a person of the standing of Shri K. M. Munshi propagates in this manner, then there is no wonder if ordinary public is misled.

Those who insist to find cow-slaughter in *atithigya* (नतिबिष्य) and *atithinir gāḥ* (नतिबिष्यी) are clearly prejudiced. The basis of their prejudice is the predilection of Western scholars like Keith, Macdonell and others who are insistent in their efforts to prove that the Aryans were uncivilized.

The expression *atithinir gāḥ* — नतिबिष्यी occurs in Rgveda 10.68.3 whose meaning has been clarified by Bloomfield in the Journal of the American Oriental Society. The original mantra reads:

साधवर्या नतिबिष्यीरिविराः स्पाहिः सुवर्णा अनवद्धाहः
ब्रह्मपति: पवंतेयों विदुर्याः निर्गा ऊपे यवमिव स्थिविस्य:।

श्रीरवेद १०.६८.३)

After resolution of the *sandhis* this will read as follows:

8 9 10 11 12 13
साधवर्या, नतिबिष्यी, इविराः, स्पाहिः, सुवर्णा, अनवद्धाहः,
1 15 14 2 7 3 5
ब्रह्मपति: पवंतेय: विदुर्य: निर्, गा: ऊपे, यवम:,
4 6
इव, स्थिविस्य:।

The literal meaning of this as given by Prof. Bloomfield in the Journal of the American Oriental Society is as follows:

(1. ब्रह्मपति:) Bṛhaspati (2. निर्, 3. ऊपे) has divided out (4. इव) like (5. यवम:) barley (6. स्थिविस्य:) from the bushels (7. गा:) the (rain- cows) (8. साधवर्या) (which are) propitious to the pious, (9. नतिबिष्यी:) fit for the guest, (10. इविरा:) strong, (11. स्पाहिः) desirable, (12. सुवर्ण:;) beautiful in colours, (13. अनवद्धाहः) faultless in form (14. विदुर्य:) after having conquered them (15. पवंतेय:) from the clouds.
H. H. Wilson has translated it as under:

"Bṛhaspati brings unto (the gods), after extricating them from the mountains, the cows that are the yielders of pure (milk), ever in motion, the objects of search and of desire, well-coloured and of unexceptional form, (as men bring) barley from the granaries." (RV. x.5.8.3)

And Ralph T.H. Griffith has translated it as follows:

"Bṛhaspati, having won them from the mountains, strewn down, like barley out of winnowing-baskets, the vigorous wandering cows who aid the pious, desired of all, of blameless form, well-coloured."

In both these English translations of the Rgveda mantra, nowhere is there any indication that the words atithinī and gah suggest the meaning of ‘a guest who causes the slaughter of a cow’. Bloomfield’s interpretation of the words atithīgva and atithīṅgāh in the Journal of the American Oriental Society also does not indicate even a remote hint of cow-slaughter and to the contrary he has taken them as proper names.

The word atithinī (प्रतिविनी) can be formed only by adding the possessive suffix-inī. Meanings with the possessive suffix can be ‘with a guest’; ‘one whose the guests are’; ‘one for whom the guests come’; ‘one who is useful to guests’ etc. and the cow can be useful to the guests only by her milk, curd, ghee etc. If one contends that she can also be useful by her beef, then she will be useful only once for a guest and it will become impossible, for a man of common status to slaughter a new cow every time he receives a guest. Reception of guests is as important to a common man as it is to an affluent person.

Taking into account all these considerations, atithīṅgāh will mean ‘cows fit for guests, i.e. for serving them with milk, yoghurt, ghee, etc.’, and atithīgva will mean ‘the person to whom a guest should go’, i.e., a host whose hospitality with milk products a guest should accept.
CULINARY IMPOSSIBILITY OF MIXING MEAT WITH MADHUPARKA

Late Pt. Shripād Damodar Sātavalekar has written in the section on Madhuparka, in his ‘Go-Jñana-Kośa’, Ancient Period Vedic Section, Part 1, which is translated below:—

“We do not know it fully as none in our family has ever tasted meat, as we have been strict vegetarians. Even then we have enquired from our non-vegetarian friends who have informed us that no preparation of meat is prepared with honey or candy-sugar. Whateover preparations of meat are, they are all salted and spiced. If this is true, then how can madhuparka be prepared with meat? Because it is madhuparka, i.e., it is a sweet preparation mixed (पकः) with honey (मधु). Nothing is prepared from meat by mixing it with honey or candy-sugar, but meat is always mixed with salt and spices.”

To verify its truth, we wrote and enquired from the Institute of Hotel Management, Catering and Nutrition; and a number of hoteliers. Their replies are reproduced hereunder:

Institute of Hotel Management, Catering and Nutrition, Pusa, New Delhi-12 writes in its letter No. ICT/PA/2/69/192, dated 29-1-69:

“No popular or famous dishes have been prepared so far out of meat and sugar in classical French, Indian or English cookery. Of course, this does not mean that the sweet meat preparations cannot be prepared, but the problem that has to be faced is the consumer’s acceptibility and market potentiality.”

It is clear from the above that no sweet dish is prepared with meat. If prepared, consumers will not relish it and it will be difficult to sell it,
Is Beef Possible in Madhuparka?
Madhuparka System in Siberia

Hotel Oberoi Intercontinental, Wellesley Road, New Delhi-11, writes in its letter dated 11-2-1969:

"I would like to point out that no sweet meat preparations are made by us and whatsoever no meat is used for our dessert preparations."

From this also it is evident that no sweet is prepared with meat; meat is not mixed in any sweet dish; and meat preparations are only salted and spiced. An honoured guest is entertained only by serving what is most delicious and what he likes best. When in the refinement of culinary art there is no sweet dish prepared with or from meat, then how is it possible that meat should have been added to madhuparka at the reception of an honoured guest?

Some people add a little sugar to salted spiced vegetable preparations, but it cannot be maintained on this basis that vegetable preparations are sweet. Nobody will relish vegetables prepared with sugar alone. In the same way if somebody per-chance adds a little sugar to salted and spiced meat preparations, then they do not become meat containing sweets. Salt or spices are not mentioned among the ingredients of madhuparka. In such circumstances, mixing of meat in madhuparka will be a sweet meat preparation devoid of salt and spices which has neither been seen nor heard of so far. Then it is beyond comprehension, how an honoured guest would relish the addition of meat to madhuparka. If we apply our minds seriously, then the mixing of meat in madhuparka is impossible.

Madhuparka System in Siberia

Doctor Lokesh Chandra, Director of Saraswati Vihar (International Academy of Indian Culture), New Delhi and son of late Dr. Raghuvira, the well known Indologist, has given an
instance of his experience with madhuparka, which is narrated below in his own words:—

"Deep in the heart of Eastern Siberia lies the Aginsky Monastery which has been renowned for its inexhaustible manuscript resources and unparalleled scholarship. Till the thirties of our century it continued the academic and spiritual traditions of the Nalanda University. On the midnight of 14/15 June 1967 we reached this Aginsky Monastery, a legend for those who have taken interest in Eastern Siberia, in her thought and her deep traditions. For the first time in our life we were received in national style with madhuparka comprising of yoghurt (dahi), milk and honey in silver spoons from silver vessels."

This shows that even meat-eaters of Russian Siberia do not include any kind of meat in madhuparka and as such it is beyond doubt that there is not even an inkling of meat in madhuparka and the statement that madhuparka is never without meat is baseless and wrong.

CONCLUSION

It is clear from the above considerations that there is no possibility of mixing meat in madhuparka. Due to shortage of time, even the possibility of preparing milk-rice-pudding (पालस) then and there and serving it to entertain the guest is rather slight. It may be possible that parched barley (sattu) besides milk, curd and ghee was mixed with madhuparka as is prescribed in Baudhāyana-grhya-sūtra 1.2.54 (बाद्वती ग्रिह्य धिंकर; संस्थितिग्रिह्य) and Hiranyakasipu-grhya-sūtra 1.12.10. Even nowadays in the countryside of Bihar and Uttar Pradesh, guests coming from far-off places at summer time are served with parched barley (sattu) dissolved in water mixed with sugar.
WERE COW-SLAUGHTER, MEAT SACRIFICE AND MEAT-EATING PREVALENT IN THE VEDIC AGE?

By constant propaganda it has been dinned into the minds of several people that during the Vedic age killing was a part of yajña, even cows were slaughtered, beef and other kinds of meat were commonly eaten; and the total prohibition of killing (ahimsa) came into vogue in the Buddhist and Jain period. It is true that before the Buddhist and Jain period, by misunderstanding, killing became prevalent among people to some measure, but it is totally false that in the Vedic age there was killing in yajña, or meat-eating prevailed. A number of people think that the cow is considered aghnyā अग्न्या ‘un-killable’ in the Vedas, but there is no prohibition regarding the killing of other animals and hence animals were slaughtered in the yajñas—this assumption also is false.

The high respect accorded to the cow in Vedic times has been described in details by the late Pandit Shripad Damodar Satavalekar in his Go-jñāna-kōśa (published by the Svadhyaya Mandal, Anandashram, P.O. Pardi, Dist. Balsar, Gujarat), by Pandit Dinanath Sharma in his Śrī-saṅatana-dhārāloka, and by Pandit Dharmadev Vidya-vacaspati in his Vedon kā Yathārtha Svarūpa (published by the Gurukul Kangri University). A few extracts are being cited here which clearly prove that in Vedic times there was neither cow-slaughter, nor beef-eating, nor the killing of other animals and the eating of their meat. Those who want to go into greater details they should study the three works just referred to.

THE INVIOLABILITY OF THE COW

By a careful reflection of the Vedic mantras it becomes clear that the cow is inviolable. This has been spoken of in a number
of ways in the Vedic mantras. In the Veda, the very name of 'a cow and bull' is *aghnya* (अघन्य). It means 'inviolable'. Whose name itself is 'inviolable', its cutting up or slaughter is impossible. Vedic words are full of meaning, they are significant, and intrinsically relevant. Therefore whose name is *aghnya* प्रणय or 'inviolable', its slaughter is impossible in Vedic times. And without slaughter, the offering of beef in *havan* is altogether impossible. The hypothesis of the slaughter of cows and the offering of beef in *gomedha* are all figments without any foundation.

Thus the word *go* has several meanings like, cow, her milk, her yoghurt, her butter, her sour-milk, her ghee, her urine, her dung, her hide, her hair, her bone, etc. In the Veda it is used chiefly in the sense of 'milk' and 'ghee'. This is specially to be borne in mind.

गोििि: श्रीगोिि मत्सरं । Rg.9.46.4

The literal meaning of this *mañtra* is: 'mix (श्रिषिता श्रीरीत) *soma* (मत्सरम मत्सर्ग) with the cows (गोभिह गोिि:)'. The words literally convey that mix the whole of *soma* with a whole cow. But here it means: 'mix *soma*-juice with the milk of a cow'. Here the whole has been used for its part. Milk is a part of the cow, and a part of *soma* is its juice. Here the mixing of these two parts alone is intended. Such was the idiom of Vedic speech. It is a mode of language. If this mode is understood then no doubt remains.

If, in this mantra we do not translate the word *go* as 'cow's milk', and interpret it as mix *soma* with a cow', then it has no congruency of meaning, because *soma* cannot be mixed with a cow by any means. The cow is a long and broad animal specy, and *soma* is the juice of a creeper. How can they be mixed? *Soma* cannot be mixed with a living cow, nor with a whole dead cow. If the proponents of cow-slaughter and beef were still to insist that *soma* can be mixed with the flesh of a cow after slaughtering her',
then we shall have to set aside the real meaning of gau as a cow, but we will have to understand it in the secondary meaning of 'beef' as a figurative extension. In such a situation when we have to give up the real meaning of the word gau गौ as 'cow' and we are compelled to resort to its subsidiary meaning of 'beef', then why should we not take gau गौ as meaning 'cow's milk', which will be easier to mix with soma juice. Those who interpret it as 'beef' they will have to go to the length of taking it as 'the meat of a dead cow'. It will be easier and more befitting than that if we interpret it as 'the milk of a living cow'. Because the principle is that the closer the subsidiary meaning to its primary the better it is to that extent.

THE PRIMARY PRINCIPLE OF THE VEDA

The primary principle of the Veda is to view all beings in friendly compassion. So we can say that those who saw all beings with friendly love, how could they slaughter others for their stomach? Friendly love will lead to the dedication of one's own life for others, and it is impossible that the loved one is slaughtered for the stomach. The primary principle of the Veda is exemplified by the following:

i. मित्रस्य मा चक्षुषा सर्वाः सुतानिः समीक्षलम्।
   May all beings behold me with the eyes of a friend.

मित्रस्यां चक्षुषा सर्वाः सुतानिः समीक्षे।
   I behold all beings with the eyes of a friend.

मित्रस्य चक्षुषा समीक्षलमः।
   We behold each other with the eyes of a friend! (Vājasaneyi-samhitā 36.18)

2. मित्रस्य वक्ष्य्य चक्षुषा समीक्षलवः। (मृत्युययों सहिता ४.६.२७)
   Behold all with the eyes of a friend.
   (Maitrāyani Śāṁhitā 4.9.27)
A Review of ‘Beef in Ancient India’

3. प्रायः पशुताः सूयासम्। (आथर्वेद १७.१.४)
   May I be dear to all animals. (Atharvaveda 17.1.4)

4. हृदं हृदं सा मित्रस्य मा चतुर्फ्या सर्वार्षिणि सूतानि समोऽक्षातः।
   मित्रस्य चतुर्फ्या सर्वार्षिणि सूतानि समीक्षे।
   मित्रस्य चतुर्फ्या समीक्षामहेः। (यजुर्वेद ३६.१८)
   O Dispeller of all pangs and ignorance (हृदं हृदं) strengthen me (हृदं हृदं).
   May all beings (सर्वार्षिणि सूतानि) regard (समोऽक्षातः) me (मा),
   with the eye of a friend (मित्रस्य चतुर्फ्या). May I regard (सर्वार्षिणि सूतानि) with the eye of a friend
   (मित्रस्य चतुर्फ्या). May all of us regard (समीक्षामहेः) each other
   with the eye of a friend (मित्रस्य चतुर्फ्या) (Yajurveda 36.18)

This is the commandment of the Veda. Here it admonishes us not
only to regard all men with the eye of a friend, but the entire gamut
of sentient beings. Then should one kill one’s friend for one’s
stomach. If he is to be killed, then where is the friendly eye. The
Vedic people who followed the prime principle of the Veda to
regard all beings or the entire sentient world with the eye of a
friend, could never even imagine to slaughter them to eat. So it
will have to be accepted that due to some extraneous causes meat-
eating intruded into the Aryans. The natural diet of the Aryans
was vegetarian.

In the Bhāgavata-mahāpurāṇa 7:14.9 we find the same
assertion:

मृगोपनिर्वासकिः प्राप्नुस्तो तपस्यापवित्तः।
ग्रामसम् पुष्करं पद्मेव तेरेषाममलं कियत्॥ (आष्टोभाष ७.१२.६)
“Deer, camel, donkey, monkey, rats, creeping animals, birds, and
flies—one should consider them like one’s own sons; what difference
is there between them and the sons?” (Śrimad-Bhāgavatā 7.14.9)
The Veda enjoins the non-killing not of the cow alone, but it calls upon the non-killing of all the bipeds and quadrupeds. The prime principle of the Veda is to view all beings with the eye of a friend. Consider the following supporting passages:

यज्ञशान्त्यः पशूनः पाहि I I यजुर्वेदः १.१
मा हिसीस्तत्वा प्रजा: I I यजुर्वेदः १२.३२
ग्राहवं...मा हिसीः... I I यजुर्वेदः १३.५२
ग्राहवं...मा हिसीः... I I यजुर्वेदः १३.५४
इम मा हिसीप्रां पशुम् I I यजुर्वेदः १३.४७
इम मा हिसीः...वाजिनम् I I यजुर्वेदः १३.४८
इमसुगायः...मा हिसीः I I यजुर्वेदः १३.५०
मा हिसीः पुरुषम् I I यजुर्वेदः १६.३
मा...हिसिष्टेण्ड्रिपवो मा चतुष्पषवः I I यजुर्वेदः ११.२.३

"Do not kill any of the creatures, like the horse, goat, bipeds, quadrupeds, wool-giving animals and human beings." Reading these mantras along with those propounding the principle of the friendly eye, the Vedic admonition of non-killing (ahimsa) will become apparently clear. View the generality of sentient beings with a friendly eye, and never kill them—this is the admonition of the Veda to men. Inspite of such a clear injunction, Europeans constrain to think that non-killing (ahimsa) was not so strict in the Veda as it became in later times.

Pandit Dharmadeva Vidyavachaspati has given a clear exposition of non-killing (ahimsa) in the Vedas on pages 498-499 of his book Vedon ka Yatharth Svarup (published by the Gurukul Kangri, Haridwar). A few extracts from it are cited below:

बृहदमर्मानुमार्मसिद्धा मा हिसीस्तत्वा प्रजा: I I यजु १२.३२ I I

"May you be illumined by the mighty rays of knowledge
“Those noble souls who practise meditation and other yogic ways, who are ever careful about all beings, who protect all animals, they also care for our spiritual progress. They always take care that our behaviour does not afflict any animal”. (Atharva-Veda 19.48.5).

“May I be dear to the animals”. (Atharvaveda 17.4)

One who protects the animals, and regards them with a kindly heart, he alone can be dear to them, and not one who slaughters them—this is quite clear.

It may be acceded to, that the totally complete and singularly unqualified non-killing (ahimsā) propagated by the Jains and Buddhists is not found to such a degree in the Veda, but it is unreasonable to say that the principle of non-killing (ahimsā) did not exist in the Veda. The Veda preaches ahimsā alone as the common norm of behavior, but in special circumstances like war it does not enjoin to refrain from killing. Veda enjoins ahimsā of a type in which killing necessitated by a great national war is not ruled out. But should one desire to kill others for his stomach, such killing is not permitted by the Veda. The readers should clearly bear this difference in mind. In fact, it is the Vedas alone that propound the true principle of non-killing (ahimsā). So the Aryas who follow the Veda try to save the insects moving on the road, and if some are crushed by oversight that horrifies them and they recede back uttering ‘Rām Rām—राम राम’ in repentance, and they also safeguard sparrows and pigeons who lay eggs in their houses.
A number of modern scholars think that in the Vedic age the cow was surely killed at *gomedha*. They adduce in proof that the *kalivarjya* sections prohibit *gomedha* in this Kali-age. But they entirely forget that in the Zend Avesta scriptures of the Parsis, there is surely no cow-slaughter in the *gomez yajña* which is equivalent to the Vedic *gomedha*, and in their *soma-yāga* also there is no slaughter, but the juice of the *soma* creeper alone is used. European scholars make a comparative study, but as soon as comparative studies prove *ahimsa* they give up this basis. When the *gomez yajña* of the Parsis can be accomplished without cow-slaughter, then why not the *gomedha* of the Vedic Aryans.

*Medha* does not imply killing or slaughter at all. For instance we may cite the words *grhamedha* (गृहमेध) and *pitṛmedha* (पितृमेध). Just as honoring the father is intended in *pitṛmedha* (पितृमेध), and just as sanitary and other conditions of well-being of a house are explicitly predominant in *grhamedha* (गृहमेध), likewise in *gomedha* too honoring of the cow and the preservation of her health were naturally desired. Manu has also said:

ऋष्यापनं ब्रह्मयजः पितृयजस्तु तपस्याम्।
होमो वेदो बलिभोति नुयजस्तितिवूजनम्॥ (मनुस्मृति ३.७०)

"Teaching is *brahma-yajña* (ब्रह्मयजः), pleasing the parents is *pitri-medha* (पितृमेध), offering of *homa* is *deva-yajña* (देवयजः) offering of food to worms and insects is *bhūta-yajña* (भूतयजः), and honoring the guests is *nr-yajña—nara-medha* (नरयजः — नरमेध)". (Manu 3.70)

**VEDIC NAMES OF THE COW**

The Vedic lexicon Nighaṇṭu gives nine synonyms of the cow. Out of them the following three bear the meaning ‘not to be killed’,

- *gomedha*
- *medha*
- *ahimsa*
1. *aghnyā* (अ—घ्न्या) = not to be killed.
2. *ahī* (अ—ही) = not to be killed.
3. *aditi* (ग्र—विति) = not to be cut to pieces.

These three synonyms clearly indicate that the cow should not be slaughtered. First we showed that the names of *yajña* imply non-killing (*ahimsā*), now we see that the synonyms of the cow show the same non-killing. The intrinsic meaning of the synonyms of the cow itself proclaims that the cow is holy, and therefore she should never be slaughtered. The same meaning is the basis of a stanza in the *Mahābhārata*:

> यज्ञ्या इति गवां नाम क एता हन्तुमहंति।
> महृद्धकाराकुशलं दृश्य गा वात्सल्मेतु तु यः।। (म.मा. शां २६२.४७)

"The very name of the cows is *aghnyā* that is the cow is not to be slaughtered. Then who can slay them. Those who kill a cow or a bull, they commit a most heinous crime".

(Mahābhārata, Sāntiparva 262.47)

**SYNONYMS OF YAJṆA**

From among the synonyms of *yajña*, the word *adhvara* (ाध्वर) occurs in several mantras of the Veda. Its very meaning is ‘non-killing’. The word *dhvara* (ध्वर) denotes killing (ध्वर हितसंत्वानो यथा श्रव्यम् श्रव्य:), it is prohibited by the word *a-dhvara*. The presence of the word *a-dhvara* meaning ‘non-killing’ among the synonyms of *yajña* proves that any type of killing is not appropriate in a *yajña* or *medha*. The word *medha* (मेघ) has three meanings: ‘increasing intelligence; attending; and killing’ (मेघ हितसंगमने श्रव्य:). The word *medha* has a nuance of killing, but it also signifies ‘increasing; attending’. Thus the etymological meanings of *go-medha* (गो-मेघ) can be: (1) increasing the cows, (2) attending the cows, and (3) killing the cows. The readers themselves should
consider which of the three meanings is intended. By association with the word *a-dhvara* (ऋघ्वर) ‘non-killing’ for a *yajña* the idea of cow-killing has to be discarded, and the other two meanings remain. Rearing the cows, multiplying them, and eugenic cow-breeding is meant by ‘attending the cows’. All these are comprehended by *gomeda* (गोमेघ) but not cow-killing; this is clear even by considering just the synonyms of *yajña*.

**PROHIBITION OF COW-SLAUGHTER**

गां मा हिसीरदितं विराजम् ॥ ४३ ॥
घृतं हुहालामदितं जनाय...मा हिसीः ॥ ४५ ॥

(यजुर्वेद १३)

“The cow is illustrious and inviolable, therefore do not slay her (Yajurveda 13.42). The cow is inviolable and she yields ghee for the people, therefore do not slay the cow, (Yajurveda 13.49)”.

Thus, slaughter of cows is prohibited, it is a clear injunction against killing them.

**THE INCOMPARABLE COW**

The Veda enjoins that for everything else there is a comparison, but the cow is beyond comparison; so many are the beneficences conferred by her on man. For it, see the following mantra:

ब्रह्म सूर्यसमं ज्योतिष्ठोः समुद्रसमं सरः ॥
इन्द्रः पृथिव्यं वर्षयानं गोस्त्र माण्ड्रा न विद्यते ॥ (यजु २३-४८)

“The effulgence of knowledge can be compared to the sun, the Heavens (शुलोक) can be compared to the sea, the earth is very vast, yet Indra is vaster than her, but the cow cannot be compared to anything.”

(Yajur-veda 23.48)
Behold! how the Vedas describe the loftiness of the cow. Though the word gau (गौ) is used for the earth also, but in the above mantra the word gau (गौ) stands for the cow alone, and the passage expresses its (cow’s) incomparability in so many words.

ADVANTAGES OF THE COW

"May this inviolable cow yield milk for both the Aśvini, and may she prosper for our great good fortune" (Rg 1.164.27). In this mantra it is said that may the inviolable cow prosper (सा प्रणयेयां वर्षाताम्); this mantra deserves careful reflection. Mr. Griffith translates it as ‘and may she prosper to our high advantage.’ When this mantra proves that the increase of cows leads to the growth of our fortune, then whence arises the possibility of slaughtering the cow? The numerical increase of the cow and the enhancement of its quality leads to numerous advantages for man—this has been propounded by the Veda without reservations and in several ways. Such great importance was attached to the cow in Vedic times. So we can say that in Vedic times efforts of the pious were directed to the improvement of the cow. Also see Rg-veda 1.164.40:

"May the cow eat the best of grass, may she be blessed, and by her may we also be blessed with wealth. O inviolable cow (प्रणये) ! ever feed on grass (तुम्हारे अश्वे) and coming back (आ-चरतली) drink pure water (महु मुक्तमाचरतली)."

What the cow should be fed has been clearly spoken of in the mantra. The cow should eat grass alone, and when a cow is
kept, there should be such arrangements as she gets the best grass. Milk obtained from a cow that eats the best grass and drinks pure water—that alone is health-bestowing for man. The milk which is obtained from a cow fed on fried dishes, grains, decaying produce and human excreta, etc.—that cannot be so wholesome.

The following mantra is note-worthy in this respect:

यावतीनामोषधीनां गावः प्राइन्त्यभ्या यावतीनामुजायः ।
तावतीस्तुम्भ्यनधी: यम्मू यच्छन्त्यायास्तु: ॥ (अष्टवेद ५.७.२५)

"All the herbs that inviolable cows feed on, and all those on which goats and sheep feed, may all of them increase your well-being," Griffith has translated the word aghnyā (ग्रहन्या) as 'whom none may slaughter'. If the word aghnyā (ग्रहन्या) standing for the 'cow' has this meaning, and her slaughter is not proper then on what basis do European scholars opine that beef-eating was prevalent among the Aryans?

ANIMALS IN YAJÑA

Whatever man offered to the gods in yajña, that he ate himself—on this basis European scholars have written:

"The usual food of the Vedic Indian, as far as flesh was concerned, can be gathered from the list of sacrificial victims; what man ate he presented to gods—i.e. the sheep, the goat and the ox". (Vedic Index, Vol. II, page 147, lines 10–13).

It means that all the offered animals were slaughtered and eaten. It appears from what follows in the Vedic Index that according to the Europeans the horse was killed at aśvamedha, but they have specified that the Vedic Aryans mostly did not eat horse-meat. It is really considerate of the Europeans that they have spared the Aryans from eating horse-meat. Because of the general European belief that what was offered at yajña was eaten, and that the horse was slaughtered at yajña, it was difficult for the Aryans to be spared from it. But in the book 'Vedic Index' it
is clearly stated that horse-meat was not eaten—so we tender them our thanks.

If Europeans concede the exceptions that inspite of human sacrifice at *narmedha* (नरमेघ) human meat was not consumed, and inspite of the sacrifice of a horse at *asvamedha*, horse-meat also was not eaten, then what objection do they have to accept the fact that the flesh of other animals was also not partaken of. Now remains the question of animal-offering in the Vedic *yajña*. Under the sub-head ‘*Ahiṁsa* (non-violence) in the Veda’ and ‘*Synonyms of Yajña*’, we have come to the conclusion that in the Vedic *yajña* there was no slaughter or offering of animals; and as a general rule violence to all beings is forbidden in the Vedas.

According to Ralph T. H. Griffith’s translation, Atharva-Veda provides that;

i) “Horses are the grains; Oxen the winnowed rice-grains; gnats the husks (श्रवः कल्पा, गावस्तङ्गला, मशका स्तुषा:) 11.3.5

ii) The grains of corn have now become a cow; the sesamum her calf (ञाना बेनुरभवद्र वत्तोस्यान्तिजोस्बवतु 18.4.32.”

The above quotations indicate that wherever prescriptions of oblation of cow are apparent, there they mean only corn (barley), rice, sesamum etc. and not animal flesh.

according to Mīmāṁsā-darśāna—वेनुवच्चाचवदक्षिणा सक्तस्नान इति पुष्पापनयो यथा हिरण्यय 10.3.65—a Brahmana takes away a cow or horse as a gift (दक्षिणा) just as he does in the case of gold *dakṣiṇā*. This proves that in *yajña*. cows and horses were assembled for giving away to Brāhmaṇas in *dakṣiṇā*.

**CATTLE EXHIBITIONS AT YAJÑA**

Here it must be pointed out that the meaning ‘to come together’ of the root *medhr* (नर) is supported by several episodes of *yajñas* in the Mahābhārata. For instance, in the *Asvamedha-parva* of
the Mahābhārata it is narrated as follows: (The references of chapter and verse numbers are from Gita Press edition followed by Bhandarkar Research Institute edition).

स्थलजा जलजा ये च पशुव: केचन प्रभो।
सबविन समानीतानु अरपयंस्तत्र ते नूता: ॥ 85.32; 87.6
गाश्चेव महिषीशचेव तत्र वृद्धिस्त्रियोऽपि च।
श्रीदकानि च सत्वानि श्वापदानि व्यासि च ॥ 85.33; 87.7
जरायुजाण्डातानि स्वेदजानुद्विभानि च।
पवतानूपजातानि सूतानि वदवुश्च ते ॥ 85.34: 87.8
एवं प्रमुद्धिं सर्वं पश्चायत्वनवाल्यत:।
यज्ञवां नूता हंस्तवा परे विस्मयमागता: ॥ 85.35, 87.9

"In the pavilion of the yajña, people saw all kinds of land and water animals which had been brought there. There were several kinds of cows, she-buffalos, old women, water creatures, beasts of prey and birds. Viviparous and oviparous creatures, creatures born of sweat and plants of mountainous and lacustrine regions—all were to be seen there. Thus seeing the pavilion abundant in animals, cows, wealth and grains, and filled with joy, the kings were in ecstasy."

This clearly proves that exhibitions were held at gomedha, naramedha, aśvamedha and avimedha, etc.

EVIDENCE OF YAJÑA

Whether meat should be used in the yajña or not is a different matter. Our opinion is that yajñas were without meat, but for argument’s sake if we consider yajñas with meat, then we will
come to know that the modern altar (vedi—वेदी) of the yajña is two-fold:

(1) pūrva altar, and

(2) uttara altar.

In the pūrva altar there were several altars in which only grain was offered, and meat is never mentioned. Meat is said to be offered only in the uttara altar. If the two adjectives of altar, pūrva and uttara, are understood as 'ancient times' (pūrva-kāla) and 'later times' (uttara-kāla), then it is clearly proved that only grains were offered on the ancient (pūrva) altar, and meat began to be offered on the later (uttara) altar.

The altar on which meat is offered nowadays, that is the later altar. Uttara-vedi clearly means the altar that came into vogue in later times, i.e. in the ancient yajñas, this altar did not exist at all. The altars which existed in ancient times, the pūrva (ancient) altars’ are still found. In the pūrva altar only pure grain is offered, and meat is offered on the uttara altar. Not only that, but first the offering of grains was completely finished on the pūrva altars, and then offering on the meat-altar started. Meat is never offered in the early part of the yajña, only grains are offered, and in the later days of yajña meat is offered in the uttara altar.

It is clearly proved that in very ancient times, the yajña was performed at pūrva altars on which only grains were offered, and the offering of later times comprised of the offering of meat at the uttara altar. If somebody insists that meat yajñas were prevalent during the period of the Brāhmaṇas, then he will have to agree to the fact that this was not the vogue in ancient times and only meat-less yajñas were prevalent in those days.

If meat yajñas began in later times, it was to prevent meat-greedy men of sinister nature to continue this disposition. With this end in view it must have been ordained that if meat has to be
eaten then partake of it only in *yajña*, so as to save daily slaughter. This seems to be the intent of the following stanza of the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Purāṇa 11.21.29:

ते ने मतमविलया परोक्ष विषयालमका: ।
हिसायां यदि रागः स्वादः यज्ञ एव न चोदना ॥

(त्रिमोमऽ ११.२१.२६)

Lord Śrī Kṛṣṇa said to Udhava—

“Not knowing My implicit view, if sensuous men find pleasure in violence, then they should indulge in it only in *yajña*”.

From the above it is clear that it is not a general injunction. It has been ordained only for the purpose of putting a curb on sensuous pleasures and not as a general injunction to duty.

Lord Kṛṣṇa has said further:

हिसाबिहारा ह्यालच्येः पशुमिः स्वसुक्ष्मः ।
यजन्ते देवता यज्ञ: पितृमुतपतीन खला: ॥ (त्रिमोमऽ ११.२१.२०)

“People who find enjoyment in violence, out of wickedness and for the gratification of their pleasures they slaughter animals, offer the meat in *yajña*, and thereby make a pretence of worshipping the gods, manes and rulers of evil spirit.

Śrīmad-Bhāgawata has stated clearly earlier also that animals killed in sacrifice take their revenge by devouring their killer in the next birth:

ये स्वनेताविद्येःस्तमस्त्वकः सदभिमानिः ।
पशुन दृष्टान्ति बिल्लकः प्रत्य खादनिः ते च तान ॥

(त्रिमद्भागवत व ११.५.१४)

“Those who are ignorant of this real Dharma (that is in *yajña*, the touching of animal is enjoined—not its killing—
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श्रीमद्भागवत 11.5.13) and though wicked and haughty, account themselves virtuous, kill animals without any feeling of remorse or fear of punishment, and are devoured by those very animals in their next birth.”

(श्रीमद्भागवता 11.5.14)

In the Mahābhārata also, which is considered as a fifth Veda, animal killing is prohibited in yajña:

इज्ञायज्ञास्यतिकलयों माणृशुघोधमः
हन्याज्ञानतून माणृत्वृत्य: स वें नरकभायतः
(Mahābhārata, Anuśāsana-parva 115.43: 116.45)

The wretch among men who, pretending to follow the path of religious rites and yajñas laid down in the Veda, would kill living creatures from greed of its flesh, would certainly go to hell.

KALIVARJYA SECTION

Some people assert that in the kali-varjya sections aśvamedha, gomedha, etc. are prohibited in the Kali age, therefore before this prohibition aśvamedha and gomedha were performed, and horse-meat was eaten at aśvamedha and beef during gomedha.

Now the question arises who has written this kali-varjya section, and in which text is it incorporated? Is this found in a respectable authoritative work? This is not found in the respectable authoritative smṛti works, therefore we cannot arrive at any special and potent conclusion from such an imaginary section.

The second point is that everything becomes clear when the chronology of the kali-varjya section is fixed. According to us, the kalivarjya section has been written within the last 700-800 years. Therefore this cannot regulate the entire past preceding it. Here too, there is the aforesaid defect of chronological incongruency.
Besides, if we accede that in the \textit{kaïvarjya} section, \textit{aśvamedha} and \textit{gomedha} are prohibited, even then we cannot come to know of the Vedic rites of \textit{aśvamedha} or \textit{gomedha}. It can only prove that before the writing of the \textit{kaïvarjya} section, meat \textit{yajñas} were performed.

\textit{Yajñas} of the Brāhmaṇa and Śūtra texts show additions and subtractions as compared to the \textit{yajñas} of the period of the Vedic mantras. Certain items are not found in the \textit{yajñas} of the mantra-samhitās, but they have been inserted later on. The reason, is that in the \textit{pūrva} altar, meat was not employed in offering, and in the offerings of the \textit{uttara} altar, that is in the \textit{yajñā} ritual of later insertions, meat offering was employed. It was a custom of the times when the manual of \textit{yajña} ritual was composed. The Vedic usage is only that which has been prescribed in the metrical mantra portions. Therefore, we ask as to which Vedic mantra proves that the cow was slaughtered in the Vedic \textit{gomedha}; if there is even a single mantra, let anyone bring it forward. Gone are the days of accepting statements without proof. We know that now-a-days several scholars acquiesce into the contention that cows were slaughtered during \textit{gomedha}, but here the question is not the status of persons who accept it: the scholars or the non-scholars. Here we have to consider as to what is attested by the Vedic mantras and what is not attested—this is the question here and it is this that we have to consider.

\section*{PUNISHMENT FOR EATING MEAT}

Those who eat meat, such carnivores have been termed \textit{yātudhāna} (violent person of a fiendish disposition) by the Veda and it enjoins punishment to them:

\begin{quote}
\textit{y}: \textit{पोष्य}\textit{येण} \textit{क्रिषि} \textit{समझ}\textit{क्ते} \textit{ये} \textit{श्रव्येन} \textit{पञ्जु} \textit{यातु}\textit{धान}: ।
\textit{यो} \textit{ग्रन्या} \textit{भरत} \textit{शोरस} \textit{तेष} \textit{शोर} \textit{वर} \textit{हर} \textit{सा} \textit{पिं} \textit{वृह} ॥
\end{quote}

(\textit{ऋग्वेद} १०.८७.१६)
"One who partakes of human flesh, the flesh of a horse or of another animal, and deprives others of milk by slaughtering cows, O king! if such a fiend does not desist by other means, then even cut off his head by your powers, this is the ultimate punishment which can be inflicted on him."

(Rgveda 10.87.16)

य श्रामं मांसमवति पौर्णेयं च ये क्रविः।
गर्भाण् खावन्ति केशवास्तानितो नाश्यामवस्त। (अष्टवः ८.६.२३)

It is said in this mantra of the (Atharva-Veda 8.6.23) that those who eat uncooked flesh, who eat meat cooked by men, who eat eggs that are embryos, do away with this evil addiction of theirs.

This very clearly proves that in the Vedas there is prohibition of meat-eating.

EVIDENCE OF THE MAHĀBHĀRATA

घुरा मल्ल्या मधु मांसेमासवं कुसरौवनम्।
घुर: प्रवत्तिं होतमनंद्रस वेदेषु कलितस्॥

(म.भा. शालि २६५.६; २५७.६)

"Liquors, fish, mead, meat, spirits, rice cooked with sesamum (til) seeds— all these have been inserted into yajña by the wicked people. Vedas have not prescribed their use in yajña." (Mahābhārata, Śānti-parva 265.9; 257.9)

बोजयःयोग्यं यष्ट्वयमविति वे बैद्वीकी श्रुतिः।
प्रजस्थानिनि बोजानि च्छांग नो हत्तुमहं छा्॥
नेष धर्म सतां देवा यत्र विष्मे वेपु॥

(म.भा. शालि ३३७.४-५; ३२४.४-५)

"Yajñas should be performed with seeds—this is the Vedic tradition. Aja are a variety of seeds, therefore it is not
proper to slaughter he-goats. Wherever there is animal-slaughter in *yajñas*, that is not the way of good men."
(Mahābhārata, Śānti-parva 337.4-5; 324.4-5)

HEINOUSNESS OF COW-SLAUGHTER IN THE MANU-SMṛTI

”A teacher, propounder (of the scriptures), father, mother, guru, brahmaṇa, cow and ascetic—they should never be killed;”

(Manu-smṛti 4.162)

The slaying of persons specified in the stanza has been equated with cow-slaughter. In other words it means that cow-slaughter is on par with murder of a teacher, propounder of the scriptures, father, mother, guru and brahmaṇa.

HEINOUSNESS OF COW-SLAUGHTER IN CHRISTIANITY

‘He that killeth an ox is as if he slew a man’ (Isaiah 66/3)

According to English dictionaries, the word ‘ox’ stands for the male and female species of the bovine family.

PROHIBITION OF BEEF IN ISLAM

Al-Ghazzālī (1058-1111 A.D.) was one of the most brilliant philosophers of Islam. At the age of 28, he headed the Institute of Islam at Baghdad. His chief book, ‘Ihya Ulum ul-Dīn’—’The Revival of Religious Sciences’ is respected as highly as the Quran. Its Urdu translation has been published by the Nawalkishore Press, Lucknow under the title *Mazākul Ārafin*. In its 1955 edition (part 2, page 23, lines 17-19 the detrimental effects of beef, and the virtues of the ghee and milk of a cow are stated as follows:

“the meat of a cow is disease (*marz*), its milk is health (*ṣafā*) and its ghee is medicine (*dāvā*).”
THE MEANING OF UKŚANNA AND VAŚANNA AND THE BARRENNESS OF THE VAŚA COW.

In the ‘Vedic Index’, Vol. 2, page 145, under the caption ‘Māṃsa’, Macdonell and Keith have written:—

“The eating of flesh appears as something quite regular in the Vedic texts, which show no trace of the doctrine of ahimsa, or abstaining from injury to animal. For example, the ritual offering of flesh contemplates that the gods will eat it, and again the Brähmanas ate the offerings.

(Foot note: So Agni is called eater of Ox and Cow in RV. VIII.43.11)

A similar assertion has been made by V.S. Apte in Chapter 19, page 389 of ‘The Vedic Age’, which has been quoted above under the heading of ‘Cow killing and Beef in the Marriage Ceremony’.

THE BLIDED TADDHITA OR THE USE OF THE WHOLE FOR THE PART

The late Pandit Shridι Dāmodar Śatavalekar has explained the system of the Elided Taddhita (lupta-taddhita prakriyā) on page 13 of the first part of the Vedic Section of his Go-jīṇa-kośa:

There are some Vedic mantras where the word-meaning seems to convey a strange sense, for example:

गोभिः वीरपीत मत्सरपः। (Rgveda 9.46.4)

Its word-meaning is: Cook or mix (śrīnīta) soma (matsaram) with cows (gobhiḥ). Prima facie, people are misled to
interpret it as an injunction to cook or to mix soma with beef. This misapprehension arises due to the ignorance of grammar. If one is fully conversant with the taddhita affixes, then this error does not arise. Regarding it Ācārya Yāska has said in the Nirukta 2.5:

ॐ

When there is at taddhita affix, the whole is used for a part. For example, in gobhīḥ śrīṇīṭa matsaram, the word gau means ‘milk’. In this connection, it is well-worth to notice what Yāska has elaborated elsewhere too:

‘श्रवणं बुधन्तो ग्रह्यासते गवि’ इत्यविष्ववं च र्मणः।
ग्राह्यापि च च श्लेष्मम प्रविष्टं सन्नृद्धं व्रति वीलयस्यं इति रघुस्तुति।
ग्राह्यापि स्माव च श्लेष्मम च ‘गोभिः सन्नृद्ध पतति प्रसूता’ इति रघुस्तुति।

ज्यास्पि ‘गोबल्व्यः’ गव्या चेतागा, गव्या चेतागा गव्या गमयतीषूत्तं इति।
‘वृक्षे वृक्षे नियतामामयः। गोभिः प्रपतान गुढा:।’

(Nirukta 2.5)

Here Ācārya Yāska has cited three Vedic mantras and has given meanings of the word go as ‘hide, gluten, ligament, and bow-string’—in all of them a part is denoted by the whole.

Arthur Anthony Macdonell and Arthur Berriedale Keith have also accepted it on page 234, Volume I of the ‘Vedic Index’:

‘The term go is often applied to express the products of the cow. It frequently means the milk, but rarely the flesh of the animal. In many passages it designates leather used as
the material of various objects, as a bowstring, or a sling, or thongs to fasten part of the chariot, or reins, or the lash of a whip.”

Instead of saying ‘the eyes see’, it is said that ‘man sees’. Similarly, for cow products like milk, yoghurt (dahi), ghee, hide, gluten, ligament and the string made of ligaments—for all of them—the Veda uses one word gau. In such cases, the meaning should be arrived at by the context. For the convenience of our readers we will cite an instance of each:—

श्रेयं बुहन्तो प्रध्यासते गच्छ। (Ṛg. 10.94.9)

“Draining (duhantah) the soma (aṁśum) they sit (adhyāsatē) on the hide (gavi).”

Rulph T. H. Griffith has also translated it in the same way, taking gavi to mean ‘hide’, “draining the stalk they sit upon the Ox’s hide.”

See further:—

वनस्पते वृक्षात्रो हि मूया ब्रतमत्तर्गा प्रतरर्ग: सुवीरः।
गोभि: सन्नद्धि प्रति वृक्षवस्त्वात्या ते जयतु जत्वानि।।

(Rṛg. 6.47.26)

“O chariot fashioned out of the tree (vanaspatē) ! be (bhuyāḥ) strong in your parts (vidvaṅgo), be our mate to carry us across (prataraṇaḥ), being full of brave heroes (svirāḥ). Compact with (sannaddhaḥ) straps of leather (gobhiḥ) show forth thy strength (vīlayasva), and may thy rider (te āsthātā) with the vincible foe (jeivāni jayatu).”

In this mantra, the whole denotes the part in two cases:

(1) the word go denotes the straps of leather, and
(2) the word *vanaspati* refers to the chariot made of the wood of a tree. Just as the tree is lumbered into wood, and the wood is manufactured into a chariot, so the hide is derived from the cow and string from the hide. Similarly, the cow produces milk, milk curdles into yoghurt, the yoghurt yields butter, and butter is boiled to ghee—for this reason the word *go* is used metaphorically for all these products.

Now let us go on to another illustration:—

वुष्टे वृषोऽप्रस्या दन्तो गोभि: सन्नद्रा पतलति प्रसुता ।

(Ṛg. 6.75.11)

"This arrow is dressed (*vaste*) in fine feathers (*suparnam*), its tip (*dantah*) is made out of deer-bone (*mṛgaḥ*), it is strongly fastened with fine threads of cow-hide (*gobhiḥ sannaddhā*) and when launched (*prasūtā*) it strikes (*patati*) the enemy."

In this mantra also there are two instances where the whole denotes the part. The word *mṛga* ‘deer’ expresses the bone of a deer. Instead of saying ‘the bone of a deer’ only the elliptic expression ‘deer’-is used. Further on, the leather straps are expressed by *gobhiḥ*. This word has also been used elliptically for ‘the straps of cow-hide’.

Also refer to the following mantra of Ṛgveda 10.27.22:—

बृक्षे बृक्षे नियताममयब्राह्मीस्ततो बयः प्रपतान् पूर्खावः ॥

"The bowstring made of cowhide (*gauḥ*) strung (*niyatā*) on every bow made of wood (*vṛkṣe vṛkṣe*) resounds (*amūmayat*) and the arrows with bird-feathers (*vayaḥ*) which consume men, i.e. strike them to death (*pūrusādah*) fall (*prapatān*) in the ranks of enemies."
In this mantra, three words exemplify the semantics of ‘a whole for a part’:—

(1) ōṛkṣa ‘tree’ means a bow made from the wood of a tree.  
(2) gau ‘cow’ denotes the bowstring made of cow-hide.  
(3) vayāḥ ‘birds’ stands for arrows with bird-feathers.

From the afore-mentioned examples the readers must have understood that in the Vedic style the whole stands for its part. If this principle had been only applicable to the word gau ‘cow’, then one could have objected to it as an over-straining, but this is found in the case of other words also. Over 2500 years ago, Ahārya Yāska has also said the same, and his examples are tabulated below:—

1. vanaspati ‘tree’ stands for a chariot made of the wood of a tree.  
2. ōṛkṣa ‘tree’ stands for a bow made of the wood of a tree.  
3. gau ‘cow’ stands for its milk, ghee and others.  
4. gau ‘cow’ stands for its hide, hide-products etc.  
5. gau ‘cow’ stands for string, bag, etc. made from its hide.  
6. mṛga ‘deer’ stands for weapon made from its bones.  
7. vayāḥ ‘birds’ stands for the arrows made from the feathers of the birds.

Several instances can be cited; but here we have confined ourselves only to those quoted by Āchārya Yāska. These will clarify to our readers that this is the Vedic style. As such the word gau (cow) used in Vedas or elsewhere as oblation material for yajñīna indicates milk, ghee etc. obtained from a cow.
THE MEANING OF VAŚĀNNA

Now we have to consider the meaning of the words *uksana* and *vaśānna* which are the epithets of Agni. Europeans surmise that *uksānna* means ‘meat of the bull’ and *vaśānna* is beef. The Europeans opine that because these words occur for Agni (fire) in the Vedas, meat was offered in the fire and it was also consumed. If human food is inferred from the synonyms of fire, then the fire is termed *viśvād* which means ‘one who eats all’ as in Rgveda 8.44.26:

युवानं विश्वाति कौव विश्वादं पुरवेपसमुः।
श्रविन्तं शुभाभि मन्मभि: II

‘I glorify with noble ideals Agni, the youthful, Lord of the Universe, sage who eats all *viśava-adam*, and who stirs much.’

In this mantra, the word *viśvādam* has been used for Agni. Agni eats (अव) all (विश्व), hence man ate everything; it is improper to conclude from it that men of the Vedic age were omniverous. Agni eats all, it consumes whatever is put into it, but how does it prove that man also necessarily consumed all these things.

Faggots of seven kinds of trees were offered into the fire, but how does this lead to the conclusion that Vedic Aryans ate the wood of the seven trees of mango, catechu, wood-apple, *Butea frondosa*, banyan, *Calotropis gigantea*. Such a procedure of deductions would be disastrous. Hence it would be improper to deduce from the words *uksānna* and *vaśānna*, which are found in the Rgveda, that Vedic Aryans ate meat of the bull and beef.

We have already explained before, the principle that the whole is used for its part. In accordance with it, the word *vaśānna* means ‘the Agni which consumes milk, ghee and other produce from the cow.’ Other similar examples are:
In Rgveda 1.137.1 there are gośrītāh and gavāśirāh. They are adjectives of soma. Their literal meaning is ‘mixed (śrīta) with cow (go)’, and again mixed (āśirāh) with cow (go)’. In both of them the word go ‘cow’ occurs, and here no one interprets it as beef, but as ‘milk of a cow’. Mr. Griffith has translated the word gavāśirāh as ‘bent with milk’. It is known to all that a very pleasant drink was prepared by mixing cow’s milk with soma.

Ācārya Śāyāna comments on the words gośrītāh and gavāśirāh as follows:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{विकारे प्रकृतिशब्दः} & : \text{ पणोभि: समिष्टिः:} \\
\text{गोभि: शौरेः श्राविरो समिष्टिः: सजातः} & : (Rg. 1.137.1-2)
\end{align*}\]

To wit, here the word go ‘cow’ has been understood as ‘milk’ and soma is mixed therewith—so it is said here.

**THING MIXED WITH SOMA AND THE MEANING OF UKŚĀNNA**

The following products used to be mixed with soma according to information contained in the Vedic mantras:

1. **Gavāśirāh गवाशिरः** : ‘Soma mixed with cow’s milk (RV. 1.137.1)

2. **Gośrītā गोश्रीतः** : Soma mixed with cow’s milk (RV. 1.137.1)

3. **Daṇḍyāśirāh दण्डयाशिरः** : Soma mixed with curd of cow-milk (RV. 1.137.2)

4. **Yavāśirāh यवाशिरः** : ‘Soma mixed with flour made from parched barley’ (RV. 1.187.9)

5. **Tryāśirāh त्र्याशिरः** : ‘Soma mixed with milk, curds and parched grain’—Griffith (RV. 5.27.5)

6. **Rasāśirāh रसाशिरः** : ‘Soma mixed with juices’ (RV. 3.48.1)
From the above it is clear as to which products were mixed with soma. This should be particularly borne in mind by the readers that nowhere is there any reference to the mixing of flesh or blood with soma.

In the Veda, soma is also termed ukṣā. The root meaning of the word ukṣā is ‘one who sprinkles’. Drops of juice drip from soma—hence it is called ukṣā. At first, soma juice is offered at the former altar (पुर्व बेदी). Hence, soma is the food of fire—this is the meaning of the word ukṣānna—‘one whose food is soma’. The meaning ‘bull’ is not intended here, because meat of the bull is never offered at havana, then how can it go into the fire.

For a comprehensive discussion of the meaning of ukṣā as ‘soma’, see the chapter on ‘Is Beef eating Prescribed in the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka-Upanisād?’

This evidence proves that the terms ukṣānna and vaśānna for fire do not mean ‘one who eats the flesh of a bullock or of a vaśā cow’, but it means that ‘one who consumes products obtained from a bullock or a vaśā cow’ as for instance:

ukṣā or soma—the fire that consumes soma juice; or
ukṣā or bull—the fire that consumes grain produced through agriculture by bullock; or
ukṣā or bull—the fire that consumes grain which imparts energy like that of a bull; and
vaśā वशा—the fire that consumes milk-rice-pudding, ghee or other produce from the milk of a vaśā cow.

On page 929, column 2 of the Sanskrit-English Dictionary by Monier-Williams, vaśa (वश) is translated as “will, wish, desire RV. etc., etc.”, vaśān anu or anuvāśān “according to wish or will”.

THE MEANING OF RGVEDA 8.43.11

Those who translate the terms ukṣānna and vaśānna as fire that eats bullock’s flesh or beef, they cite Rgveda 8.43.11 to prove their contention. The original mantra is as follows:
It has been translated into Hindi by Pandit Jayadeva Sharma, Vidyalankar, Mīmāṁsā-Tīrtha and a commentator on all the four Vedas. Its English version is given below:

(1) Let us adore and perceive (विचेष्य) with Vedic mantras (स्तोत्रेः) the soul (अत्मा आत्मा) that is ethereal like the fire (यगन्ते), that consume food capable of procreating (उक्षात्राय), that enjoys food as it desires (वक्षात्राय), and that is of the nature of vigour and verve (सोमपूर्वाय).

(2) Let us revere, adore and worship (विचेष्य) with hymns (स्तोत्रेः) the Supreme Lord who is effulgent like fire (अत्माने), the Giver of waters (उक्षा), the Mover of all, of supreme sway (सोमपूर्वाय), and the Creater of the Universe (वेघसे).

BARRENNESS OF THE VAŚĀ COW

The late Pandit Shripad Damodar Satarwalekar has discussed this topic on pages 78-80 of this book Go-jñāna-kośa (Ancient Period Vedic Section, Vol. I). Its English version is given below:

In Classical Sanskrit, 'Vaśa' means a barren cow. By interpreting these hymns as such under the impression that they pertain to barren cows, many people have gone to the extent that barren cows were slaughtered and different parts of her body were offered at the yajña. In our opinion it is excessive overdoing in interpretation. First of all we should examine whether in these hymns the word vaśā conveys the meaning of a barren cow or of a milch cow. Let us consider the following verses from the Atharvaveda;—

ATHARVAVEDA 10.10

1. वशां सहस्रदारा...श्रव्यांमंति 10.10
   We praise the vaśa cow which gives us milk in a thousand streams. (4)
2. शतं कळसा: नतं वोधारः नतं गोप्तारो ग्राहि पृष्ठे ग्रस्या: ||१५||
For the vaśā cow a hundred keepers and a hundred milkers stand ready with a hundred milk vessels. (5)

3. इरासिरा......वशा ||१६||
The giver of milk as food is the vaśā cow. (6)

4. ऊष्मते भद्रे पर्जन्य:......वशे ||१७||
The udder of the vaśā cow symbolises the rain-cloud. (7)

5. धुकौ......शीरं वशे तवम् ||१८||
O vaśā cow! you pour milk. (8)

6. ते......पयं: शीरं......व्रह्द्वशे ||१९||
Milk of the vaśā cow has been extracted. (10)

7. ते......शीरं व्रह्द्वशेः......तिष्ठु पाणे रक्षति ||२०||
After milking the vaśā cow, its milk has been stored in three vessels. (11)

8. सर्वं गर्भाब्येवत......ग्रस्याः: । ससूच हि तामाहुर्वखेति ||२१||
When the cow which generally does not conceive becomes pregnant, all get frightened. (23)

9. रेतो ग्रहवद्वशायः: । ......ग्रम्म्तं तुरियम् ||२२||
The semen of vaśa cow is her milk, ambrosia-like. (29)

10. वशाया दुर्गतपिवनसाध्याय वसवशच वे ||२३||
The Sādhyas and Vasus have drunk the milk of the vaśā cow in yajña. (30)

11. वशाया दुर्गं पीतवा साध्याय वसवशच वे ||
tे वे श्रवन्तय विष्टपि पयो ग्रस्या उपासते ||२४||
When the Sādhyas and Vasus have taken the milk of the vaśā cow, they praise her milk alone in Heaven. (31)
12. एनामेके बुधे घृतमेक उपासते ॥१३२॥
Some milk this cow, while others look after its ghee. (32)

ATHARVAVEDA 12.4

13. उध्येन प्रस्मे बुधे ॥१६॥
This cow gives milk through both udder and teats. (18)

14. सुदुचा दुरवरा दुरवरा ॥१४॥
The vaśā cow is easy to milk. (35)

15. प्रवीयमाना वासा ॥१३॥
The vaśā cow gets conceived. (37)

16. गोपताये वशलुपुत्रे विषय बुधे ॥३६॥
Vaśā yields milk as if it were poison to the owner of the cow who does not donate. (39)

17. वशायास्तु त्रिय धर्मेव वर्षात्र धर्मिन्द्र निवः स्यातु ॥४०॥
The vaśā cow loves those who offer her milk products in yajña. (40)

According to Atharva-Veda 10.10.23 (serial no. 8 above) it appears that the vaśā cow normally does not progenerate and in a while when she conceives, the rearers get scared. According to Atharva-Veda 12.4.37 (serial no. 15 above), at certain times, the vaśā cow conceives and progenerates. This verse of the Atharva-Veda reads in full as follows:—

प्रवीयमाना चरति कुदा गोपलाये वसा।
बेहतर मा मन्यमानो मूल्यों पाशे ब्रह्मताम्। ॥ (Atharvā 12.4.37)

(वसा) The vaśā (प्रवीयमाना) cow which progenerates (कुदा चरति) roams about in anger (गोपलाये) towards her master and curses him saying "(मन्यमानः) he who considers (मा) me
WAS THERE COW-SLAUGHTER AND BEEF IN THE MARRIAGE CEREMONY?

In the first volume of the History of the Indian People, entitled ‘The Vedic Age’, published by George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London under the auspices of the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, Dr. V. M. Apte has written in the 19th chapter on ‘Social and Economic Conditions’, (Second edition, 1952) under the caption: “Marriage and the Position of Women” (page 389).

“A hymn in RV (X.85)—which may be called the wedding hymn—gives us some idea of the oldest marriage ritual. The bridegroom and party proceed to the bride’s house (X. 17.1), where the well-adorned bride remains ready (IV. 58.9) to join the marriage-feast. The guests are entertained with the flesh of cows killed on the occasion (X.85.13). The ceremony proper now commences. The bridegroom grasps the hand of the bride and leads her round the fire (X. 85.36,38). These two acts constitute the essence of the marriage and the bridegroom is now the husband who takes her by hand (hasta-grābhah X. 18.8). The bridegroom next takes the bride home in a car, in a wedding procession (X. 85.7, 8, 10, 24-27, 42). Then follows the consummation which is signified chiefly by the purification of the bride’s garment (X. 85.28-30, 35).”

Thereafter Dr. Apte writes on page 393 under the caption: “Food and Drink” (page 393):—

“The cow receives the epithet aghnyā (not to be killed) in the Rgveda, and is otherwise a very valued possession. It
Was there Cow-Slaughter & Beef in Marriage
Explanation of Rigveda IV.58.9

is difficult to reconcile this with the eating of beef; but we may get some explanation if we remember the following:

i) Firstly, it was the flesh of the ox rather than of the cow that was eaten; a distinction was definitely made.

ii) The flesh of the cow was (if at all) eaten at the sacrifices only, and it is well known that one sacrifices one’s dearest possession to please the gods.

iii) Even in the Ṛgveda, only vaśās (barren cows) were sacrificed. For example, Agni is called in VIII.43.11 as vaśānna.

The expression atithinīr gāh (cows fit for guests) in X.68.3 implies the same distinction."

In the Vedic Index, Vol. 2, page 145, Arthur Anthony Macdonell and Arthur Berriedale Keith have stated:

"The marriage ceremony was accompanied by the slaying of oxen, clearly for food."

Before taking into consideration the 3rd mantra of the 85th sūkta of the tenth maṇḍala of the Ṛgveda, on the basis of which the aforementioned scholars have alleged beef in the marriage ceremony, it would be in the fitness of things that all the mantras of the 85th sūkta be considered for the appropriate setting of the whole situation.

EXPLANATION OF ṚGVEDA IV.58.9

Dr. Apte alleges that according to Ṛgveda IV.58.9 as the bridegroom’s party reaches the house of the bride, she is well-adorned and keeps ready to join the marriage-feast. The mantra reads:

कन्यायाः बहुतमेतवा उ प्रवेभ्यञ्जना प्रभम चाकशीमि।
यत्र सोमं सूयते यत्र ज्ञो घृतस्य धारा प्रभम तत्कवन्ते॥
The padapāṭha or break-up of the constituent words is as follows:

काव्यः, इव, वहतुमु, एतवा, उ, अक्षिः, अक्ष्ना, अमिः, छात्तीमि, यत्र, सोमः, द्रुयते, यत्र, यजः, धृतस्य, धारा, अमिः, ततू, पवत्ते।

We have looked up all these words in the Sanskrit English dictionaries of Monier-Williams and V. S. Apte. None of these words means a ‘feast’.

The word meaning of the mantra is as follows:—

काव्यः प्रक्षः प्रक्ष्नाः — As the girls

प्रविद्ध प्रविद्ध ना — having adorned themselves with ornaments

अमिः पवत्ते — are resplendent

वहतुमु एतवा — while going for marriage,

Likewise

(Physical meaning)  (Spiritual significance)

यत्र सोमः द्रुयते — where the soma-yajña is conducted.

where there are disciples of noble virtues.

यत्र यजः — where the yajña takes place,

where there is the yajña of intellectual give-and-take

तत्तू — there

there

धृतस्य धारा — I see the shining streams of ghi.

I envision or experience the uninterrupted flow of the expression of knowledge which is like the fast-flowing gher i.e., illuminated knowledge is visualised.

प्रविद्ध छात्तीमि — Where there is yajña, the offering faggots are kindled being soaked in ghi and thereby the yajña becomes bright, brilliant and illuminated.
This is an allegorical mantra, and there is not even a remote inkling of a beef feast.

H.H. Wilson has translated this mantra into English and there is not even a far-fetched allusion to a beef-feast. His translation is quoted below:

"I contemplate these streams of gīṁ as they flow from where the soma is effused, where the sacrifice (is solemnized), as maidens decorating themselves with unguents to go to the bridegroom". (RV. IV.5.13.9)

Ralph T.H. Griffith has referred to the bridal feast in the English translation of this mantra, but there is no reference to beef. His complete translation is as under:

"As maidens deck themselves with gay adornment to join the bridal feast, I now behold them,

Where Soma flows and sacrifice is ready, thither the streams of holy oil are running."

In the English-Sanskrit dictionaries of Monier-Williams and V.S. Apte, the following Sanskrit equivalents are given for "feast".

सतिक्रिया, सहभोजन, सभ्योजन, उत्तमात्सःसःमारः, परमात्मसःमारः, विशिष्टात्मसःमारः.

How this meaning 'of joining the marriage feast' has been inserted by Dr. V.M. Apte in 'The Vedic Age' or other authors into this mantra, cannot be comprehended.

Dr. V.M. Apte writes that it was the flesh of the ox rather than of the cow that was eaten, because the cow has been termed aghnya (अग्न्या) 'one who is not to be killed', and she is also a valued possession. According to him, the bulls are not valued wealth, and thus they are not referred to as the inviolable in the Vedas. But this is a misunderstanding on his part. The late Pandit Shripad Damodar Satavalekar has discussed it at length.
in his *Go jñāna-kośa*, Vedic section, part 2, on pages 8-9 of the Introduction. It is cited below in our English translation:

**THE INVIOBLABILITY OF THE BULL**

As the word *aghnṛya* (अघ्न्या) is used for the cow, likewise the term *agnṛya* (आग्न्य) is applied to the bull. Therefore, like the cow the bull too is to be protected, looked after and inviolable. See Atharva-Veda 9.4:

भृज्जान्मां रक्षा ऋष्ट्यवत्ति हृति चक्रुषा।
भृष्णोति भिन्न कर्प्पयां गन्त य पवित्राम्।\[119\]
शतयाज त्व यजते नैनं तुष्ट्यगत्य।
जित्वस्ति विष्वे तं देवा यो ब्रह्मान्या ऋष्ट्यमाजुहृति।\[120\]

“That lord of the cows, the inviolable (agnṛya—आग्न्य), that is the bull, he listens to good tidings with his ears, he banishes famine by his eyes, he chases away the demons with his horns. He worships with a hundred *yajñas*, the fires do not consume (agnyayaḥ na duvanti) him (enam, the bull). All the gods promote him who offers (ā juhoti) the bull (ṛṣabhā) to the Brahmana.”

In the above mantra, the following points deserve attention:

1. The bull is termed *a-agnṛya* (आग्न्य) which means ‘not to be killed’.

2. The donation of a bull to a Brahmana is equivalent to a hundred *yajñas* (mantra 18). Such is the importance of the protection, bringing up and donation of a bull.

3. The fires do not consume him, such is the importance of a bull (mantra 18).

4. The bull does not hear untoward speech, because all only praise him (mantra 17).

- The bull does away the horrors of famine (*avartī kanti caksusā*). The bull eliminates famine by agriculture (mantra 17).
By perusing the above Atharva-vedic description of the bull, the readers will realise the utility of the bull, so who will dare to slaughter him for filling up his stomach and who would be willing to invite famine thereby. If the bull averts famine, it is necessary to keep him well-guarded.

Dr. V. S. Apte has written: "The flesh of the cow was (if at all) eaten at the sacrifices only, and it is well known that one sacrifices one's dearest possession to please the gods." It should be known that to sentient being the dearest is one's own body; so if offering of life has to be made to please the gods, the dearest possession that is one's own body should be offered. It is his misunderstanding that the gods are pleased by the offering of a cow. See its detailed discussion under the caption: 'Were Cow-Slaughter, Meat Sacrifice and Meat-Eating Prevalent in the Vedic Age?'

Hereafter Apte writes that according to the Rgveda a barren (vaśā) cow was offered, because in Rgveda 8.43.11 Agni is called vaśānna. By this he means that the food of agni is vaśā, therefore, a barren (vaśā) cow was slaughtered and its flesh offered in havan. To consider the Vedic vaśā cow to be barren is due to ignorance. For its correct interpretation see the caption: 'The meaning of Uksānna and Vaśānna and Barrenness of the vaśā cow'.

Still further, Dr. Apte asserts that the expression atithinīr gāh (Rgveda 10.68.3) also implies the same. See its detailed discussion under the sub-caption: 'The Meaning of Atithinīrgāh and Atithigva of the caption: 'Is Beef Possible in Madhuparka?'

THE MEANING OF RGVEDA 10.85

Now we will consider the relevance of cow-slaughter and beef in the marriage ceremony. It has been discussed by the late Pandit Shripad Damodar Satavalekar in his Go-jñana-kośa, Vedic
Section, Part 1, pages 16-20. It is quoted below in our English translation. The following mantra is cited in support:

सूर्याया बहुतः प्राणान्त सविता यमवासुजतः
प्रधानाय हृद्यते गावोर्जन्योः: पर्युत्तते || (Rigveda 10.85.13)

This mantra occurs in an allegorical context. The meaning will become clear by taking its contextual setting into account. Now let us see some mantras preceding it as well as a few that follow:

सत्यनोत्समिता शूमिः सूर्योत्समिता श्रीः
ऋतुनारदियात्सस्तस्त्ति विवि सोमो द्रविष्टि: ऺु ||

चित्तिरा उपबंधरं चतुरा प्रस्यजनमसः
श्रौरुषमि: कोशा प्रासीद्वद्यावासूर्याः पतिमु || ७ ||

स्तोत्रा प्रास्नप्रतिध्य: कुरीरं छन्धब्रोपशः
सूर्याय ऋशिवना वरानिरासोतुराववः || ६ ||

सोमो बद्रौरवनभवदिवनासस्तासुभा वरा
सूर्या हितपते हस्तसनी मनसा सवितावालः || ६ ||

मनो प्रस्द्या ग्रान प्रासीदृश्व ग्रौरासीहुलतः श्व्रिदः
शुक्रावन्द्रवहावतः सर्वसुरसूर्या ग्रहमु || १० ||

ऋषक्ष्राम्यामम्भीति गावी ते सामसितवः
श्रोते ते चक्रे प्रास्तां विवि पत्थाश्चरावः: १११ ||

श्रुची ते चक्रे यथा स्वाते प्रकुल प्राहतः
श्रानो मनसमयं सूर्यारोह्त्रयति पतिमु || १२ ||

सूर्याया बहुतः प्राणासिरिता यमवासुजतः
प्रधानाय हृद्यते गावोर्जन्योः: पर्युत्तते || १३ ||
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यदयां शुभस्वप्ती वरेयं सूर्यामुपः
वेंकेसः चक्रां वामासीत्वक देश्त्राय तस्तथ्युः || १५ ||

हे ते चक्रेः सूर्ये ब्रह्माण्यो ऋतुयच विडुः।
प्रयोक्ते चक्रां यद्युहात तद्वदात्यद इतिदुः || १६ ||

(Rigveda 10.85.1, 7-13, 15, 16)

While considering these mantras the readers should bear in
mind that it is an allegorical description of the marriage of Suryā
(सूर्या), the Daughter of the Sun, to the Moon. Its meaning is:

Earth is sustained by Truth: by Surya (सूर्य) are the heavens
sustained. By verity the Ādityas stand secure, and Soma
stands in heaven—सूर्या (१); Intellectual power was the
pillow of her couch, sight was the unguent for her eyes: All
the objects from the earth to the heavens were her treasure
when bride Suryā (सूर्या) went unto her Lord. (7); Mantras
were the cross-bars of the chariot, Kurūra-metre decked it;
The bridesmen were the Twin Aśvins, Agni led them all. (8);
Soma was he who wooed the bride, groomsmen were both
the Aśvins, when the Sun-god Savitā, bestowed his willing
Suryā (सूर्या) on her Lords. (9); Her Mind was the bridal
car; the covering thereof was heaven; the two white steers
drew it, when Suryā (सूर्या) approached her husband’s home.
(10); The two bulls were kept steady in place by the mantras
of the Rig and Sāma Vedas. The two ears were the two
chariot wheels: stationary and moving were the path in the
heavens. (11); Clean as thou wentest, were thy wheels; the
vyāna-breath was the axle of the chariot. Seated on such a
chariot fashioned of the Mind, Suryā (सूर्या) proceeds to her
Lord. (12); Savitā gave a bountiful dowry to Suryā (सूर्या).
She moved forward. This is the time of the Maghā constella-
tion when the cows are sent as dowry (Europeans have
interpreted it as cows are slain during the *Maghā* constellation), that is, the rays of the sun reach the moon and in the *Phālgunī* constellation (*arjunnyoh paryuhya*te) the moon *Soma* is wedded to *Suryā* (13); O ye twin *Aśvi-devas*, when you came to *Suryā's* wedding on a three-wheeled chariot, where was the one chariot wheel of yours? Where stood ye for the command? (15): *O Surya* (*सूर्य*) the *Brahmans* recognize the two seasons (*Uttarāyaṇa* and *Dakṣināyana*) as two wheels of thine and the one kept concealed (or invisible in the cave of the heart) is known to those who are skilled in the eternal truths. (16)

The readers can follow the mantras and comprehend their meaning. It will be clear that there is no relevance of the slaughter of cows. If we try to insert that the cows were killed, that does not suit the context. We have given above the translation of the Europeans (in brackets) and also the real and correct meaning. The readers should deliberate and should themselves come to realize how wrongly the Europeans have misunderstood these mantras.

Dr. Wilson has translated the expression *aghāsu hanyante gāvaḥ* as ‘the cows are whipped along’, which is a bit better than Griffith, Whitney and others who have understood it as ‘the cows are slaughtered’ which is a grave blunder as is clear from the whole context. The meanings of the mantras as we have given above are also accepted by the Europeans; they differ only in the slaughter of cows. In fact, now it is not necessary to go into further details. Yet, we will elaborate the allegory of the bridal chariot to make it clearly intelligible to the readers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridal chariot</th>
<th>Spirit, mind</th>
<th>(Mantra 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covering of the chariot</td>
<td>Heaven</td>
<td>(,, ,,)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who draw the</td>
<td>Two bulls</td>
<td>(,, ,,)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chariot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Reins Mantras of Rk & Sāma (Mantra 11)
Path or way The stationary and moving worlds, i.e. the inanimate and animate worlds (Mantra 11)
Axle of the chariot vyāna breath (Mantra 12)
Pillow Intellectual power (Mantra 7)
Unguent for the eyes sight (Mantra 7)
Treasure all the objects (Mantra 7)
Crossbars of the chariot Mantras (Mantra 8)
Shine of the chariot Metres of the mantras (,, ,)
Groomsmen of the bride The twin Aśvins (Mantra 9)
Herald Agni (,, ,)
The two wheels of the chariot The two ears (Mantra 11)

This description follows the mantras literally. The readers are aware that Vedic depiction proceeds on the three planes of the physical, deific, and metaphysical. This three-fold interpretation will become clear from the tabulation given hereunder:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHYSICAL (in worldly usage)</th>
<th>DEIFIC (in the universe)</th>
<th>METAPHYSICAL (in the body)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father of the bride</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>The Supreme father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bride</td>
<td>Suryā (Light of the Sun)</td>
<td>Intellective power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridegroom</td>
<td>Soma</td>
<td>Spirit endowed with the 16 degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groomsmen of the bride</td>
<td>Twin Aśvins</td>
<td>Inhalation and Exhalation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the bridal party</td>
<td>Agni in the fore</td>
<td>Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Symbolization</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unguent in the eyes</td>
<td>Scenes</td>
<td>Sight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridal treasure</td>
<td>All the objects</td>
<td>All the parts of the body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cows</td>
<td>Rays</td>
<td>Senses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chariot</td>
<td>Lightning</td>
<td>Mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covering of the chariot</td>
<td>Heaven—बुलोक</td>
<td>Brain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path of the chariot</td>
<td>Stationary and moving</td>
<td>Inanimate and animate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who draw the chariot</td>
<td>Two bulls</td>
<td>Prāna &amp; apāna breaths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reins</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mantras of the Rk &amp; Sāma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross bars of the chariot</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mantras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shine of the chariot</td>
<td></td>
<td>Metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vyāna breath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two wheels of the chariot</td>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>Two ears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillows in the chariot</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noble thoughts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On perusing this tabulation, the Vedic allegory must have become evident to the readers. So it is not necessary to elaborate it further. The readers can see this wedding within themselves and also in the world without. These Vedic mantras depict the eternal wedding taking place in the external world; and now-and-then the nuptials occurring in the human body have also been indicated by allegory to the mind, noble thoughts, etc. The light of the sun drives pleasure by reflecting into the moon; this provides the metaphor for a description of the metaphysical reality.
USE OF THE ROOT ‘HAN’ WITH THE WORD ‘GO’

The word go (गो) refers to the rays of the sun; this is beyond doubt. In hanyante the root is han. The great grammarian Pāṇini, the Sage, has given two meanings: han himsā-gatyoh, i.e., in the Dhātupātha it means ‘kiling’ and ‘moving’. In the dictionaries, this root han has the following meanings:

To kill:  To multiply;  To go

The readers will find these meanings in every dictionary. If the readers will take these meanings into account, then the meaning of the expression

श्रवासु हन्यते गावोश्रवणयो: पर्युऊष्टर

in the mantra (even leaving out the allegory) will be clear,

(श्रवासु) at the time of the Maghā constellation
(गाव:) the cows (हन्यते) are driven along, and
(श्रवणयो:) during the Phālguni constellation
(पर्युऊष्टर) the marriage takes place.

Dr. Wilson has taken only this meaning. Besides the allegorical interpretation, as a matter of fact on a cursory glance too, this is the straight-forward meaning. Though the well-known meaning of the root han is ‘to kill’, yet the other significance of ‘to move’ has not become obsolete. If we take it to mean ‘to multiply’, then the expression gāvah hanyante will mean ‘the number of cows is multiplied’, the cows are multiplied two-fold or four-fold. When a marriage takes place, several people collect together and to offer them milk, cows are collected and brought from place to place and thus their numbers are augmented. See how perfectly and naturally this interpretation suits the context. A meaning which will conform to the concept of inviolability of the cow inherent in the word aghnyā and which will suit the context, that meaning alone will be correct and appropriate.
Besides, it will be clear from the tabulation that the cows of the physical plane, are the rays in the deific, and the sensory powers on the metaphysical plane. In case of doubt, the meaning should be determined by recourse to other areas of semantic usage. On there being a doubt as to the meaning on the physical plane, i.e. in worldly practice, whether the cows should be slaughtered or not during a marriage, how the mantra should be translated; which of the two meanings of the root han should be taken—we should consider and arrive at an appropriate decision after taking into account the meanings on the deific and metaphysical planes. On the deific plane, it is clear that the rays of the sun are reflected on to the moon and light spreads. The rays of the sun are not killed or extinguished. Considering this, we find that the root han in the sense of 'to kill' is not intended, but the significance of 'expansion, spreading or movement' alone is meant. If the meaning of extinction or killing is taken up, then how could the rays of the sun reach the moon after being extinct. How will light, the daughter of the sun (Suryā Sāvitrī) be wedded to the Moon (Soma)? How will the bridal party proceed in pomp and show? In short, here the root han does not signify 'to kill'.

On the metaphysical plane we should look within. Will there be happiness of the Spirit by annihilating the sensory powers, or will their discipline alone auger well? The bridal chariot should proceed on the path of dharma, disciplined by the mantras of Rk and Sāma, on the way of the world. For this, the bulls who draw this chariot should be well-trained, and governed by the mantras they should move on the correct path. From this train of ideas, it is again evident that cow-keeping is intended.

Likewise, it is but proper that cows should be collected, moved along the proper way and not allowed to go astray so that family relations coming to the wedding ceremony are well-fed with milk. What will be gained by killing them, by slaughtering them?

From this point of view also it appears that the multiplication of cows is intended, or to move them along the proper path
is meant. As pointed out above, the root *han* means *gati* or movement. This *gati* signifies knowledge, going and obtaining. These meanings are attested by the grammarians. If we take this meaning of *gati*, then the expression *gāvah hanyante* would mean to gain knowledge about the cows, to move the cows or to obtain the cows.

The root *han* also means ‘to prod’. Now-a-days this meaning is current in the Marathi language. The word *hanana*—Marathi *hānaṇe* (हाणणे)—means to prod with a stick, i.e. a cowherd leads the cows by a stick in whichever direction he wants to take them. So this is also the signification of the word *hanana*. If we take this meaning of the root *han*, then *hanyante gāvah* would mean that the cowherds prod the cows to the desired direction. In the context of the marriage, they bring them together and take them to the desired destination.

Whichever alternative we accept, this much is clear that the killing of cows is not intended. Ācārya Sāyaṇa also does not translate it as killing *mahā naksatreṇu gāvah hanyante kāṇḍe tākāyante preranābhyām*, i.e. at the time of the *mahā* constellation, the cows are driven to their destination being prodded on with sticks. The cows starting from the house of the Sun are guided on the correct way to the house of the Moon. The purport of the commentary of Sāyaṇa is that the sun god gave cows as dowry to his daughter at her marriage. To bring the cows to the house of the moon the cowherd of the sun drive them along, and if necessary to keep them on the correct path they prod them with sticks and finally the cows reach the house of *soma*, and at the time of the *phalgunī* constellation the daughter of the sun is wedded to the moon. If we accept the meaning of ‘killing of cows’, then the dowry would be annihilated and the would be son-in-law would be angered, and the marriage would be interrupted. So the meaning of ‘killing’ does not apply here.

In whatever manner we consider the passage, it will be evident that cow-slaughter is not meant here. Inspite of all this European scholars have written on the basis of this mantra that
'the marriage ceremony was accompanied by slaying of oxen, clearly for food'. It is really astonishing how they jot down their imagination without considering the context. The Europeans may indulge in fancy, but we should arrive at a rendering after due consideration of the context. As we have seen in the above mantra, in no way does cow-slaughter fit in the context, yet Europeans are bent upon presenting this mantra as an evidence of beef-eating. Can there be a bigger blunder?

The *maghā* constellation is immediately followed by the prior (*pūrvā*) and later (*uttarā*) *phālgunī* constellations. The moon stays in them for three nights. If Monday falls on the *maghā* constellation, then the Tuesday and Wednesday fall on the two *phālgunī* constellations. Hence the dowry is sent during the *maghā* constellation, and the wedding takes place on the second or third day. If any facts have to be deduced from this mantra, then we will arrive at the situation that according to the Veda, cows were given as dowry, and the marriage took place after the dowry reached the bridegroom’s home. But, there is no possibility of deducing the slaughter of cows. Such a conclusion is a display of strange ignorance. We certainly have to decide which of the several meanings of the root *han* is intended here:

1. *han*—to kill. This meaning is well known.

2. *han*—to go; to move; to goad. This meaning is given by grammarians and it is also exemplified by passages. In the Vedic usage this meaning is commoner than in the classical language. It is also *gati* given in the Vedic lexical work *Nighañtu* 2.74.

3. *han*—to guard; as in *hasta-ghna*. Here *ghna* from the root *han* means to protect. *Hasta-ghna* means 'hand-guard', which is cognate to *dastānā*. This is a Vedic usage (*Rgveda* 6.75.14).

4. *han*—to multiply. It is used in mathematical literature. *ghāta* (घात) *hanana* (हनन) *hattī* (हति) *hata* (हत) convey the meaning of 'multiplication' etc.
Was there Cow-Slaughter & Beef in Marriage?
Use of the root 'Han' with the word 'Go'

5. *han*—to raise; to kick up. Its instance is: *turaga-khura-hatas tathā hi reṇuh*—‘the dust kicked up by the hoofs of horses’ in Sākuntala 1.32.

6. *han*—to beat; to prod; as the cowherds prod the kine by a stick.

7. *han*—to ward off; to avert. This meaning is attested by the Mahābhārata also.

8. *han*—to touch; to come in contact. It is an astronomical term in Varāhamihira’s Brhat-samhitā.

9. *han*—to give up; to abandon.

10, *han*—to obstruct.

Ten meanings of the root *han* are given in dictionaries. Which of them are applicable to the ancient Vedic mantras, can be decided only after considering their relevancy to the context. If the root *han* is interpreted as ‘to kill’ wherever it occurs, that would become nonsensical.

**Conclusion**

Those scholars who have tried to show on the basis of Rig-Veda that the cow-slaughter was resorted to for feasting the bride-groom party, have picked up stray mantras from here and there without any coherence. They have tried to mislead the people by their academic standing or by the importance of their status. The bride is set to be elegantly adorned and dressed to be taken to participate in the bridal feast in the fourth Mandala of the Rig-Veda, and in the remote tenth Mandala it is alleged that the marriage party is feasted on beef. While unconnected and far removed, both of them are allegorical descriptions as has been shown earlier. Those scholars whose intellect runs over to cover such unrelated statements, far removed from each other, it is beyond comprehension that their intelligence is unable to see the reality of facts. Undoubtedly, they have moulded their researches being motivated by special considerations. This is amply attested and it must have become evident to our readers by the clarifications offered in this essay.
WAS THE COW KILLED AT CREMATION?

Raja Rajendralala Mitra writes on page 2 lines 4-6 of his booklet ‘Beef in Ancient India’:

“A supply of beef was deemed an absolute necessity by pious Hindus in their journey from this world to another world, and a cow was invariably killed to be burnt with the dead.”

He has further referred the readers to his article ‘Funeral Ceremonies of Ancient Hindus’. On ransacking, we found it in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal Vol. XXXIX, Part I, No. IV of 1870. It was delivered as a speech in November 1870. On lines 3-10 of page 251 it is stated:

“The Āranyaka, after arranging the sacrificial vessels, gives the mantra for covering the corpse with the raw hide of the cow, which should be entire with head, hair and feet, the hairy side being kept upper-most. The mantra for the purpose is addressed to the hide; ‘Cuirass, carefully protect this body from the light of Agni; envelope it with thy thick fat and marrow; holding this impudent Agni, desirous of seeing and consuming it by his vigour, allow him not to go astray’.”

The mantra of the Āranyaka referred to above is the 7th mantra of the 16th sūkta of the 10th maṇḍala of the Rgveda.

On lines 7-9 of page 147 of the ‘Vedic Index’, Vol. II, it is asserted:

“The ritual of cremation of the dead required the slaughter of a cow as an essential part: the flesh being used to envelope the dead body.”

The late Pt. Shripād Dāmodar Sātavalekar has discussed this passage at length on pages 4-5 of the Introduction to his ‘Go-
jñāna-kośa’, ancient sector, Vedic section, part II, under the heading ‘Aantya Yajña’. It is quoted below in extenso in our English translation:—

"According to Vedic tradition the whole life of man is a great yajña. To devote one’s entire life to the good of all is a yajña, and death of the human person is the final offering. When the final offering, i.e. the offering of one’s body, is effected, that is the completion of the life-long yajña. The readers should note the loftiness of the conception of a life pervaded by yajña. In the Vedic tradition, cremation is not mere reduction of the body to ashes, but it is the final yajña, and being the last offering it is the consummating yajña. The body is offered into the flaming fires; from this point of view the offering of flesh—i.e. one’s entire body—into fire is in accord with Vedic dharma. But can this be termed a yajña with meat? Now-a-days a meat sacrifice means the offering of the flesh of a horse, a cow, or a bull. This is quite different from the final offering or cremation. In this ultimate act, the offering of the human body or of another body, is not meant to be eaten. As the dead body has not to be kept in the house, it is burnt and this is termed the last yajña. So if one says that meat is used in yajña it is true in a way, but what is intended and understood by it—that is not the truth. So we say that in spite of fire being named krayāda ‘consuming flesh or corpses’ it does not prove the eating of animal flesh. Fire was so termed because of the cremation of dead bodies in the Vedic age. As a matter of course, men die, their corpses are cremated. In war, horses, bulls and other animals die in battle along with men—all of them were cremated in Vedic times. The readers can judge from this custom that though fire is called krayāda, it in no way proves the eating of meat:

श्रन्नेवं परि गोभिर्यंस्व सं प्रोपृण्ड्र पीवसा मेदसा च ।
नेर्वा धृष्ट्युहर्सा जहूँ घाणो दृष्टिविश्लिष्यष्य्याते ॥

(Rg. 10.16.7)
Here the word gobhih is used. Europeans have surmised from it that the corpse was covered with beef, and for it, they deem cow-slaughter to be essential. Several Indian scholars also think likewise. Here it has to be taken into consideration that the word gobhih is in the plural, and according to Sanskrit grammar, plural means 'at least three cows'. If a human corpse has to be covered with flesh, will it require three cows as minimum? If this rite has to be accomplished with beef, will one cow not suffice? The body of a cow is three-to-four times the human body, so the covering of the corpse of one human being will not require at least three or more cows.

This will draw the attention of our readers to the fact that something else is intended. By the word gau (गाउ) are intended milk, yoghurt (योग्न), ghee, hide, etc. This is accepted even by Europeans. So we must find out for which product three or more cows can be required during cremation, and what is it that cannot be effected by one cow alone.

Flesh, hide, lard, etc. can be obtained in sufficient quantity from one cow. So ghee alone is the product which will have to be obtained from more than three cows. It is essential to smear the corpse with ghee before putting it on the fire. Those who perform havan they know well that ghee is poured over oblation-materials before they are offered into the fire. So also the kindling faggots are soaked in ghee before being put into the fire. In the final havan when the body, the consummating faggot is offered into the fire, will ghee not be required? Now-a-days ghee required for properly soaking the faggots is not available, so they are just sprinkled over with a few drops. In the Vedic age when there was no dearth of ghee, it is no wonder that the dead body was well anointed with ghee, the body that was the faggot offering par excellence into the ultimate yajña. The ghee also allays poison. When the corpse burns, poisonous air fills the atmosphere; to cleanse it the more the ghee the better, and more and more necessary it is. The atmosphere is purified by it. According to Vedic custom, the quantity of ghee used for cremation was equal
to the weight of the body. Now-a-days the Hindus make 5 to 10 tolas suffice for this rite.

To comprehend 'gau' as meaning ghee produced from a cow, is not new. It is accepted by all. Inspite of this, it is amazing how one can surmise the slaughter of a cow by the mantra under discussion.

The attention of scholars has not been drawn to the plural form of gau, or they have intentionally overlooked it, hence this non-sensical rendering—this is clear and evident.

The detailed consideration of this mantra also proves that in the Vedic age there was no idea of slaughtering either a milk-cow or a vaśā cow.
WAS A RED BULLOCK SLAIN FOR ITS HIDE AT THE AUSPICIOUS OCCASIONS OF MARRIAGE AND ROYAL CONSECRATION?

In 'Cow-Slaughter—Horns of a Dilemma', edited by Śri A B. Shah, Śri Mukandi Lal has written under the caption: 'Cow Cult in India' on page 18:

"Slaughter of cows on ceremonial occasions was considered auspicious in ancient India. The bride and bridegroom were to sit on the raw skin of a red bull before the altar. The skin must have been of the red bull sacrificed on the occasion of the marriage ceremony to feed the guests."

He continues further:

"Similarly, on the occasion of the coronation of kings, the raw skin of a red bull was placed under the seat of the king to be anointed. Probably the king had to sit on fresh cow hide to perform the ceremony."

We have already introduced Messrs. A B. Shah and Mukandi Lal and have given an assessment of the depth of their knowledge under the heading "Were Cows slaughtered at King Rantideva's Place?" It is not necessary to repeat it here.

Śri Mukandi Lal has not referred to the Dharma-śāstra wherever the above facts are cited. It appears that he has no personal knowledge of their source and neither did he find it necessary to go into their details. His sole objective seems to be to do propaganda for cow-slaughter somehow or the other, making use of the stature of his position. Whatever it be, it is necessary to clarify the points raised by him in trying to mislead the common man, so that false apprehensions are removed.
Was a Red Bullock Slain for Marriage and Royal Consecration? Was a Red Bull-Hide Obtained by Slaughter?

WAS A RED BULL-HIDE OBTAINED BY SLAUGHTER AT A MARRIAGE CEREMONY?

For cow-slaughter in a marriage ceremony and for serving beef to guests during a marriage feast, see the heading ‘Was There Cow-Slaughter and Beef in the Marriage Ceremony?’

The contention of Sri Mukandi Lal is that beef was served to guests at marriage, and for it a red bull was slaughtered then and there and the raw hide of the red bull was used as a seat for the bride and groom. Such a raw hide was also used at the coronation ceremony as a seat for the King to be coronated. Let the readers consider how practicable it is that a red bull was slain just after the arrival of the groom’s party; its raw hide was utilized for seating the bride and groom and a similar fresh raw hide was employed as the seat for a King to be coronated and to serve the meat of that red bull to guests in the groom’s party? The fresh raw hide of a red bullock slain instantaneously will be dripping with blood and its flesh will be oozing, which is a horrid sight. It will be smelling horrible. Is it possible that such an item fits in the festive decorations of a marriage or of a royal consecration? Inspite of this, men like Mukandi Lal try to mislead people by such impossible fantasies without a proper analysis of the whole situation, taking undue advantage of the stature of their position.

In recent times, Pandurang Vaman Kane has made a detailed study of the Dharmasāstras. Its results have been incorporated in his book “History of Dharmasāstra”. From the description given in its Vol. 2, part 1, page 530, under the caption ‘Ceremonies of Marriage’, it is clear that according to the Sūtras, only the bride is seated on a bullock-hide and that too when she comes to the bridegroom’s house after the performance of the due departure ceremony. On that occasion the groom makes a few offerings in the marital fire. All the grhya-sūtras we have been able to gather, prove this very situation. Thus it clearly proves as false and unfounded the contention of Mukandi Lal that a bullock was slain then and there by the bride’s party to serve beef to the groom’
entourage and that its freshly obtained hide was used to seat the groom and bride for the marriage ceremony.

All the grhya-sūtra texts are not available now-a-days. After strenuous efforts, we have been able to consult Āśvalāyana, Kāṭhaka, Vārāha, Baudhāyana, Pāraskara, Gobhila, Bhāradvāja and Khādīra grhya-sūtras.

All of them refer to the red (रेखित, लोहित) hide of the bullock. But the Baudhāyana-grhya-sūtra does not specify the red colour. Nowhere have we come across a seat of bullock-hide instead of the usual seat. Wherever a seat of hide is referred to, there only the deer-hide is prevalent. Even if, for argument's sake we accept a bullock-hide seat for any ritual of the marriage ceremony, it does not prove that to obtain bullock-hide for a seat, it was incumbent to slay a bovine animal. The hides of animals who die a natural death are available, which can be utilised for all appropriate purposes. Cows and bullocks of a red colour also die. If, in case ox-hide or red ox-hide is required for a ritual during marriage, then an ox-hide obtained without killing can also be used as a seat on such occasions. Even by straining or twisting the interpretation of words in the original text we do not arrive at the meaning that it was essential to obtain hide for a seat by slaying a cow or a bull on that very occasion, nor can we come to the meaning that the groom's party was to be served with beef.

Here below are the texts of the grhya-sūtras on which we have been able to lay our hands. Readers conversant with Sanskrit can conclude for themselves:

1. Āśvalāyana-grhya-sūtra 1.8.9 ;—

विवाहाविनिमुपसमाधाय पत्रेः स्त्रात्स्यांनांबन्धूपरस्माः स्त्रायांमुक्तत्तलोम
tस्मिनुपविद्यायं समन्वार्हवायाम्। प्रा । न: प्राजा जनयति प्रजापतिरिति
चतुर्भि: प्रत्यूंच हुव्वा समज्ञन्तु विश्वेवे इति दधः प्राणय
प्रतिप्रयब्धेवार्ये वाजनकिव हुद्ये॥
2. Śāṅkhāyana-grhya-saṅgraha :-

शन्तुहोकर्मं वस्यामः। श्रेण सत्तरथायादाराज्यभागः पाकिकः।
उपोत्सनेवलावनायाराज्यभागः कृत्वा ततो लोकः क्लियहजर्मेण
वघुमुन्यवेशयति। ततो वघु: कुशार्वारम्भे पतिः ज्वाहिति।

3. Kāṭhaka (Laugākṣi) grhya-sūtra 3.4.4 (28.4) :-

रोहित्या मुलेन वा यद्वा पुष्पोत्सनमपरा विनिमयालुके। रोहिते
चर्मेणुपविश्वयापि वा बन्धवेव ज्योत्रसुण्डितिह्व त्वामिनिरेतु
प्रथम इति च।

4. Vārāha-grhya-sūtra : (Gaekwad’s Oriental Series No. XVIII,
Edited by R. Sama Sastry B.A., 1921 edition योग्यतंभिन्यः प्रकरणः,
page 18) :

परवाचने रोहिते चर्मेणुपवेशये प्राग्रीवे लोमते बर्मतास्तीयः तेषु
वघुमुन्यवेशयति।

5. Baudhāyana-grhya-sūtra 1.5.8 :-

प्रणान्नानुके चर्मेणुपवेशयति—“इह गाव: प्रजायध्वमिहािवथ इह
पुरुषः। इहो सहस्वाक्षियो रायस्पोषो निषेधतु” इति।

6. Pāraskara-grhya-sūtra 1.8.10 :-

तां हट्पुरुष उन्मध्य प्राग्रोदववात्सनुगत प्रागारे श्रात्तुः। रोहिते
चर्मेणुपवेशयति इह गावे निषोदन्तिवहािवथव इह पुरुषः। इहो सहस्य
वाक्षियो यह इह पुरुषा निशोदन्तिविव।

7. Gobhila-grhya-sūtra 2.2.3 :-

प्रपरेराणिनिमानुके रोहितस्य सर्वम् प्राग्रीवभवत्तालोमास्तीिःभवति।

8. Bhāradvāja-grhya-sūtra 1.18 :-

पुनस्तायप्रतिया देवि तन्नतु यत्र प्रागता इते धर्मानं ग्राहादुहनुके। रोहिते
चर्मेणुपवेशयोसि गावे निषोदन्तिवहािवथ इह पुरुषः।
9. Khādīra-grhya-sūtra 1.4.2:—

ब्राह्मणकुलेवनिमित्तसाधाय पत्नादवनेलोऽहित चर्मानिहुतवलोम प्रायोज्मातीयं वायुतंत्रतापवेशेऽत्

10. We could not get the original Sanskrit text of the Mānava-grhya-sūtra but only its English translation by M. J. Dresden. Herein too the sequence is that the bride is seated after coming to the house of her in-laws, and there is no inkling of any slaying here. It also enjoins the spreading of kuśa grass on the hide, and alternatively it prescribes that the bride should take a kuśa seat. Below we quote the English translation:

"To the west of the fire, he causes the bride to sit down upon a red bull-skin, of which the neck is turned eastward, on the hairy side, after having bestrewn it (i.e. the skin) with Darbha-grass, or (he causes her to) sit down on Darbha-grass (only)."

Even a person like Max Muller, whose intention was to eliminate the feeling of reverence for the cow from the minds of the Hindus, has not been able to twist the meaning of any grhya-sūtra in his English translation, to signify that at the occasion of marriage, a seat of raw hide was provided for the bride and groom by killing a red bullock at the spur of the moment and that its flesh was served to the groom's party (see 'Sacred Books of the East', edited by F. Max Muller, Vol. XXIX & XXX Grhya-Sūtras Parts I & II). Besides the grhya-sūtras, rites of the marriage ceremony are not detailed anywhere. We are at a loss to know whence Mukandi Lal has found out that in ancient India cow-slaughter was considered auspicious at a marriage ceremony and the bride and groom had to sit on a raw skin of a red bull before the altar, and that the skin had to be of a red bull which had been sacrificed on the occasion of the marriage ceremony to feed to the guests.

From the foregoing discussion it is clear that there was no on-the-spot slaughter even if the bride had to sit on a bullock-hide
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The Meaning of Anādūh and Gocarman to consummate certain rites after reaching the house of her in-laws after the marriage ceremonies.

The meanings of the word rōhita (रोहित) in Monier-Williams' Sanskrit-English Dictionary are as follows:

(i) a red deer;
(ii) a red mare;
(iii) a red or chestnut horse.

So the meaning of रोहिते चर्मणि can also mean the hide of a red deer, red mare or a red horse.

THE MEANING OF ANADUH AND GOCARMA

According to the texts of Baudhāyana, Pāraskara and Bhāradvāja grhyā-sūtras given above, where आनजुहे रोहिते चर्मणि उपवेशलयत्य occurs, it is followed by इह गावो निषोदन्तु, इह प्रवाह; इह पुरुष: which means ‘may the cows (oxen) sit here, here the horses, here men’. In Sanskrit the word gau also connotes a bullock. It can mean that on the return of the marriage party the bullocks yoked to the chariots may also sit, i.e. remain there, there also the horses, there the people, i.e. the groom’s party. How can the sitting area of the hide of a bullock or deer accommodate so many bullocks, horses and men? To make the sentence इह गावो निषोदन्तु, इह प्रवाह; इह पुरुष: significant, what can be the intent of the Pāraskara-grhyā-sūtra प्रनुप्त भ्रागारे प्रानजुहे रोहिते चर्मणि उपवेशलयति? This ought to be well-considered. Its correct interpretation has been given by Pt. Dinanath Śastri Sārasvat in his Sanātana-Dharmalok, Vol. 6, pages 436-440 whose resume is given below:

1. According to the Ranti-kośa, the word anadūh (अनादुह) signifies the main residence or the gaiety room in the marriage pavilion. The etymology of the word anadūh (अनादुह) is अनो वहित—इति प्रनजुह्य. So the meaning of anadūh (अनादुह) given by the Ranti-kośa is correct as being the main residence which bears the chariot in the form of husband and wife.
The Vācaspatya lexicon says धनुक्क आस्तश्रेष्ठालो which means that the word anaduh (अनन्दुः) is used to connote ‘an adjacent place’ etc. This refers to the gaiety room near the marriage pavilion, where it is appropriate to seat the bride, or the groom and the bride together.

2. रोहिले चर्मणि can also mean ‘red hide’ and also ‘the hide of a red deer, or red horse or mare’. A deer-skin seat has been in vogue for ceremonial sitting. Thus the meaning of the sentence धनुक्के ध्रागारे धानदुः रोहिले चर्मणि उपवेशयति in Pāraskara gṛhya-sūtra 1.8.10 according to the two preceding interpretations will be : (उपवेशयति) he seats (her) (रोहिले) on deer-hide (धनुक्के) in a covered (ध्रागारे) building (धानदुः) in the gaiety room near the marriage pavilion.

3. The hide of a bullock is also termed go-carma (गोचर्म ‘bovine hide’). Let us now consider the various meanings of go-carma (गोचर्म). The technical senses of go-carma are as follows:

(a) In the Mitākṣarā commentary of the Yājñavalkya-smṛti:—

दशहस्ते वठले त्रिशष्ठो-वष्णुविनिवर्तनम्। दश तान्येव गोचर्म

i.e. ‘ten hands make a rod (वठले), 30 rods a nivartana (निवर्तन). A land area of ten such nivartanas is termed a gocarṇa (गोचर्म).

The meaning of nivartana in Monier-Williams’ Sanskrit-English Dictionary, page 560, column 1 is as follows:

‘a measure of land 20 rods or 200 cubits or 40,000 square hastas’

The counterpart of the English word ‘rod’ in Sanskrit is daṇḍa (दंड). The English word ‘cubit’ is defined in an English dictionary as the measure from the elbow to the end of the middle finger which is 18 to 22 inches. An English dictionary
defines the length of ‘rod’ as 5 1/2 yards or 16.1/2 feet, which is approximately ten hands. In the Yājñavalkya-smṛti too a ‘rod’ (daṇḍa) has been reckoned as ‘ten hands’ which tallies with the English dictionary. According to the Yājñavalkya-smṛti a nivartana is 30 rods long × 30 rods wide area of land, i.e. 300 hands × 300 hands = 90,000 sq. hands. But, according to the Sanskrit English Dictionary of Monier-Williams, a nivartana is 20 rods or 200 hands, i.e. 200 hands long × 200 hands wide = 40,000 square hands.

(b) Gṛhya-saṁgraha 1.39:

क्षेत्रभेक्षात् यत्र गवां तिष्ठति संघृतम्।
बालवल्त-प्रसूतानां गोचरमें इति संविदु:॥

that is, an area in which 100 bulls and cows can sit with their calves, that is termed gocarma (गोचरम्).

The Candra-kānta-bhāṣya comments on the above:—

गवां शतं बुशचको यत्र तिष्ठद्यन्वितः।
एतद् गोचरमस्मात्र तु प्रायुक्तबिविभो जनाः॥

that is, where a 100 cows and bullocks can sit without restrictive restraints, that land-area is termed gocarma (गोचरम्) by those conversant with the Vedas.

(c) The lexicon Padmacandra-kośa defines it on page 136 as a measurement of land 100 yards long and about 3 yards wide.

(d) It is stated in the 9th stanza of the Br̥haspati-smṛti:

सबुधं गोसहस्रं तु यत्र तिष्ठत्त्यतन्त्रितम्।
बालवल्त-प्रसूतानां तद्रो गोचरम् इति स्मृतम्॥

i.e. where a 1000 cows and bulls can sit comfortably with their calves, that measure of land is termed a gocarma (गोचरम्).

The measurements of gocarma given in the Sanskrit English Dictionary of Monier-Williams on page 364, column 2 are as follows:—
(i) A particular measure of surface—a place large enough for the range of 100 cows, one bull and their calves; Gṛhya-sūtras;

(ii) or a place 10 times as large; Parāśara-smṛti;

(iii) a place 300 feet long by 10 feet broad; Wilson;

(iv) or a place 30 Daṇḍas long by 1 Daṇḍa and 7 Hastas broad. Bṛhasp. (Mahābhārata xiii, 3121 Sch.).

It tallies with the definition given above in (b).

It agrees with the definition in (d).

It corresponds to the definition in (c).

Its style partly tallies with the definition given above in (a), but its area measurements are different.

Thus, gocarma (गोचर्म) means a land area where, according to the Gṛhya-saṁgraha, a 100 cows and bulls can sit along with their calves, or according to the Bṛhaspati-smṛti where a 1000 cows and bulls can be accommodated along with their calves. These meanings are appropriate to the context, because where चर्मणि उपवेष्यति is prescribed, there it is also enjoined that हि गायो नियोज्यन्तु, हि अश्रवः; हि पूरवः: i.e. ‘may the cows sit here, here the horses and here men’. If we take the connotation of an animal-hide, then how can a hide accommodate all the numerous chariot-bullocks, horses and men assembled for the marriage ceremony? The aforesaid technical meaning alone is appropriate to the context as it refers to a measure of land which can be occupied by cows and others. So sometimes a meaning based on the etymology alone becomes irrelevant and absurd; only a signification arrived at after due consideration of the context can be faultless. Thus, it will mean:— at the groom’s house, near the marriage pavilion, there should be an area of land which is sufficient to accommodate all the bullocks yoked to chariots, riding horses, and all the people who have arrived for the grand occasion, and where there is a seat of red deer-hide for the bride in the illuminated gaiety room.
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Hide Seat in a Royal Consecration

In his article, Mukandi Lal opines that at a royal consecration the king had to sit on a fresh and raw skin of a red bull. Just as the technical meaning of gocarma (गोचर्म) alone is relevant in a marriage ceremony, likewise the same meaning is appropriate to the ceremony of a royal consecration, because during a coronation too, there is a multitudinous crowd as at a marriage.

HIDE SEAT IN A ROYAL CONSECRATION

It has not been possible to trace a text which details the rites that are performed when a king ascends the throne. In the consecration, during a rajasūya yajña, a seat of bullock-hide is referred to here and there, but there is no reference that a fresh and raw hide should be obtained by slaying the animal then and there. Now we will consider all the descriptions that we have found.

Johannes Cornelis Heesterman has written a book 'The Ancient Indian Royal Consecration', wherein it is said on page 106, chapter 13, paragraph 1:

"The unction will be administered to the King while standing up a tiger skin."

(At Mahābhīṣeka, described by Kauśika Sūtra, likewise a tiger skin is used (17, 13). At the Laghvabhīṣeka, however, a bull’s hide is used (17, 3).)

Besides the tiger skin, Āpastamba-śrautasūtra and Vārāha-śrautasūtra prescribe also a throne of Khadira or Udumbara on which the tiger skin is to be fastened. The other authorities do not use a throne at the unction. The actual enthronement takes place later, after the chariot drive."

According to Monier-Williams’ Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Khadira (खदिर) means:

Acacia Catechu (having very hard wood, the resin of which is used in medicine called Catechu, Khayar, Terra japonica). page 336, column 3.
and *Udumbara* (उदुम्बर) means:

The tree Ficus Glomerata. page 196, column 3:

In the above cited texts, there is not even a hint that tiger-skin or bullock-hide was obtained by slaying them then and there, and that it was a raw hide. It may be possible that a new (unused) skin-seat was necessary for the royal coronation. Consecrations are not of daily occurrence; they take place once in an age, for which a new skin which has never been used for any purpose can be preserved, and such an un-used new skin can be used for the coronation ceremony. A new skin does not mean a raw skin obtained by slaying the animal then and there. A skin which has never been used for any purpose and which has been kept in a store-house is a new skin. Whichever śrauta-sūtra could be found and wherever a hide-seat is referred to, all such passages are cited below in original for Sanskrit-knowing readers, so that it may become clear that a new hide-seat does not mean a raw skin which has been obtained by slaying the animal at that very moment:

1. Āpastamba-śrauta 18.15.5:

   प्रमेयः प्राचास्तुर्धिः राविरीमोदुम्बराः वासन्वी प्रतिष्ठाप्य सोमस्य
   तिविभिरतिततः शार्दूः लचमः प्राचीनप्रीवलुतलोमास्तीवंतमातीति
   तामात्मात्मान्त्रयं हिरण्यं निघात्य विच्छोप्य वाहिति सौवर्णः शतमालेन
   शतक्षण्णेश शतक्षण्णेन वा यज्ञमात्स्य शैवान्धिः निचते।

   This description agrees with that given in J. C. Heesterman's 'The Ancient Indian Royal Consecration' as to the type of wood used for the throne.

2. Kātyāyana-sūtra 15.5.1:

   मस्तकतीयान्ते पांत्राशः पूर्वेण व्यावधार्मस्वस्तेस्याति सोमस्य
   तिविभिरिति

3. Baudhāyana-śrauta-sūtra 12.10:

   प्रज यज्ञमस्तायतने शार्दूः लचमः प्राचीनप्रीवलुतलोमास्तर्याति।
4. Vārāha-śrauta-sūtra 3.2.43:

सोमस्य तिबिषिरस्ति त्वाग्रिहस बिबेष्ट्यासान्ध्रामास्तुर्यायितः

The throne used by Kings is called a *sin̄hāsana* (ṣīṅha सिङ्ह + āsana आसन) which means 'lions seat', or 'a seat made of a lion skin'. In the śrauta-sūtras, the seat of tiger-skin is referred to frequently. In his book ‘The Ancient Indian Royal Consecration’, J. C. Heesterman says that according to the Kauśika-sūtra a bull’s hide was used at the minor consecration (*laghu abhiṣeka*) of a king, which can be correct. We could not have access to the original text of the Kauśika-sūtra. Yet, this much is clear that there is no context which proves that bull-hide was raw and it was obtained from a bull slain instantaneously.
WAS YĀJÑAVALKYA USED TO ‘ĀMSALA’ BEEF?

Macdonell and Keith have written as follows in the Vedic Index, Part 2, page 145, under the entry ‘Māmsa’:

“The great sage Yājñavalkya was wont to eat the meat of milch cows and bullocks (dhenvanaduha) if only it was āmsala (‘firm’ or ‘tender’) (Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa iii.1.2.21)”

Following them blindly, and without going into the crux of the situation, a number of Indians have started humming their tune.

This has been discussed at length by Pandit Dinanath Śastri Sārasvat in his Sanātana-Dharmāloka, Part 6, pages 375-380. Here below follows a gist of his arguments for the benefit of our readers. The original text of Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa 3.1.2.21 is:

श्रवय एन्न (यज्ञानं) शाल्ल प्रायाद्यति। स वेग्वे ৎ अनन्हाःच नासनीयात्। वेनवनहृ हं इव सरव विस्मित:। ते देवां अभुवन—वेनवनहृ हं इव सरव विस्मित: हृत:। यदवेषां बासां बौन्यम्; तद्र वेनवनहृपर्येर्धम:—हृत:। यद्र श्रायेषां बौर्यांमासीत्; तद्र वेनवनहूर्योरादु:। तस्माद् वेनुशचव अनन्हाःच सुविष्टं सुदृढः:। तद्र हू एवत्तु सवाश्चिमव, यो वेनवनहूर्योरस्यात्। वन्तगतिरिव तं ৎ हू श्राभिहु तमभित्ततो जायां गभी निरवधीदिति पापमक्रू—हृति पापी कौति:। तस्माद् वेनवनहूर्योरसीन्यायात्। तद्र हू उबाच यान्बक्यः—शासनान्येष श्राहमु श्रासल्ल चेंद्र भवतीति (3.1.2.21)

In the Vedas the cow and bull are inviolable. So the question of eating any type of flesh of a cow or bull does not arise. By the principle of the elided taddhita (तुष्ट तथ्यत्र प्रक्ष्या) the word dhenu (देव) ‘cow’ means products from the cow, i.e. milk and products from milk, and anaduḥ (अनदुह) ‘bullock’ means the produce from farming done with a bullock,
The context of the Satapatha is quite different. Sāyana Ācārya has made it clear beyond doubt. After the householder has shaved, bathed and dressed, the *adhvaryu* should lead him to the pavilion. Then the householder should undertake a fast to fulfil his initiation into the *yajña*, and he should not eat even cream and its sweets prepared from cow’s milk and food obtained from farming with a bullock. Here the words of Sāyana are:

प्रस्तापि (शालाप्रवेश-कल्ल: ) अश्रणकालत्वाद्रि यज्ञ अश्रणे कांचित्र नियममह—चेन्न-चेनो: कृरादिकस, अनुजुहः समविचि कर्षणसाध्यमिश्यर्थः, ततुभय नाइनियात्। तदुः अश्रणत: सर्वीश्च भवति, तस्य च जायाया गम्भ-समव्ये सति ततु सर्वीश्च ते रेतोद्हर्णेऽपि पिरसीरम गर्मि हिष्यात्, ततु पापकीर्तं स्वात्। तदु उभयं: (चेन्ननुह्यो: ) (पायसम) अन्नं (च) नाइनियात्। तत्र याज्याक्यप्रक्रमाह—चेन्न-दस्मात्रु उभयम् (चेन्ननुह्या-) अश्रणे शरिरम् अर्घलं [बलबद्] भवति, तस्मात्रु तयोरस्मशनीयामेव।

Sāyana Ācārya has very clearly translated the two words as ‘cow’s milk’ and ‘food procured from farming with a bullock’. There is no mention of any kind of flesh.

Yājñavalkya is not a householder for whom fasting would have been obligatory. He is a chaplain. Fasting in a *yajña* has been prescribed for a householder. So Yājñavalkya in his capacity of a chaplain says:

प्रस्तापम् एव अर्घं अर्घलं चेन्न भवति हि।

“I can eat what is *aṁsala* (अर्घल).” Alternatively it can also be understood as follows: In the opinion of Yājñavalkya if the performer of a *yajña* totally abstains from eating and as the *yajña* lasts for a long period, he will become emaciated and then he will not be able to perform the *yajña*. To keep up his bodily needs, he will have to eat something. So Yājñavalkya opines that even as a performer of the *yajña* I can eat what is *aṁsala* (अर्घल). And those householders who follow him can also partake of such victuals.
The antagonists have translated *aṁśala* (अंसल) of the cow and bullock as ‘tender flesh’, which is not relevant in any manner. The flesh of young cows and bullocks is not tender; only the flesh of a calf is tender. In this context the calf is neither mentioned in the original passage nor in the statements of the antagonist.

The word *aṁśala* (अंसल) does not mean ‘the flesh of an animal’. According to sutra 5.2.98 of Pāṇini वस्तसांताम्यां कामवले it means ‘nourishing, strength-bestowing’. In Amarakośa 2.6.44 also it has been translated as मांसलोकसल: which means ‘*aṁśala* is मांसल’. मांसलā (मांसल) does not apply to flesh (*māṃsa*). *Māṁsala* is used for cream and sweets therefrom, fresh and dry fruits and such other nourishing eatables. It is clear that the word *aṁśala* (अंसल) does not refer to ‘animal flesh’. There is no basis or authority for translating *aṁśala* (अंसल) as ‘tender flesh’. The correct and genuine meaning of *aṁśala* is ‘nourishing’ or ‘strength-giving’.

So in his capacity as a chaplain or as performer of a *yajña*, Yājñavalkya can partake of milk or milk-products like butter, cream, cream-sweets, or milk-rice pudding (*khīr*), and his followers can also do likewise. And if these be forbidden, they can take strength-giving fruits, both fresh and dry, which are not produced from a cow (*dhenu* दनु) or from cultivation with a bullock (*anaḍūḥ* अनःदुः); and this will sustain the prohibitive injunction of the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa ‘तस्माद वेषु-अन्नःदृ: न अद्यायः’.
DID AGASTYA SLAY A HUNDRED BULLS?

Macdonell and Keith have written as follows in the Vedic Index, Part 2, page 145 under the entry ‘Māṁsa’.

“The slaughter of a hundred bulls (uksan) was credited to one sacrificer, Agastya. (Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa ii,7,11,1; Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa xxi.14.5).”

The English translation of Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa 2.7.11.1 is given below with all the original Sanskrit words in parentheses:

“अगस्त्यो) Agasya (प्रोक्षतु) performed the proksana (उक्षण:) of the bulls (सर्सुर्य:) for the Maruts, (इन्द्र:) Indra (ग्राहत तावः) carried them away. (ते) They the Maruts (ग्राहयत) came upon him (वज्रस:) with their vajras (उच्चत्व) uplifted. (ग्राहस्य चंव) Agasya (इन्द्र: च) and Indra (ग्राहमयताम्) pacified (तान्) them (कयाशुभीयवः) with the Rgvedic hymn beginning kayāśubha. (शान्तावः) When they were calmed down (उपाल्यत) he called (तान) them (वत) The (कयाशुभीयम्) kayāśubhīya hymn (मवति) is (सास्य) for pacifying.”

Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa, also known as Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa, 21.14.5 is cited below in its English translation with the original Sanskrit words in parentheses:

“अगस्त्यो वे) Agastya verily (प्रोक्षतु) consecrated by sprinkling (उक्षण:) the bulls (सर्सुर्य:) for the Maruts. (अवधनात) He bound (तान्) them (इन्द्राय) for Indra. (ते) They (ग्राहस्यतन्तु) fell upon (ग्राहाय) him taking up (वज्रस:) the vajra,
(स) वे, अगस्त्य (अपलशस्त्र) साव (एतत्) यह (क्यालशोम्यस्त्र)
kayāśubhaṁya hymn. (तेन) बीत (प्रशस्तवध्व) हेम परसत (the
anger of the Maruts)."

In the Sanskrit-English Dictionary of Monier-Williams
prokṣaṇa has been translated as ‘consecration by sprinkling’. The
context clearly indicates that consecration cannot be for violence.
In the Vedas, the bovine family has been declared inviolable in
every way. Yet beef-gluttons see cow-slaughter everywhere as a
lascivious person sees only a woman whether awake or asleep.
When the cow-family is unkillable under all circumstances, then
there is no hinderance in accepting consecration by sprinkling for
gifting.
SUPPLEMENT

WERE COWS SLAUGHTERED AT KING RANTIDEVA’S PLACE?

(To be read on page 80, before the Heading ‘Rantideva in the Meghadūta of the great poet Kālidāsa’)

The word ‘badhyate’ is found in the chapter on marriage in Atharva-veda 14.1.26 and also in Rgveda 10.85.28 reading पतिव्रत्नेषु बद्धते where it is clearly interpreted even by Europeans as ‘the husband is bound in bonds (of family life)’.

As such, the verse of Mahābhārata under consideration would really mean that two thousand cattle used to be kept near the kitchen by chaining to the peg, so that their products like milk may be available readily even at odd times for the guests. The idea of keeping other 2000 animals may be for utilising them for transport of materials needed in the reception of guests.

Be it known that this verse is not found in all the editions of Mahābhārata. As already explained, the Dharma-Vyādha while preaching to Kauśika Brāhmaṇa on various subjects has not quoted any historical example. The dialogue between Dharma-Vyādha and Kauśika Brāhmaṇa is spread over ten chapters in Vana-parva in verses approximating the number of days in a year, out of which about 20 verses recount the previous birth of Dharma-Vyādha and about three-quarters of a hundred relate to the queries by Kauśika Brāhmaṇa. The balance of nearly 250 verses relates to the preaching by Dharma-Vyādha. Out of these, no historical example is quoted on any subject dealt with in the preaching. Quoting historical instances in preaching ahimsā (non-violence) is against the system of preaching by Dharma-Vyādha, particularly against the context of the subject as interpreted by the protagonists. Hence it is also not free from doubt, whether this verse is genuine or not.
Is Beef Possible in Madhuparka?

Historical Examples of the Gift of a Cow with Madhuparka

(To be added on page 98 after line 24 and before the sub-heading 'Āsvalāyana-Gṛhya-Sūtra')

Let us now look into the historical examples of madhuparka, wherein only the gift of a cow is mentioned and not serving its beef after immediate slaughter.

Valmikiya Ramayana:—

(a) When Śrī Rāma went to Bharadvāja Muni, he (Bharadvāja Muni) gave a reception to Śrī Rāma by offering madhuparka and a cow in gift.

रत्यं तदु बचनं शुद्धवा राजपुत्रस्य धीमतः।
उपायमत धमस्त्सा गामध्यंसुदकं ततः॥

(Ayodhyā-kāṇḍa 54.17)

meaning—Pious Bharadvāja Muni after hearing highly intellecuted Prince Śrī Rāma, offered him water for washing feet and hands and then offered arghya (madhuparka) and also a cow in gift.

(b) On the arrival of Mahārṣi Agastya and others Lord Śrī Rāma also offered them madhuparka in reception along with a cow in gift.

हस्त्वा प्राप्तानं मुनोस्सतस्तु प्रसुतुंस्य कुतान्तज्जलि:।
पादाध्ययादिविभिन्नचं गां निवेद्य च सावर्म्॥

(Uttara-kāṇḍa 1.13)

meaning—On arrival of those great sages, Śrī Rāma Candra got up and stood before them with folded hands and then worshipped them with high esteem by offering water for washing their feet and hands and by offering arghya (madhuparka) and a cow in gift to each of them.

Mahabharata

(a) When Śrī Nārāda presented himself in the assembly of King Yudhīṣṭhira, the King received him with madhuparka rite and with the gift of a cow,
meaning—The king, conversant with religious observances & duties, worshipped them in the prescribed manner by offering water (for washing feet and hands), madhuparka and a cow in gift and pleased them by fulfilling all their desires.

(b) When Lord Śrī Kṛṣṇa arrived in the assembly of Kauravas, a cow was gifted to Him in His reception by madhuparka rites:

(Udyoga-parva 89.19)

meaning—The priests of Dhṛtarāṣṭra presented water, madhuparka and a high breed cow for the reception of Bhagavān Janārdana.

(c) When Lord Śrī Kṛṣṇa came to Duryodhana’s place, there too the gift of a cow with madhuparka is mentioned:

(Udyoga-parva 91.9,10)

meaning—Kururāja (Duryodhana) offered water, madhuparka, cow and his palace and kingdom on the occasion.

Srimad-Bhagavata Mahapurana:

(a) When Akrūra arrived in Braja, Lord Kṛṣṇa received him with madhuparka rite and presented a cow in gift.
meaning—Then, enquiring about his safe arrival and giving him an excellent seat, Balarāma washed his feet with due ceremony and fetched (for him) an offering called madhuparka (consisting of honey, clarified butter and curds). Again, bestowing on the guest a cow and massaging him, weary as he was, the almighty Lord respectfully and with (great) reverence brought (for him) pure food endowed with manifold excellences,

(b) When Kauravas honoured Balarāma with madhuparka rite, there too, a cow was presented.

ते संगम्य यथाव्यायं गामर्ध्यं च त्यवेदनः ।
तेशा ये तत्प्रभावता: प्रशोधु: शिरसा बलम्।

(Śrīmad Bhāgavata 10.68.19)

meaning—They received Balarāma with due honours and offered Him arghya (water for washing His hands with) and a cow; and such of them as knew His greatness saluted Him with their heads (bent low).

(c) When Sudāmā visited Dvārakā, the reception to him included the gift of a cow, even though reception by madhuparka rites is not clearly specified:

ध्रुपः: कुरसिलिचन्द्रं प्रवदीपविलिचन्द्रं ।
प्रच्छिबाह्यवेदं ताम्बूं गां च स्वागतमंचवीत।

(Śrīmad Bhāgavata 10.80.22)

meaning—Having joyfully worshipped His friend with scented fumes and rows of lights, and offering him betel-leaf seasoned with catechu, lime, areca-nut parings and cloves etc. and a cow, the Lord greeted the Brāhmaṇa with sweet words.

(d) On his arrival at the place of Bahulāśva in Janakapura, when Lord Kṛṣṇa was given a reception with madhuparka rite, gift of a cow is very explicit:

सकुशुम्बो वहन शून्या पूजयाचकः हैवरान्।
गृह्यमायाम्बराकल्पशुपोपीपायेः श्रुतं।

(Śrīmad Bhāgavata 10.86.29)
meaning—King Bahulāśva sprinkled that all-purifying water on his head and on his relatives and worshipped the Lord as well as the divine sages by offering them sandal-paste, flowers, textiles, ornaments, scented fumes, lights, oblations of water, cow and oxen.

Several similar examples can be found in the Purāṇas. But there is not a single instance, wherein beef or any other kind of meat is served with madhuparka. Even at present, the meat eaters will not accept in madhuparka the raw meat obtained by slaughter of any animal on the spot.

Is Beef Possible in Madhuparka?
Manu-smṛti

(To be read three lines above from bottom of page 113)

The aforesaid stanza 5.41 of the Manu-smṛti is not authentic, as is proved by the statement made by Bhiṣma-pitāmaha while preaching duties to Mahārāja Yudhiṣṭhira. The stanza reads as follows in the Śāntiparva of the Mahābhārata:

सचंकम्बर्चोऽसा हि धर्मस्य मनुरक्तवीत ।
कामकाराद्विहिससति बहिवेद्या पशुन्न नरा: ॥

(Gitapress 265.5; Bhandarkar 257.5)

meaning—Holy Manu has prescribed ahimsā (non-violence) only in all performances. Out of their selfish desires, i.e. induced by the desire of eating meat and pretending that slaying of animals in yajña is not himsā (violence), people slaughter animals on the outer altar of the yajña."

●
"Is Beef Possible in Madhuparka?"

Uttara-Rama-Carita and Mahavira-Carita

(The text is too large to read clearly, but it appears to discuss the possibility of consuming beef in Madhuparka. It references Vasishta and Visvamitra and refers to earlier King Janaka's expression:

"अङ्कितमेतिविरामिवविहीर: पाण्डमदयः
तत्रत्र च मधुपर्कः कल्पयतां शोत्रियाय।" (2.44)

That is, if he is a rishi (sage), he may be offered a seat, pādyā (water for washing his feet) and arghya (water for cleaning hands) and be honoured by offering madhuparka, fit for a śrotiśya. The expression samjñāpyate vatsatarī sāngayate vatsatārī etc., is in the context of honouring with madhuparka rite. It has already been discussed and proved that there is no possibility of any kind of animal flesh in madhuparka. Prescription of the gift of a cow with madhuparka is also indicated in the scriptures. In the phrase referred to samjñāpyate sāngayate is a word which may mean violence (kṛṣṇa) as well as non-violence (a-kṛṣṇa). In the Sanskrit-English Dictionary of Monier-Williams, page 1133, column 3, samjñāpana is interpreted as 'causing agreement or harmony; killing a sacrificial animal'. In Atharva-veda 6.74.1-2 samjñāpana has the former meaning:

सं व: पुज्यन्तां ततवः सं मनांसि समु ब्रताः
सं वोरं ब्रह्मणेत्वपतिभंग: सं वो श्रीगमतम्
संज्ञपनं वो मनसोभ्यं संज्ञपनं हृदः
श्रवों भवस्य वच्चान्ते तेन संज्ञपयामाें वः

Ralph T.H. Griffith, in his translation of the Hymns of the Atharva-veda, published by Master Khelari Lal & Sons, Varanasi, third edition (1962, page 285) has translated these mantras as follows:

"Close gathered be your bodies:
be your minds and vows in unison!"
Here present Brahmansapati and Bhaga have assembled you. Let there be union of your minds, let there be union of your hearts: All that is troubled in your lot with this I mend and harmonize."

Supporters of beef-eating interpret the words ‘saṃjñāpyate vatsatari’ as ‘the heifer is ready for sacrifice’. As there is neither gomedha nor another similar yajña performance, interpreting ‘saṃjñāpyate’ as ‘killing a sacrificial animal’ is not possible according to Monier-Williams’ Dictionary. As the scriptures prescribe the gift of a cow in madhuparka rites, there are historical examples of the gift of a cow in reception with madhuparka, there is not a single historical example of beef served with madhuparka, and as the meat-eaters even these days would not accept raw meat with madhuparka obtained by slaughter on the spot and as there is no possibility of any kind of meat in madhuparka as discussed and proved earlier, the only justified interpretation of the words ‘saṃjñāpyate vatsatari’ would be offering a heifer in gift to Jāmadagnya Paraśurāma and thus making their union and harmony.

The whole stanza can be translated as follows:—

(वत्सतरी) The heifer (संज्ञायते) is offered to you as a gift. (प्रन्तं) Dishes (पञ्चते) are being cooked (सचिवि) in ghee. (श्रोत्रिय) O Śrotriya! (प्राणतोत्तिसि) you have come (श्रोत्रियगृहात्) to the house of a śrotriya. (जुश्वन न:) Please favour us by accepting our hospitality.

Let the readers decide themselves as to which is the appropriate interpretation with reference to the context of the subject.
APPEAL OF THE COW

Poor cows bemoan their lot and humbly plead thus they:
"You human beings! how the quadrupeds us treat?
With milk we have like mother nursed you day by day;
You send us to the butcher's house with death to meet.

"The men who hope to fatten bodies their with beef,
And hence by killing brutally us their bellies fill;
They will not lose the body,—seems they harbour such belief,—
Or carry it indeed along with them they will.

You do not seek to get well-built with milk we serve;
Derive nor joy from milk-products not few.
You want to drink our blood, then drink without reserve.
1Ye born in 'mage of God! nothing too much for you.

"Helpless are we poor creatures with no strength, no brawn.
You keep us or destroy, we are under your thumb.
Perhaps God too has now His help from us withdrawn;
'Ve are your cows—what more can say poor cattle dumb?

"Before our eyes our calves struggle for milk in vain,
While we, not minding that, provide you milk wholesome;
We feed on grass in woods, return to you again.
When grown up are those calves, they too your hacks become.

"Goes on like this if process of our decay here,
Regard the sun as set in India's Fortune's sky.
The little verdure too that's left will disappear.
Death on this golden land will stalk and jackals cry."

1 O Priests of non-violence! nothing too much for you.

Note—(Translated from 'Bharata-Bharati' of Rashtra-kavi late Shri Maithili Sharan Gupta, M. P.)
"A book that is shut is but a block"
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