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PREFACE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As I have omitted in the body of the work to say anything of the views of Signor Angelo de Gubernatis about the purport of the Vedic texts relating to Vasishṭha and Visvāmitra, I may state here that this young Italian Sanskritist, in his Essay, entitled “Fonti Vediche dell’Epopea” (see the Rivista Orientale, vol. i. pp. 409ff., 478ff.), combats the opinion of Professor Roth that these passages refer to two historical personages, and to real events in which they played a part; and objects that Roth “took no account of the possibility that a legend of the heavens may have been based upon a human foundation” (p. 409). Signor de Gubernatis further observes that the 33rd and 53rd hymns of the third Maṇḍala of the Rig-veda “may perhaps have been recited at a later period in connection with some battle which really occurred, but that the fact which they celebrate seems to be much more ancient, and to be lost in a very remote myth” (p. 410). Visvāmitra, he considers, is one of the appellations of the sun, and as both the person who bears this name, and Indra are the sons of Kuśika, they must be brothers (p. 412). See, however, the remarks in p. 347ff. of this volume on the epithet Kaśiṣka as applied to Indra). Sudās, according to Signor de Gubernatis (p. 413), denotes the horse of the sun, or the sun himself, while Vasishṭha is the greatest of the Vasus, and denotes Agni, the solar fire, and means, like Visvāmitra, the sun (p. 453). Signor de Gubernatis is further of opinion (pp. 414, 478, 479, and 483) that both the 33rd and 53rd hymns of the third, and the 18th hymn of the seventh Maṇḍala are comparatively modern; that the names of Kuśikas and Visvāmitras claimed by the authors of the two former, are fraudulently assumed; while the last (the 18th hymn of the seventh Maṇḍala) was composed by a sacerdotal family who claimed Vasishṭha as its founder. I will only remark that the theory of Signor de Gubernatis appears to me to be an improbable one. But the only point of much importance for my own special purpose is that ancient Indian tradition represents both Vasishṭha and Visvāmitra as real personages, the one of either directly divine, or of sacerdotal descent, and the other of royal lineage. They may, however, have been nothing more than legendary creations, the fictitious eponymy of the families which bore the same name.
some eminent Brāhmans, and became a member of their class. In the fifteenth section (pp. 431–436) two other instances are adduced from the same Brāhmaṇa and from two of the Upanishads, of Kshatriyas who were in possession of truths unknown to the Brāhmans, and who, contrary to the usual rule, became the teachers of the latter. The sixteenth section (pp. 436–440) contains an extract from the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa regarding king Viśvantara who, after at first attempting to prevent the Śyāparaṇa Brāhmans from officiating at his sacrifice, became at length convinced by one of their number of their superior knowledge, and accepted their services. In the seventeenth section (pp. 440–442) a story is told of Matanga, the spurious offspring of a Brāhman woman by a man of inferior caste, who failed, in spite of his severe and protracted austerities, to elevate himself (as Viśvāmitra had done) to the rank of a Brāhman. The eighteenth section (pp. 442–479) contains a series of legends, chiefly from the Mahābhārata, regarding the repeated exterminations of the Kshatriyas by the warlike Brāhman Paraśurāma of the race of Bhṛigu, and the ultimate restoration of the warrior tribe, and a variety of extravagant illustrations of the supernatural power of the Brāhmans, related by the god Vāyu to king Arjuna, who began by denying the superiority of the priests, but was at length compelled to succumb to the overwhelming evidence adduced by his aerial monitor.

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

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

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

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

---

INTRODUCTION

CONTAINING A PRELIMINARY SURVEY OF THE SOURCES OF INFORMATION.

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

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

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

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

1 Siyāna says in his commentary on the Rigveda (vol. p. i. p. 4): Mantra-brāh manyaṭmakam taevad aśuṣṭam lakṣaṇam | ata eva Āpastambā yajña-paribhūṣāyāṃ evūha 'mantra-brāhmaṇayor veda-nāmadheyaṃ' | “The definition (of the Veda) as a book composed of mantra and brāhmaṇa, is unobjectionable. Hence Āpastamba says in the Yajnaparibhūṣāḥ, ‘Mantra and Brāhmaṇa have the name of Veda.’”

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

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

Yadyāpi mantrabrāhmaṇātmako vedas tathāpi brāhmaṇasya mantra-vyākhāna-rūpatvād mantrā evādau samāmnätāḥ | "Although the Veda is formed both of Mantra and Brāhmaṇa, yet as the Brāhmaṇa consists of an explanation of the Mantras, it is the latter which were at first recorded."4

The priority of the hymns to the Brāhmaṇas is accordingly attested by the constant quotations from the former which are found in the latter.5 Another proof that the hymns are far older than any other portion of Indian literature is to be found in the character of their language. They are composed in an ancient dialect of the Sanskrit, containing many words of which the sense was no longer known with certainty in the age of Yāska, the author of the Nirukta,6 and many grammatical forms which had become obsolete in the time of the great grammarian Pāṇini, who refers to them as peculiar to the hymns (chhandas).7 A third argument in favour of the greater antiquity of the mantras is supplied by the fact that the gods whom they represent as the most prominent objects of adoration, such as Indra and Varuṇa, occupy but a subordinate position in the Itihāsas and Purāṇas, whilst others, viz., Vishnu and Rudra, though by no means the most important deities of the hymns, are exalted to the first rank, and assume a different character, in the Puranic pantheon.8

4 See also the passage quoted from the Nirukta in p. 174 of the 2nd vol. of this work, and that cited from Śāyaṇa in p. 195 of the same vol. Compare the following passage of the Muṇḍaka Upanishad, i. 2, 1: Taṣṭaṁ satyam mantrātāh karmāṇi kavayo yānī opāsyaṁ tūṁ tretāyōṁ bahudhā satantāni | "This is true: the rites which the rishis saw (i.e. discovered by revelation) in the hymns—these rites were in great variety celebrated in the Tretā (age)."


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

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

No sufficient data exist for determining with exactness the period at which the hymns were composed. Professor Müller divides them into two classes, the Mantras or more recent hymns, which he supposes may have been produced between 1000 and 800 years,—and the older hymns, to which he applies the name of Chhandas, and which he conceives may have been composed between 1200 and 1000 years,—before the Christian era. Other scholars are of opinion that they may be even older (see Müller’s Anc. Sansk. Lit., p. 572, and the Preface to the 4th Vol. of the same author’s edition of the Rig-veda, pp. iv.-xiii). This view is shared by Dr. Haug, who thus writes in his introduction to the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, p. 47: “We do not hesitate, therefore, to assign the composition of the bulk of the Brāhmaṇas to the years 1400-1200 B.C.; for the Saṁhitā we require a period of at least 500-600 years, with an interval of about two hundred years between the end of the proper Brāhmaṇa period. Thus we obtain for the bulk of Saṁhitā the space from 1400-2000; the oldest hymns and sacrificial formulas may be a few hundred years more ancient still, so that we would fix the very commencement of Vedic literature between 2000-2100 B.C.”

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

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

10 For further details on these Brāhmaṇas, the reader may consult Professor Max Müller's Anc. Sansk. Lit. pp. 345 ff.; Professor Weber's Indische Literaturgeschichte, and Indische Studien; and Dr. Haug's Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.

11 See, for example, the Ś. P. Br. xi. 5, 1, 15; and the Taitt. Sanhitā, ii. 2, 10, 2, and ii. 6, 7, 1.
work is said to be the production of Vyāsa, but its great bulk, its almost encyclopædic character, and the discrepancies in doctrine which are observable between its different parts, lead inevitably to the conclusion that it is not the composition of a single author, but has received large additions from a succession of writers, who wished to obtain currency and authority for their several opinions by introducing them into this great and venerated repository of national tradition.\textsuperscript{12}

The Purāṇas are commonly said to be eighteen in number, in addition to certain inferior works of the same description called Upapurāṇas. For an account of these books and a summary of their contents, I must refer to the late Professor H. H. Wilson’s introduction to his translation of the Vishnū Purāṇa.\textsuperscript{13}

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

\textsuperscript{12} On the Rāmāyaṇa and Mahābhārata, see Professor Monier Williams’s “Indian Epic Poetry,” which contains a careful analysis of the leading narrative of each of the poems.

\textsuperscript{13} See also the same author’s analyses of the contents of the Vishnū, Vāyu, Agni, and Brāhma-vaivarta Purāṇas in the “Gleanings of Science,” published in Calcutta, and those of the Brāhma and Pādma Purāṇas in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, No. ix (1838) and No. x. (1839).
CHAPTER I.

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

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

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

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

This celebrated hymn contains, as far as we know, the oldest extant passage which makes mention of the fourfold origin of the Hindu race.
In order to appreciate the character of this passage, we must consider it in connection with its context. I therefore quote the whole of the hymn: 

mām āsan | te ha nākam mahimānaḥ sachanta yatra pūrvo sādh-
yāḥ santi devāḥ |

“1. Purusha has a thousand heads,15 a thousand eyes, a thousand feet. On every side enveloping16 the earth, he overpassed17 (it) by a space of ten fingers. 2. Purusha himself is this whole (universe), whatever has been and whatever shall be. He is also the lord of immortality, since (or, when) by food he expands.18 3. Such is his greatness, and Purusha is superior to this. All existences are a quarter of him; and three-fourths of him are that which is immortal in the sky.19 4. With three quarters Purusha mounted upwards. A quarter of him was again produced here. He was then diffused everywhere over things which eat and things which do not eat. 5. From him was was born Virāj, and from Virāj, Purusha.20 When born, he extended beyond the earth, both behind and before. 6. When the gods performed a sacrifice with Purusha as the oblation, the spring was its butter, the summer its fuel, and the autumn its (accompanying) offering. 7. This victim, Purusha, born in the beginning, they immolated on

15 The Atharva-veda (xix. 6, 1) reads sahasra-bāhuh, “having a thousand arms,” the transcriber, perhaps, taking the verse literally, and considering that a being in human form, if he had a thousand eyes and a thousand feet, ought only to have five hundred heads, and not a thousand as in the text of the Rig-veda.
16 For eriteśa in the R. V. the Vaiśasaneśy Sanhitā, 31. 1, reads speiteśa, which seems to mean nearly the same.
17 The word is atyatishtah. Compare the Sātapatha Brāhmaṇa, xiii. 6, 1, 1, and atishtihāvānaḥ in S‘. P. B. iv. 5, 4, 1, 2. Professor Weber renders atyatishtah “occupies” (Indische Studien, ix. 5).
18 The sense of this is obscure. Instead of yad annenaśirohit, the A. V. reads yad anyennābhavat saha, (“that which,” or, “since he”) was with another.”
19 Compare A. V. x. 8, 7: ardhaśa vivam bhuvanaṃ jajñā ādya asya ardhāṃ kva tad babhīva; “with the half he produced the whole world; what became of the (other) half of him?” See also ibid. v. 13.
20 This sentence is illustrated by R. V. x. 72, 5, where it is said, Aditer Daksha ajñayata Dakshād u Aditiḥ pari | “Aditi was born from Daksha and Daksha from Aditi”—a text on which Yāska remarks (Nirukta, xi. 23): tat katham upopadyeta | samāṇa-jananānaḥ syātan iti | api vī deva-dharmena itaretara-janmanāḥ syātan ita-
aretara-prakriti | “how can this be possible? They may have had a common birth; or, conformably with their nature as deities, they may have been produced from one another, and possess the properties of one another.” Compare A. V. 13. 4. 29 ff., where Indra is said to have been produced from a great many other gods, or entities, and they reciprocally from him. In regard to Virāj, compare the notes on the verse before us in my article on the “Progress of the Vedic religion,” etc., in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1865, p. 354.
the sacrificial grass. With him the gods, the Sādhyas, and the rishis sacrificed. 8. From that universal sacrifice were provided curds and butter. It formed those aerial (creatures) and animals both wild and tame. 9. From that universal sacrifice sprang the rich and sāman verses, the metres, and the yajush. 10. From it sprang horses, and all animals with two rows of teeth; kine sprang from it; from it goats and sheep. 11. When (the gods) divided Purusha, into how many parts did they cut him up? what was his mouth? what arms (had he)? what (two objects) are said (to have been) his thighs and feet? 12. The Brāhmaṇa was his mouth; the Rājanya was made his arms; the being (called) the Vaiśya, he was his thighs; the Śūdra sprang from his feet. 13. The moon sprang from his soul (manas), the sun from his eye, Indra and Agni from his mouth, and Vāyu from his breath. 14. From his navel arose the air, from his head the sky, from his feet the earth, from his ear the (four) quarters: in this manner (the gods) formed the worlds. 15. When the gods, performing sacrifice, bound Purusha as a victim, there were seven sticks (stuck up) for it


22 See, however, Vāj. Sanh. xiv. 30, to be quoted below.

23 Compare the Kaushitaki Brāhmaṇa Upaṇishad, ii. 9: *atha paunyamāyām purastāḥ chandramasam drājyomānām upatiṣṭhatā etayā eva evatvā "somo rājāśi vichakṣhato paṇeke mukhāḥ suṣṭhitāḥ | brāhmaṇas te ekam mukham | tena mukhena viṣṇoḥ tesi | tena mukhena mām annādam kuru | rājā te ekam mukham | tena mukhena viṣṇoḥ tesi | tena mukhena mām annūdam kuru | svanās te ekam mukham "ityūdāḥ | which is thus translated by Mr. Cowell: "Next on the day of the full moon let him in this same way adore the moon when it is seen in front of him (saying), 'thou art Soma, the brilliant, the wise, the five-mouthed, the lord of creatures. The Brāhmaṇa is one mouth of thine, with that mouth thou eatest kings, with that mouth make me to eat food. The king is one mouth of thine, with that mouth thou eatest common men, with that mouth make me to eat food. The hawk is one mouth of thine," etc. The fourth mouth is fire, and the fifth is in the moon itself. I should prefer to render the words *somo rājāśi, *"thou art king Soma,"—"king" being a frequent designation of this god in the Brāhmaṇas. See also M. Bh. iii. 12,962, where Vishnu is introduced as saying in the same mystical way: *Brahma vāytram bhujau kṣattram ūrū me saṁśītah viśāh | pādu sūdrāḥ bhavatime vikramena kraṇena cha | "The Brāhmaṇa is my mouth; the Kṣattriya is my arms; the Viṣṇa is my thighs; these Śūdras with their vigour and rapidity are my feet." 24 Instead of ūrū, "thighs," the Atharva-veda, xix. 6, 6, reads *madhyam, "middle."

25 The Vāj. S. xxxi. 13, has a different and singular reading of the last half verse: *saṁśītād vāyus'cha prānas'cha mukhād agnim ajñyata | "From his ear came Vāyu and Prāṇa (breath) and from his mouth Agni."
(around the fire), and thrice seven pieces of fuel were made. 16. With sacrifice the gods performed the sacrifice. These were the earliest rites. These great powers have sought the sky, where are the former Śūdhyas, gods.726

I have above (p. 7) intimated an opinion that this hymn does not belong to the most ancient portion of the Rig-veda. This view is, however, controverted by Dr. Haug, who, in his tract on "the origin of Brāhmanism" (published at Poona in 1863), p. 5, writes as follows: "The few scholars who have been engaged in the study of the Vedas unanimously regard this hymn as a very late production of Vedic poetry; but there is no sufficient evidence to prove that. On the contrary, reasons might be adduced to shew that it is even old. The mystical character of the hymn is no proof at all of its late origin. Such allegorical hymns are to be met with in every book of the collection of the mantras, which goes by the name of Rig-veda samhitā. The Rishis, who were the authors of these hymns, delighted in such speculations. They chiefly were suggested to them by the sacrificial rites, which they daily were performing. According to the position which is assigned to it in the Yajur-veda (where it is found among the formulas referring to the human sacrifice), the hymn appears to have been used at the human sacrifices. That, at the earliest period of the Vedic time, human sacrifices were quite common with the Brahmans, can be proved beyond any doubt. But the more eminent and distinguished among their leaders soon abandoned the practice as revolting to human feelings. The form of the sacrifice, however, seems to have been kept for a long time; for the ritual required at that occasion is actually in the Yajur-veda; but they only tied men of different castes and classes to the sacrificial posts, and released them afterwards, sacrificing animals instead of them."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Prajāpatir akāmaya ta "prajāyetha" iti | sa mukhatas trivritam nirmāminīta | tam Agnir devatā 'navasūyata gāyatri ohandro rathantaram
sāma brāhmaṇo manushyāṇām ājaḥ paśunām | tasmāt te mukhyāḥ mukhato
hy asriyantā | uraso bāhuhyām panchadaśam niramītā | tam Indro
devatā 'nvasrīyāta trishṭup cHANDO brihat sāma rājanyo manushyāṇām
aviḥ paśunām | tasmāt te vīryāvanto vīryād hy asriyanta | madhy-
ataḥ saptadaśah niramītā | tam Viśvedevāḥ devataḥ anvasrīyanta
jagati chHando vairūpam sāma vaisyo manushyāṇām guṇah paśunām
| tasmāt te ādyā annadhanād hy asriyanta | tasmād bhāyāṁso 'nye-
bhyaḥ | bhāyishthāḥ hi devataḥ anvasrīyanta | pattaḥ ekaviṁśaṁ
niramītā | tam anushṭup chHando 'nvasrīyāta vairūpam sāma śudro
manushyāṇām aśvāḥ paśunām | tasmāt tau bhūta-saṅkrāminiḥ aśvāḥ
cha śudrāḥ cha | tasmāt śudro yajne 'navakṛipto na hi devataḥ an-
vasrīyanta | tasmāt pādāv upajīvataḥ | pattaḥ hy asriyētām |
"Brajāpati desired, 'may I propagate.' He formed the Trivṛt
(stoma) from his mouth. After it were produced the deity Agni,
the metre Gāyatrī, the Sāman (called) Rathantara, of men the Brāhma-
man, of beasts the goats. Hence they are the chief (mukhyāḥ),
because they were created from the mouth (mukhataḥ). From (his)
breast, from (his) arms, he formed the Panchadaśa (stoma). After
it were created the god Indra, the Trishṭubh metre, the Sāman
(called) Brihat, of men the Rājanya, of beasts the sheep. Hence
they are vigorous, because they were created from vigour. From
(his) middle he formed the Saptadaśa (stoma). After it were created
the gods (called) the Viśvedevas, the Jagati metre, the Sāman called
the Vairūpa, of men the Vaiśya, of beasts kine. Hence they are to
be eaten, because they were created from the receptacle of food.
Wherefore they are more numerous than others, for the most numerous
deities were created after (the Saptadaśa). From his foot he formed
the Ekaviṁśa (stoma). After it were created the Anushṭubh metre, the
Sāman called Vairāja, of men the Śudra, of beasts the horse. Hence
these two, both the horse and the Śudra, are transporters of (other)
creatures. Hence (too) the Śudra is incapacitated for sacrifice, because
no deities were created after (the Ekaviṁśa). Hence (too) these two
subsist by their feet, for they were created from the foot."
Sect. III.—Citations from the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, the Vajasaneyi Sanhitā, and the Atharva-veda.

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

S. P. Br. ii. 1, 4, 11 ff.—“ Bhūr” iti vai Prajāpatiṁ ājanayata “bhuvah” ity antarikṣham “svar” iti diyaṁ | etavād vai idam sarvāṁ yāvad ime lokah | sarveṣa eva ādhyate | “bhūr” iti vai Prajāpatiṁ brahma ājanayata “bhuvah” iti kṣattram “svar” iti viṣam | etavād vai idam sarvāṁ yāvad brahma kṣattraiṁ viṭ | sarveṣa eva ādhyate | “bhūr” iti vai Prajāpatiṁ ātmānam ājanayata “bhuvah” iti prajāṁ “svar” iti paśuṁ | etavād vai idam sarvāṁ yāvad ātmā praṇāḥ paśuvaḥ | sarveṣa eva ādhyate |

“(Uttering) ‘bhūḥ,’ Prajāpati generated this earth. (Uttering) ‘bhuvah,’ he generated the air, and (uttering) ‘svāḥ,’ he generated the sky. This universe is co-extensive with these worlds. (The fire) is placed with the whole. Saying ‘bhūḥ,’ Prajāpati generated the Brahma ; (saying) ‘bhuvah,’ he generated the Kṣattriya ; (and saying) ‘svāḥ,’ he generated the Viṣ. All this world is so much as the Brahma, Kṣattriya, and Viṣ. The fire is placed with the whole. (Saying) ‘bhūḥ,’ Prajāpati generated himself; (saying) ‘bhuvah’ he generated offspring; (saying) ‘svāḥ,’ he generated animals. This world is so much as self, offspring, and animals. (The fire) is placed with the whole.”

Taitt. Br. iii. 12, 9, 2.— Sarvaṁ hedaṁ brahmaṇaṁ haiva srishtaṁ | rīghyo jatam vaiśyaṁ varṇam āhuh | yajurvedam kṣhattriyasyāhur yonim | sāmavedo brahmaṇanāṁ prasūṭiḥ | pūrve pūrvebhyo vacha etad āchuḥ |

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

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

Vājasaney Sanhitā, xiv. 28 ff. (Taittiriya Sanhitā, iv. 3, 10, 1).—ekayā astuvata prajāḥ adhiyanta Prajāpatir adhipatir āsīt | tisrībhīr astuvata brahma asrīyata Brahmanaspātir adhipatir āsīt | pañchaḥ bhūtān ṣrīyanta Bhūtanāmpātir adhipatir āsīt | saptabhīr astuvata sapta rishayo 'ṣrīyanta Dhatā adhipatir āsīt | navabhir astuvata pitaro 'ṣrīyanta Adītir adhipatī āsīt | ekādaśabhir astuvata pitavo 'ṣrīyanta ārtavāḥ adhipatayaḥ āsān | trayoḍāsbhir astuvata mūsā ṣrīyanta samvatsaro 'dhīpatair āsīt | pañchadaśabhir astuvata kṣattradma asrīyata Indro 'adhīpatir āsīt | saptadaśabhir astuvata pāsavo 'ṣrīyanta Bṛihṣaspātir adhipatir āsīt | navadaśabhir astuvata sūdravīśa ṣrīyayetām ahorātre adhipatī āsām | ekaviniṣṭatāḥ astuvata ekādaśabhir pāsavo 'ṣrīyanta Varun' dhīpatir āsīt | trayoviniṣṭatāḥ astuvata kṣudrāḥ pāsavo 'ṣrīyanta Pūṣaḥ adhipatir āsīt | panchaviṇīṣṭatāḥ astuvata aranyāḥ pāsavo 'ṣrīyanta Vāyura adhipatir āsīt | saptaviṇīṣṭatāḥ astuvata dyāvatprīti evaṃ | Vaso Vindā ṣrīyanta svasaṃpatayo 'ṣrīyanta Soma 'dhīpatir āsīt | ekaviṇīṣṭatāḥ astuvata prajāḥ asrīyanta yavāḥ cha ayavāḥ cha adhipatayaḥ āsān | trayaviṇīṣṭatāḥ astuvata bhūtān āsāmyaḥ Prajāpatiḥ Parameshtāḥ adhipatir āsīt |

"He lauded with one. Living beings were formed: Prajāpati was the ruler. He lauded with three: the Brahman (Brāhman) was created: Brahmanaspāti was the ruler. He lauded with five: existing things were created: Bhūtanāmpati was the ruler. He lauded with seven: the seven rishis were created: Dātṛi was the ruler. He lauded with nine: the Fathers were created: Adītī was the ruler. He lauded with eleven: the seasons were created: the Ārtaivas were the rulers. He lauded with thirteen: the months were created: the year was the ruler. He lauded with fifteen: the Kshattria (the Kshattriya) was created: Indra was the ruler. He lauded with seventeen: animals were created: Bṛihṣaspāti was the ruler. He lauded with nineteen: the Sudra and the Arya (Vaiśya) were created: day and night were the rulers. He lauded with twenty-one: animals with undivided hoofs were created: Varuṇa was the ruler. He lauded with twenty-three:
small animals were created: Pūshan was the ruler. He lauded with twenty-five: wild animals were created: Vāyu was the ruler (compare R.V. x. 90, 8). He lauded with twenty-seven: heaven and earth separated: Vasus, Rudras, and Ādityas separated after them: they were the rulers. He lauded with twenty-nine: trees were created: Soma was the ruler. He lauded with thirty-one: living beings were created: The first and second halves of the month 31 were the rulers. He lauded with thirty-one: existing things were tranquillized: Prajāpati Parameshṭhin was the ruler.” This passage is explained in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa viii. 4, 3, 1 ff.

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

S. P. Br. xiv. 4, 2, 23 (= Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad, i. 4, 11 ff. (p. 235).—Brahma vai idam agrē aśīt ekam eva[| tad ekaṁ sam na vyabhavat | | tat śreya rūpam aty asrijata kshattrām yāny etāni devatā kshattrāṇi | Indro Varunaḥ Somo Rudraḥ Parjanyo Yamo Mṛityur Īśanah iti | tasmāt kshattrāṁ param nāsti | tasmād brāhmaṇāḥ kshattriyād ādhatād upāste rājasūye kshatre eva tad yaśo dadhāti | sā etsa kshattrasya yonir yad brahma | tasmād yadyāpi rājā paramatām gachhate brahma eva antataḥ upaniśratayā svām yonim | yaḥ u ha enaṁ hinaṁ svām sa yonim richiḥti | sa pāpyānaṁ bhavati yathā śreyāṁ sam hiṁsātvā | 24. Sa na eva vyabhavat | sa viśam asrijata yāny etāni deva-jātāni gaṇāḥ śākyāyaṁ vasava rudrāḥ ādityāḥ visvedvāḥ marutāḥ iti | 25. Sa na eva vyabhavat | sa saudram varṇaṁ asrijata pūshaṇam | iyāṁ vai pūsha yaṁ hi idam sarvaṁ pushyaṁ yad idaṁ kīnaḥ | 26. Sa na eva vyabhavat | tat śreya rūpam aty asrijata dharmaṁ | tad etat kshattrasya kshattrāṁ yad dharmaḥ | tasmād dharmaṁ param nāsti | ātha abaliyān baliyāṁsam āsāṁśate dharmēṇa yathā rājṇā evam | yo vai sa dharmaḥ satyaṁ vai tat | tasmāt satyaṁ vädantam āhir “dharmaṁ vādati” iti | dharmāṁ vā

31 The Taśtitrīya Sanhitā reads yūvāḥ and ayyūvāḥ (instead of yūvāḥ and ayyūvāḥ as in the Vājasaneyi Sanhitā) and in another passage, v. 3, 4, 5 (as I learn from Prof. Aufrecht), explains these terms to mean respectively months and half months (aṁśi na yūvāḥ ardhāṁśeḥ ayyāvāḥ), whilst the commentator on the V. S. understands them to mean the first and second halves of the month, in accordance with the S. P. B. viii. 4; 3, 18, and vii. 4, 2, 11 (pūrapakṣāḥ vai yūvāḥ aparaṇapakṣaḥ ayyāvāḥ | te hi idaṁ sarvaṁ yuvate chāyāvate cha) | Prof. Aufrecht also points out that yūva is explained in Kātyayana’s Śrauta Sūtras, iv. 11, 8, as equivalent to pūrapasya apūpam, “a cake of barley.”
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vadantam “satyam vadati” iti | etad hy eva etad ubhayam bhavati |
27. Tat etad brahma kshattraṁ viṣ śudraḥ | tad Āgninā eva deshu brahmābhavaḥ brahmaṇo manushyeshu kshattryena kshatriyo vaisyena vaisyah śudreṇa śudraḥ | tasmād Āgnin eva deshu lokam ichhante brahmaṇe manushyeshu | etābhyaṁ hi rūpaḥbhyaṁ brahma abhayat |

23. “Brahma (here, according to the commentator, existing in the form of Agni, and representing the Brāhman caste) was formerly this (universe), one only. Being one, it did not develop. It energetically created an excellent form, the Kshattraya, viz., those among the gods who are powers (kṣhattrāṇi), Indra, Varuṇa, Soma, Rudra, Parjanya, Yama, Mṛtyu, Īśāna. Hence nothing is superior to the Kshattraya. Therefore the Brāhman sits below the Kshatriya at the rājasūya-sacrifice; he confers that glory on the Kshattraya (the royal power). This, the Brahma, is the source of the Kshattraya. Hence, although the king attains supremacy, he at the end resorts to the Brahma as his source. Whoever destroys him (the Brāhman) destroys his own source. He becomes most miserable, as one who has injured a superior. 24. He did not develop. He created the Viś—viz., those classes of gods who are designated by troops, Vasus, Rudras, Ādityas, Viśvedevas, Maruts. 25. He did not develop. He created the Śuddha class, Pūshan. This earth is Pūshan: for she nourishes all that exists. 26. He did not develop. He energetically created an excellent form, Justice (Dharma). This is the ruler (kṣhattrā) of the ruler (kṣhattrā), namely, Justice. Hence nothing is superior to justice. Therefore the weaker seeks (to overcome) the stronger by justice, as by a king. This justice is truth. In consequence they say of a man who speaks truth, ‘he speaks

\[33 \text{Atra yad ātma-sabdenoktaṁ srasṛtri Brahma tad Āgniṁ srīṇātvā agre Agni-rū-

pūpānam Brāhmaṇya-jāty-abhīmānavad asmin vākye Brahma-sabdenābhūhāhyate} \]

\[33 \text{This rendering of the last few words is suggested by Professor Aufrecht. The} \]

\[\text{commentators understand them to mean that the Brāhmas give the king their own} \]

\[\text{glory (that of being a Brahmā): and they refer to a formula by which at the} \]

\[\text{rājasūya-sacrifice the king, after addressing the priest as Brāhman, is addressed in return} \]

\[\text{with the word “Thou, king, art a Brāhmān” (teṣāṁ rājan brahmāṁ), etc. See the} \]

\[\text{Taittirīya Sanhitā i. 8, 16, 1, where the commentator remarks. “As in common life} \]

\[\text{domestic priests and others, sitting below a king seated on his throne after his return from} \]

\[\text{conquering a foreign territory, address him with many benedictions and eulogies, so} \]

\[\text{here too service is presented. By this benedictory service the power of cursing and} \]

\[\text{showing kindness existing in the Brāhmas is transferred to the king.” Reference is} \]

\[\text{then made to the passage before us, as noticing this custom.} \]
justice;’ or of a man who is uttering justice, ‘he speaks truth.’ For this is both of these. 27. This is the Brahma, Kshattriya, Visé, and Südra. Through Agni it became Brahma among the gods, the Brähman among men, through the (divine) Kshattriya a (human) Kshattriya, through the (divine) Vaisya a (human) Vaisya, through the (divine) Südra a (human) Südra. Wherefore it is in Agni among the gods and in a Brähman among men, that they seek after an abode.”

Taittirīya Brähmana, i. 2, 6, 7.—Daivyə vai varṇo brāhmaṇaḥ | asuryyo śūdraḥ. “The Brähman caste is sprung from the gods; the Südra from the Asuras.”

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

Atharva-veda, iv. 6, 1.—Brāhmaṇo jajne prathamo aśaśirṣho dāsaśyaḥ | sa somam prathamaḥ papau sa chakārārasaṁ visham | “The Brähman was born the first, with ten heads and ten faces. He first drank the soma; he made poison powerless.”

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

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

Taittirīya Sanhitā, ii. 4, 13, 1.—Devā vai rājanyāḥ jayamāṇāḥ abibhayuḥ | tam antar eva santāṁ dāmnā ’paumbhan | sa vai esho ’pobhā jāyate yad rājanyo | yad vai esho ’napobhā jāyeta vrittrān ghaṁś charet | yam kūmayeta rājanyam “anapobhā jāyeta vrittrān ghaṁś charēd” iti tasmai etam aindra-bārhaspatyaṁ charuṁ nirvapet | aindro vai rājanyo
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_brahma Brihaspatiḥ | brahmaṇā ēva ēnaṁ dāmnō 'pombhanād muñčati | hiranmayāṁ dāma dakshiṇā sākshād ēva ēnaṁ dāmnō 'pombhanād muñčati |."  "The gods were afraid of the Rājanya when he was in the womb. They bound him with bonds when he was in the womb. Consequently this Rājanya is born bound. If he were born unbound he would go on slaying his enemies. In regard to whatever Rājanya any one desires that he should be born unbound, and should go on slaying his enemies, let him offer for him this Aindra-Bārhapattyā oblation. A Rājanya has the character of Indra, and a Brahman is Brihaspati. It is through the Brahman that anyone releases the Rājanya from his bond. The golden bond, a gift, manifestly releases from the bond that fetters him."

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

_So 'rajyata tato rājanyo 'jāyata |

"He (the Vrātya) became filled with passion: thence sprang the Rājanya."

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

_Tad yasya evaṁ vidvān vrātyo rājno 'tīthir gṛihāṇ āgachhet ḫreyāṁśam enaṁ ātmano mānayet | tathā kṣhattrāya nāvrischate tathā rāṣṭrāya nāvrischate | ato vai brahma cha kṣhattrān cha udatishṭhatām | te abrūtām "kam praviśāva" iti |

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

Sect. IV.—Further Quotations from the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, Sāṅhitā, and Aranyaka, and from the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa.

The following passages belong to the third of the classes above adverted to, as in the descriptions they give of the creation, while they refer to the formation of men, they are silent on the subject of any separate origination of castes:
AND OF THE ORIGIN OF THE FOUR CASTES.

Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa, ii. 3, 8, 1.—Prajāpati akāmayata “prajāyeya” īśi | sa tepo 'tapyata | so 'ntarvān abhavat | sa haritaḥ śyāvo 'bhavat | tasmāt striḥ antaratiḥ harinī sati śyāvā bhavati | sa vijāyamāno garbhena atāmyat | sa tāntāḥ krishna-śyāvo 'bhavat | tasmāt tāntāḥ kriṣṇaḥ śyāvo bhavati | tasya asur eva ajīvat | 2. Tena asūnā asūrāṁ asrijata | tad asūrānām asurātvaṁ | ya evam asurānām asurātvaṁ veda asūmān eva bhavati | na enam asur jahāti | so 'surān śrīśtvā pitā iva amanyata | tad anu pitrīn asrijata | tat pitrīnām pitrītvam | ya evam pitrīnām pitrītvam veda pitā iva eva svānām bhavati (3) yanto asya pituro havam | sa pitrīn śrīśtvā 'manasyat | tad anu manushyān asrijata | tad manuṣhyānān manushyatvam | yaḥ evam manushyānān manushyatvām veda manavā iva bhavati na enam manur jahāti | tasmāi manushyān susri-jānāya divā devatārā abhavat | tad anu devān asrijata | tad devānāṁ devatvam | ya evam devānāṁ devatvām veda divā ha eva asya devatārā bhavati | tāni vai etāni chatvāri ambhāmsi devāḥ manushiḥ pitaro 'surāḥ | teshu sarveshu ambho nabhāḥ iva bhavati |

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

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

Satapatha Brahmana, vii. 5, 2, 6.—Prajāpatir vai idam agre āsid ekaḥ eva | so ’kāmayata “annam, eṣṭiṣyayā praṇayeṣa” iti | sa praṇeṣhaṁ ēva adhi pāśīn nirānimīta manasaḥ purusham chakshuḥso ’ṣeam praṇād gūm śrōtrādavim vāche ’jam | tad yad ēnān praṇeṣhyo ’dhī nirānimīta tasmād ātuḥ “praṇāḥ praṣavaḥ” iti | mano vai praṇānāṁ praṭhānam | tad yad manasaḥ purusham nirānimīta tasmād ātuḥ “puruṣaḥ praṭha-maḥ pāśūnāṁ vīryyavattamaḥ” iti | mano vai sarve praṇāḥ | manasi hi sarve praṇāḥ praṭihitiḥ | tad yad manasaḥ purusham nirānimīta tasmād ātuḥ “puruṣaḥ sarve praṣavaḥ” iti | puruṣhasya by ēte sarve bhavanti |

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

S. P. Br. xiv. 4, 2, 1 (=Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad, p. 125).—Ātmā eva idam agre āsit puruṣa-vidhāḥ | so ’nuvākṣhya na anyād atmano ’paṣyat | “so ’ham asmi” ity agre vyāharat | tato ’haṁ-nāma abhavat | tasmād aṣṭu ētpary āmantrito ’ham ayam” ity eva agre uktra ātha anyād nāma prabṛte yad asya bhavati | 2. Sa yat pūrvo ’smāt sarvasmAṣmat sarvān pāṇmaṇaḥ aushat tasmāt puruṣaḥ | oṣati ha vai sa taṁ yo ’smāt pūr-vam bhūhshati yāḥ evaṁ vedā | 3. Lo ’bibhet | tasmād ekāki bibheti |

36 The Commentary not very satisfactorily explains this as meaning, “All these four abodes of the gods, etc., are like waters—i.e., suited to yield enjoyment, as ponds, rivers, etc., are fit for bathing, drinking,” etc. The phrase is repeated in the Vishnu Purāṇa, 1. 5 (vol. i., p. 79, of Dr. Hall’s edition); and in his note Professor Wilson says ambhāṁsi “is also a peculiar and probably a mystic term.” It is explained in the Vāyu Purāṇa, as will be seen further on. The last words of the quotation from the Brahmaṇa are obscure. In another passage of the same work (iii. 8, 18, 1, 2) the terms ambhas, nabhas, and maḥas, are declared to denote respectively “earth,” “air,” and “sky” ( . . . ayaṁ vai loke ’nabhāṁsi . . . antarikṣhaṁ vai nabhāṁsi . . . asaṁ vai loke maḥāṁsi).
AND OF THE ORIGIN OF THE FOUR CASTES.


“This universe was formerly soul only, in the form of Purusha. Looking closely, he saw nothing but himself (or soul). He first said, ‘This is I.’ Then he became one having the name of I. Hence even now a man, when called, first says, ‘this is I,’ and then declares the other name which he has. 2. Inasmuch as he, before (pūrvaḥ) all this, burnt up (auskat) all sins, he (is called) purusha. The man who knows this burns up the person who wishes to be before him. 3. He was afraid. Hence a man when alone is afraid. This (being) considered that ‘there is no other thing but myself: of what am I afraid?’ Then his fear departed. For why should he have feared? It is of a second person that people are afraid. 4. He did not enjoy happiness. Hence a person when alone does not enjoy happiness. He desired a second. He was so much as a man and a woman when locked in embrace. 5. He caused this same self to fall asunder into two parts. Hence arose a husband and a wife.38 Hence Yājvanalkya has said that ‘this one’s self is like the half39 of a split pea.’ Hence the void is filled up by

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

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

Tattirīya Sanhitā vi. 5, 6, 1 f.—Aditiḥ putrakāmā sādhyebhyo deve-bhyo brahmaudanam apachat | tasyai uchchheshanam addauḥ | tat praśnāt sā reto 'dhatta | tasyai chatvārah Adityāḥ ajayanta | sā devīyam apachat | sā 'manyata "uchchhesanād me ime 'jñata | yad agre praśishyāmi ito me eṣāyāṁśa janishyante" iti | sā 'gre praśnāt sā reto 'dhatta tasyai vy'riddham āndam ajayata | sā Adityebhyah eva tritiyam apachat "bhogāya me idam kṛntam astu" iti | to 'bruvan "varam vṛṇāmakhai yo 'to jāyatai asmākāṁ sa eko 'sat | yo 'sya prajāyam riddhyātai asmākam bhogāya bhavād" iti | tato Vivasvān Adityo 'jyata | tasya vai iyam prajā yad manushyāḥ | tāsv ekāḥ eva riddho yo yajate sa devānām bhogāya bhavati |

"Aditi, desirous of sons, cooked a Brahmanda oblation for the gods the Sādhyas. They gave her the remnant of it. This she ate. She conceived seed. Four Adityas were born to her. She cooked a second (oblation). . . She reflected, 'from the remains of the oblation these sons have been born to me. If I shall eat (the oblation) first, more brilliant estimation in which women were held by the authors of the Brāhmaṇas was very high, as there are other texts in which they are spoken of disparagingly; such as the following: Taitt. Sanh. vi. 5, 8, 2.—Sa soma nātishṭhata strīḥhyo grihyamānāḥ | tam ghrītaṁ vastraṁ krītāṁ ghrītaṁ tam nirindriyam bhūtam apṛthiṇām | tasmāt striyo nirindriyā adāyādār api pāpiṇā puṁsa upastītāram vadamān | "Soma did not abide, when being poured out to women. Making that butter a thunderbolt they smote it. They poured it out when it had become powerless. Hence women, powerless, and portionless, speak more humbly than even a poor man." (Compare the quotation in the Commentary on the Taitt. Sanhitā, Vol. i. p. 996.) Taitt. Sanh. vi. 5, 10, 3. Tasmāt striyaḥ jātām parādayanti ut pumāṁsasm haranti | "Hence they reject a female (child) when born, and take up a male." (Compare Nirukta, iii. 4.)

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

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

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

Taitt. Br. ii. 2, 9, 1 ff.—Iḍaṁ vai agre naiva kinchana āsīt | na dyaur āśīd na prīthivī na antariksham | tad asād eva sad mano 'kuruta "syām" iti | tad atāpyata | tasmāt tapanādhīmō jāyata | tad bhūyo 'tapyata tasmāt tapanād Āgnir ājāyata | tad bhūyo 'tapyata | 2. Tasmāt tapanāj jyotir ājāyata | tad bhūyo 'tapyata | tasmāt tapanād archīr ājāyata | tad bhūyo 'tapyata | tasmāt tapanām marichayo ājāyanta | tad bhūyo 'tapyata | tasmāt tapanād udārāḥ ājāyanta | tad bhūyo 'tapyata | tad abhram īva

41 Compare Taitt. Br. i. 8, 8, 1. Ādityāḥ vai prajāḥ, "Creatures are descended from Āditi."

42 This story is told also, but with more detail of names and somewhat differently, in Taitt. Br. i. 1, 9, 10 ff. Āditiḥ prutakōmā sādhyebhya devoteebhya brahmaudanam apachat | tasyai uchchheśaḥanam adaduḥ | tat prūśnāt | sū reto 'dhatta | tasyai Dhātiḥ ca Aryanā ca ajāyetām | sū devitiyam apachat tasyai uchchheśaḥanam adaduḥ | tat prūśnāt | sū reto 'dhatta | tasyai Mitraḥ ca Varuṇaḥ ca ajāyetām | sū tritiyam apachat | tasyai uchchheśaḥanam adaduḥ | tat prūśnāt | sū reto 'dhatta | tasyai Aṁśataḥ Bhagāḥ ca ajāyetām | sū chaturtham apachat | tasyai uchchheśaḥanam adaduḥ | tat prūśnāt | sū reto 'dhatta tasyai Indraḥ ca Vivasvānḥ ca ajāyetām | "Aditi, desirous of sons, cooked a Brahmaudana oblation to the gods the Sādhyas. They gave her the remnant of it. She ate it. She conceived seed. Dhātri and Aryaman were born to her." She does the same thing a second time, when she bears Mitra and Varuṇa,—a third time, when she bears Aṁśa and Bhaga,—and a fourth time, when she bears Indra and Vivasvat.
MYTHICAL ACCOUNTS OF THE CREATION OF MAN,

samanahyata | tad vastim abhinat | 3. Sa samudro 'bhavat | tasmāt samudrasya na pibanti | prajanam eva hi manyante | tasmāt paśor jayamanād āpah purastād yanti | tad dāshatā anvāsrijata | Prajāpatir vai dāshahātā | yaḥ evaṁ tapasū vibhāṁs tapyaṁ bhavaty eva | tad vai idam āpah salilam āsit | so 'rodit Priyāpatih (4) "sa kamsai ajñi yadyasyāpratishtāhyāḥ" iti | yaḥ api eva upāvādyaṁ sā prāthivy abhavat | yad vyamrīṣṭa tad antariksham abhavat | yad urāvam udāmrista sa āyaur abhavat | yad arōdit tad anayoḥ rodastvam | 5. Yaḥ evaṁ veda na asya grihe rudanti | etad vai eṣahām lokānāṁ janma | ya evam eṣahām lokānāṁ janma veda na eshu lokeshō ārttim ārohhi | sa ināṁ pratishtām avindata | sa ināṁ pratishtāṁ vittvā akāmayata "prajāyeya" iti | sa tapo 'tappata | so 'ntarvān abhavat | sa jaganād asurān asrijata | 6. Tēbhya mṛṇmaye pātre 'nnaṁ adhutaḥ | ya asya sā tanur āsit tām apāhata | sā tamārā 'bhavat | so 'kāmayata "prajāyeya" iti | sa tapa 'tappata | so 'ntarvān abhavat | sa prajanānād eva prajāḥ asrijata | tasmād inaṁ bhāyishthāḥ | prajanānād hy enāḥ asrijata | 7. Tēbhya dārumaye pātre payo 'dhuḥ | ya asya sā tanur āsit tām apāhata | sa jyotsṇā 'bhavat | so 'kāmayata "prajāyeya" iti | sa tapo 'tappata so 'ntarvān abhavat | sa upapakshāhyāṁ eva ritān asrijata | tebhya rajate pātre ghrīnam adhutam | ya asya sā tanur āsit (8) tām apāhata | so 'ho-ratravoh sandhir abhavat | so 'kāmayata "prajāyeya" iti | sa tapo'tappata | so 'ntarvān abhavat | sa mukhād devān asrijata | tebhya harite pātre somam adhutam | ya asya sā tanur āsit tām apāhata | tad ahar abhavat | 9. Ete vai Priyāpatere dōhāḥ | ya evaṁ veda duhe eva prajāḥ | "dīvā vai no 'bhād" iti tād devānām devatvaṁ | ya evaṁ devānāṁ devatvaṁ veda devān eva bhavati | etad vai aho-ratrāgam janma | ya evam aho-hratrāgam janma veda na aho-ratreshu ārttim ārohhi | 10. Asato 'dhī mano 'srijyata | manaḥ Prajāpatim asrijata | Prajāpatih prajāḥ asrijata | tad vai idam manasya eva paramam pratishtitam yaddaṁ kīchā | tad etat svavasyasaṁ nāma Brahma | vyuchhanti vyuchhanti asmai vasyasi vasyasi vyuchhati prajāyate prajāyā paśubhiḥ pra prameshthino mātrām āpnoti ya evam veda | "At first this (universe) was not anything. There was neither sky, nor earth, nor air. Being non-existent, it resolved 'let me be.' It became fervent. From that fervour smoke was produced. It again

43 The word thus rendered is atapaya, which has the sense of "being heated" as well as "practising austere abstraction." I have purposely given an equivocal rendering, which may bear either sense.
became fervent. From that fervour fire was produced. It again became fervent. From that fervour-light was produced. It again became fervent. From that fervour flame was produced. It again became fervent. From that fervour rays were produced. It again became fervent. From that fervour blazes were produced. It again became fervent. It became condensed like a cloud. It clove its bladder. That became the sea. Hence men do not drink of the sea. For they regard it as like the place of generation. Hence water issues forth before an animal when it is being born. After that the Daśahotri (a particular formula) was created. Prajāpati is the Daśahotri. That man succeeds, who thus knowing the power of austere abstraction (or fervour), practises it. This was then water, fluid. Prajāpati wept, (exclaiming), (4) 'For what purpose have I been born, if (I have been born) from this which forms no support?' That which fell into the waters became the earth. That which he wiped away, became the air. That which he wiped away, upwards, became the sky. From the circumstance that he wept (arodit), these two regions have the name of rodast, (worlds). 5. They do not weep in the house of the man who knows this. This was the birth of these worlds. He who thus knows the birth of these worlds, incurs no suffering in these worlds. He obtained this (earth as a) basis. Having obtained (this earth as a) basis, he desired, 'May I be propagated.' He practised austere fervour. He became pregnant. He created Asuras from his abdomen. 6. To them he milked out food in an earthen dish. He cast off that body of his. It became darkness. He desired, 'May I be propagated.' He practised

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

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

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

47 Compare S’. P. Br. xi. 1, 6, 8: Atho yo 'yam avān praṇas tena asurān asṛjata | te imiṁ eva prithivīṁ abhipadya asṛjyante | tasmaī saṣṛjūṇāya tamaḥ ēva ēsa | 9. So 'vēt " pūṁmaṁvai asṛkutiḥ yasmaī me saṣṛjūṇāya tamaḥ ēva abhūd" iti | tūṁs tataḥ eva pūṁmanā 'vidhyat tataḥ eva te parābhavann ityādi | "Then he created the Asuras from this lower breath of his. It was only after reaching this earth that they were created. On him, as he continued to create, darkness fell. 9. He understood, 'I have created misery, since darkness has fallen upon me as I was creating.' Then he pierced them with misery, and they in consequence succumbed," etc. The word rendered in the text by "cast off" is applied in Taitt. Sanh. i. 5, 4, 1, to serpents.
austere fervour. He became pregnant. He created living beings (prajāh) from his organ of generation. Hence they are the most numerous because he created them from his generative organ. 8. To them he milked out milk in a wooden dish. He cast off that body of his. It became moon-light. He desired, 'May I be propagated. He practised austere fervour. He became pregnant. He created the seasons from his armpits. To them he milked out butter in a silver dish. He cast off that body of his. It became the period which connects day and night. He desired, 'May I be propagated.' He practised austere fervour. He became pregnant. He created the gods from his mouth. 9. To them he milked out Soma in a golden dish. He cast off that body of his. It became day. 9. These are Prajāpati’s milkings. He who thus knows milkings offsprings. ‘Day (āiva) has come to us!’ this (exclamation expresses) the godhead of the gods. He who thus knows the godhead of the gods, obtains the gods. This is the birth of days and nights. He who thus knows the birth of days and nights, incurs no suffering in the days and nights. 10. Mind (or soul, manas,) was created from the non-existent. Mind created Prajāpati. Prajāpati created offsprings. All this, whatever exists, rests absolutely on mind. This is that Brahma called Svovasya. 49 For the man who thus knows, (Ushas), dawning, dawning, dawns more and more bright; he becomes prolific in offsprings, and (rich) in cattle; he obtains the rank of Parameshṭhin.*

S. P. Br. vi. 1, 2, 11.—Ātha āhuḥ | "Prajāpatir eva imān lokān srishtvā prīthīvyām pratyatisṭhat | tasmai imāh oshadhayo 'nnam apa-chyanta | tud āsnāt | sa garbhi abhavat | sa uryukvebhyaḥ eva prānebhyo devān asrijata | ye 'vāñcaḥ prāṇās tebhyo martyāḥ prajāh" iti’ | yata-mathā ‘spijata tathā ‘spijata | Prajāpatiṣ tv eva idāṁ sarvam asrijata yad idam kīccha |

"Wherefore they say, ‘Prajāpati, having created these worlds, was shedding their old skins (sarpyah vai jīryanto 'manyanta ... tato vai te jīryas tanur apōgnata)."

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

49 The Commentator explains this word to mean "that which each succeeding day becomes transcendently excellent (uttarottara-dīne vasiyo ‘tādayena āreshṭham). Here, he says, the highest and absolute Brahma is not meant, but mind, which has the form of Brahma, and, by means of the series of its volitions, is every successive moment more and more world-creating" (spukalpa-paramparayā pratikshanam uttarottara- dhiku-ja-gat-sraṣṭrītvād īdrg-Brahma-rūpatvād manah prākastam |
supported upon the earth. For him these herbs were cooked as food. That (food) he ate. He became pregnant. He created the gods from his upper vital airs, and mortal offspring from his lower vital airs. In whatever way he created, so he created. But Prajāpati created all this, whatever exists."

S. P. Br. x. 1, 3. 1.—Prajāpatiḥ prajāḥ asrijata | sa ārdhebhyaḥ eva prānebhyaḥ devān asrijata | ye vānchaḥ prānās tebhyaḥ martyrāḥ prajāḥ | atha ārdhavam eva mrityum prajābhyaḥ 'titaram asrijata |

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

Taitt. Ar. i. 23. 1.—Apo vai idam āsan salilam eva | sa Prajāpatir ekaḥ pushkara-parge samabhavat | tasya antar manasi kāmaḥ samavartata "idam sṛjjeyam" iti | tasmād yaḥ purusho manasā 'bhigachhati tad vāchā vadati tat karmanā karoti | tad eshā 'bhyanūkta "kāmas tad agre samavartatādhi | manaso retaḥ prathamāṁ yad āsit | 2. Sato bandhum asati niravadīnḥ hṛdi pratishyāḥ kavayo manishā" iti | upa evaṁ tad upanam-ati yat-kāmo bhavati yaḥ evaṁ veḍa | sa tapo 'tapyata | sa tapas taptvā śarivam adhunata | tasya yaḥ māṁsam āsit tato 'rūṇāḥ Ketavo Vatara-śanāḥ rishayaḥ udatiṣṭhāṇaḥ | 3. Ye nakhas te Vaikhanaśaḥ | ye bālās te Bā lakhiyaḥ | yo rasāḥ so 'pāṁ antarataḥ kārum bhūtām sarpaṁ tam abravīt "mama vai tvan-māṁsā samabhūt" | 4. "na" ity abravīt "pūrvaṁ eva āham iha āsam" iti | tat purushasya purushatvam iti | sa "sahasra-streṣaḥ puruṣaḥ sahasrākṣaḥ sahasra-pāḍ" bhūtvā udatiṣṭhāt | tam abravīt "tvam ve (sic. mo or vai ?) pūrvaṁ samabhūt tvam idam pūrvaṁ kurushi" iti | sa itaḥ adāya apo (5) 'ṅjalinā purastad upādādhāt "eva āva eva" iti | tataḥ Ādityaḥ udatiṣṭhāt | sa prāchī dīk | atha Arunāḥ Ketur dakshiṇataḥ upādāadhād "eva āva Agne" iti | tato vai Agnir udatiṣṭhāt | sa dakshiṇā dīk | atha Arunāḥ Ketuḥ paśchād upādādhād "eva hi Vāyo" iti | 6. Tato Vāyur udatiṣṭhāt | sa pratichi dīk | atha Arunāḥ Ketur uttarataḥ upādādhād "eva hi Indra" iti | tato vai Indraḥ udatiṣṭhāt | sa udāchā dīk | atha Arunāḥ Ketur madhye upādādhād "eva hi Pashann" iti | tato vai Pāśaḥ udatiṣṭhāt | sa iyom dīk | 7. Atha Arunāḥ Ketur uparishṭād upādādhād "eva hi devaḥ" iti | tato deva-manushyaḥ pitaro gandharvāpsarasas cha udatiṣṭhān | sa ur- dhvā dīk | yāḥ viprūṣaḥ vi parāpatau tābhyaḥ 'sṛvāḥ rakshāṁsī pīṣchās- cha udatiṣṭhān | tasmāt te parābhāvan viprūḍhīyo 'hi samabhāvan | taa
esā bhyanuktā (8) “apo ha yad brihatir garbam āyaṇ daksham dadhanāḥ
janayantīḥ svayambhūm | tataḥ ime ‘dhyasṛṣṭyaṁ sargāḥ | adbhya vai
idam samabhūt | tasmād idam sarvam Brahmā svayambhū” iti | tasmād
idam sarvaṁ śīthalam iva adhruvam iva abhavat | Prajāpatir vāca tat |
atmanā ātmānāṁ vidhiyā tad eva unuprāviṣat | tad esā ‘bhyanuktā
(9) “vidhiyā lokānām vidhiyām bhutānām vidhiyām sarvāḥ pradīpo dīsāścha
Prajāpatiḥ prathamajāḥ ritasya ātmānā “tmānam abhisāṁviveśa” iti |

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

50 Compare Taitt. S. vi. 3, 10, 4, (quoted by Roth. s. v. abhigam) yad vai hṛdayena
abhigachhati taj jihvāyā vadati |
51 They are mentioned again in Taitt. Ār. i. 24, 4. See Böhlíngk and Roth’s
Lexicon s.v. Ketu (where the Arūṇa Ketu are stated to be a sort of superior beings
or demons); Artharvā-veda, xi. 10, 2; Weber’s Indische Studien, ii. 177; and the
verse of the M. Bh. xii. 774 : Arṇuḫ Ketavūś chaivas svādhūyena divaṁ gatūḥ | “By
sacred study the Arūnas and Ketus have ascended to heaven.”
52 The Sanskrit scholar will observe that the text here is rather obscure. It is either
corrupt, elliptical, or grammatically irregular.
53 Here the Sanskrit, if it be not corrupt, must be irregular and incorrect. On the
style of the Aranyakas, see Mr. E. B. Cowell’s Preface to the Kaushitakti Upanishad,
p. viii., where it is remarked: “The Aranyakas appear to belong to a class of San-
skrit writings, whose history has not yet been thorougly investigated. Their style, if
we may judge from that of the Caiturīya and Kaushitakt, is full of strange solecisms
which sometimes half remind us of the gāthās of the Lalita Vistara. The present
Upanishad has many peculiar forms, some of which are common to both recensions,
while others appear only in one. Such are: nishinchcha, in p. 10; praiti for prayanti,
in p. 51; sāmviṣyaṇ, in p. 56; vetti for vyeti, in p. 78; adudham, in p. 89, etc
(R.V. x. 90, 1), he arose. Prajāpati said to him, 'Thou wert produced before me: do thou first make this.' He took water from this (5) in the cavity of his two hands, and placed it on the east, repeating the text, 'so be it, o Sun.'\(^54\) From thence the sun arose. That was the eastern quarter. Then Aruṇa Ketu placed (the water) to the south, saying, 'so be it, o Agni.' Thence Agni arose. That was the southern quarter. Then Aruṇa Ketu placed (the water) to the west, saying 'so be it, o Vāyu.' Thence arose Vāyu. That was the western quarter. Then Aruṇa Ketu placed (the water) to the north, saying 'so be it, o Indra.' Thence arose Indra. That is the northern quarter. 'Then Aruṇa Ketu placed (the water) in the centre, saying 'so be it, o Pūshan.' Thence arose Pūshan. That is this quarter. 7. Then Aruṇa Ketu placed (the water) above, saying 'so be it, o gods.' Thence arose gods, men, fathers, Gandharvas and Apsaras. That is the upper quarter. From the drops which fell apart arose the Asuras, Rakshases, and Piśāchas. Therefore they perished, because they were produced from drops. Hence this text has been uttered; (8) 'when the great waters became pregnant, containing wisdom, and generating Svayambhū, from them were created these creations. All this was produced from the waters. Therefore all this is Brahma Svayambhū.' Hence all this was as it were loose, as it were unsteady. Prajāpati was that. Having made himself through himself, he entered into that. Wherefore this verse has been uttered; (9) 'Having formed the world, having formed existing things and all intermediate quarters and quarters, Prajāpati, the firstborn of the ceremonial, entered into himself with himself.'

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

---

\(^{54}\) The formula is in the original evā hy eva. The Commentator says that the first word means "objects of desire to be obtained," and that the second eva signifies "the moving (Sun);" the sense of the entire formula being, "Thou, o Sun, art thyself all objects of desire." The six formulas here introduced had previously occurred at the close of a preceding section, i. 20, 1.
various and even inconsistent; and (3) that they are the sources of
many of the details which are found in a modified form in the cos-
mogonies of the Purāṇas.

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

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

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


“8. He (the self-existent) having felt desire,⁵⁶ and willing to create various living beings from his own body, first created the waters, and threw into them a seed. 9. That seed became a golden egg, of lustre equal to the sun; in it he himself was born as Brahmā, the parent of all the worlds. 10. The waters are called nārāḥ, for they are sprung from Nara; and as they were his first sphere of motion (ayana—path), he is therefore called Nārāyaṇa.⁵⁷ 11. Produced from the imperceptible, eternal, existent and non-existent, cause, that male (purusha) is celebrated in the world as Brahmā. 12. After dwelling for a year in—the egg, the glorious being, himself, by his own contemplation, split it in twain.”

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

i. 31. Lokānāṁ tu viveṛddhyaartham mukhāhāru-pādātaḥ | brāhma-naṁ kshattriyaṁ vaisyaṁ śūrāma cha niravarttayat | 32. Dvidhā kri-tvātmano dehaṁ ardhena purusho ’bhavat | ardhena nāri tasyāṁ sa Virā-jam asṛjat praḥbhūḥ | 33. Tapaṁ taptāṁ ’srijad yaṁ tu sa svayam purusho

⁵⁵ The ideas in this passage are derived (with modifications expressive of the theories current in the author’s own age) from the S’atapatha Brāhmaṇa, xi. 1, 6, 1 ff. (see vol. iv. of this work, p. 21 f.); or from some other similar account in another Brāhmaṇa.
⁵⁶ See S. P. Br. i. 7, 4, 1: Prajaientir ha vai svāṁ dhūtaram abhidhāyaḥ.
⁵⁷ In the M. Bh. iii. 12952, Kriṣṇa says: opāṁ nārāḥ iti purā sanjña-karma kritam mayā | tena Nārāyaṇo pu ukto manuśa tat tv ayonāṁ sadā | “The name of nārāḥ was formerly assigned by me to the waters: hence I am also called Nārāyaṇa, for there has always been my sphere of motion.”
Virāt | taṁ māṁ vittāsyā sarvasya srashtārāṁ dvija-sattamaṁ | 34.
Aham prajāḥ sisrīkhus tu tapas taptvā suduṣkaram | patin prajānāṁ
asrijam maharshin aḍito daśa | 35. Marīchim Atryangiraśau Pulastyam
Pulahāṁ Kratum | Prachetasam Vasīṣṭhaṁ cha Bṛhiguṁ Nāradam
eva cha | 36. Eke Manuṁśa tu sapatānāṁ asrijan bhūritejasāḥ | devān
devanikāyaṁśa cha maharṣiṁśa chaṁiñaujasāḥ | 37. Yaksha-rakṣaḥ-piṣača
cha gandharvaparāso 'surān | nāgān sarpān suparnāṁśa cha pi
trimāṁ cha prithaggaṇān | 38. Vidyuto 'sani-meghāṁśa cha rohitendra-
dhanuṁśa cha | ulkā nirghāta-ketuṁśa cha jetiṁśhy uchchāvahāni cha |
39. Kinnarān vānarān matsyān vividhāṁśa cha vihanagān | paśūn mṛgān
manushyāṁśa cha vyālaṁśa chobhayotadātāḥ | 40. Krimikāṭa-patangāṁśa cha
yūkā-makshika-matkuṇam | sarvāṁ cha daṁsa-maśakam sthāvarāṁ cha
prithagvidham | 41. Evam etair idāṁ sarvam man-niyogād mahātma-
bhīkhiḥ | yathākarma tapo-yogāt eṣitāṁ sthāvāra-jangamam |
31. "That the worlds might be peopled, he created the Brahma, the
Kṣatriya, the Vaiśya, and the Sūdra to issue from his mouth, his
arms, his thighs, and his feet."
32. Having divided his own body into two parts, the lord (Brahmā) became, with the half a male
(purusha), and with the half, a female; and in her he created Virāj.
33. Know, O most excellent twice-born men, that I, whom that male,
(purusha) Virāj, himself created, am the creator of all this world.
34. Desiring to produce living creatures, I performed very arduous
devotion, and first created ten Maharshis (great rishis), lords of living
beings, (35) viz., Marīch, Atri, Angirās, Pulasya, Pulaha, Kratu, 
Prachetas, Vasīṣṭha, Bṛhigu, and Nārada.
36. They, endowed with

On this Kullūka the Commentator remarks: Daivyā cha saktīya mukhādiḥbhya
brāhmaṇādi-nirvāmam Brahmano na visankānyāṁ śruti-siddhatvātm | "It is not to be
doubted that, by his divine power, Brahmā formed the Brāhma and the other castes
from his mouth and the other members, since it is proved by the Veda. He then quotes
the 12th verse of the Purusha Sūkta.
See the Purusha Sūkta, verse 5.
It will be observed that Manu applies this term purusha to three beings, first
to Brahmā (v. 11), second to the male formed by Brahmā from the half of his own
body (v. 32), and third to Virāj, the offspring of the male and female halves of Brahmā's
body (v. 33). It will be noticed that this story of Brahmā dividing his body is
borrowed from the passage of the S. P. Br. xiv. 4, 2, 1, quoted above.
In the Rāmāyaṇa, ii. 110, 2 ff., a different account is given of the origin of the
world, in which no reference is made to Manu Svāyambhuva. The order of the
creation there described is as follows: First everything was water. Then Brahmā
Svāyambhū, with the deities, came into existence—Brahmā being said to have sprung
great energy, created other seven Manus, gods, and abodes of gods, and Maharshis of boundless might; (37) Yakshas, Rakshasas, Pisâchas, Gandharvas, Apsarases, Asuras, Nâgas, Serpents, great Birds, and the different classes of Pitris; (38) lightnings, thunderbolts, clouds, Indra’s bows unbent and bent, meteors, portentous atmospheric sounds, comets, and various luminaries; (39) Kinnaras, apes, fishes, different sorts of birds, cattle, deer, men, beasts with two rows of teeth; (40) small and large reptiles, moths, lice, flies, fleas, all gadflies and gnats, and motionless things of different sorts. 41. Thus by my appointment, and by the force of devotion, was all this world both motionless and moving, created by those great beings, according to the (previous) actions of each creature."

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

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

These great rishis seem to be the beings denoted by the word viśvasṛjâḥ, “creators of the universe,” in the verse of Manu (xii. 50), which will be quoted below. Reference to rishis, or to seven rishis, as “formers of existing things” (dhūta-kritâḥ), is also found in the Atharvaveda, vi. 108, 4; vi. 133, 4, 5; xi. 1, 1, 3, 24; xii. 1, 39; and the word dhūtakritâḥ, without the addition of rishis, is found in the same work iii. 28, 1; iv. 35, 2, and xix. 16, 2.
allegation of the separate creation of castes may have been engraven as an after-thought on the other account.63

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


59. "Having formed this Scripture, he (Brahmā) himself in the beginning caused me to comprehend it according to rule; as I did to Marichi and the other munis. 60. This Bhrigu will give you to hear this scripture in its entirety; for this muni learned the whole from me. 61. Then that Maharshi (great rishi), Bhrigu being so addressed by Manu, with pleasure addressed all those rishis, saying, 'Let it be heard.' 62. 'From this Manu Svāyambhuvā sprang other Munus in six successive generations, great and glorious, who respectively created living beings of their own,—(63) viz., Svārochisha, Auttami, Tāmasa, Raivata, Chākhusha, and the mighty son of Vivasvat. 64. These seven64 Munus of great power, of whom Svāyambhuvā was the first, have each in his own period (antara) produced and possessed the world.'"

63 In the same way it may be observed that in v. 22 Brahmā is said to have formed the sublime class of living gods whose essence is to act, and of the Śādhyuṣ (karmātmanum cha devinām so 'srūyat prāyinām pradhuh | śādhyānām cha gananā śūkhan), and in v. 25, to have "called into existence this creation, desiring to form these living beings" (śrūtīm susarja chaivemām svāḥṣṭhum ichchahum imāḥ praṇāḥ). But if the gods and all other creatures already existed, any such further account of their production by the Maharshis, as is given in verse 36, seems to be not only superfluous but contradictory.

64 It will be observed that here Svāyambhuva is included in the seven Munus, although in verse 36 (see above) it is said that the ten Maharshis, who had themselves been created by Svāyambhuvā (vv. 34 ff.), produced seven other Munus.
After some preliminary explanations regarding the divisions of time as reckoned by men and gods, etc. (vv. 64-78), the author proceeds to tell us how long each of these Manus reigns:

79. \textit{Yat prāk dvādasā-sāhasram uditam daivikām yugam | tud eka-}
\textit{saptati-gunam manvantaram ihochyate | 80. Manvantarāṇy asankhyāṇi}
\textit{sargaḥ samhāra eva cha | kriḍann ivaitat kurute Parameshṭhi punah}
\textit{punaḥ}

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

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

In vv. 81-86, the four Yugas (or great ages of the world) the Kṛita, Tretā, Dvāpara, and Kāli, their gradual deterioration, and the special duties peculiar to each, are described.\footnote{In v. 86 these predominant duties are said to be austere fervour in the Kṛita age, knowledge in the Tretā, sacrifice in the Dvāpara, and liberality alone in the Kāli (\textit{tapat param Kṛita-yuge tretayāṁ jñānam uchyate | dvāpara yajnam evāḥr dānam ekam kalau yuge}). This, as remarked in Weber's Indisches Studien, 282 ff., note, is not quite in conformity with the view of the Muṇḍaka Upanishad, i. 2, 1, which states:}
At verse 87, Bhrigu recurs to the four castes:

87. Sarvasvāsyā tu sargasya guptya-artham sa mahādyutih | mukhābāhūru-paj-jānām prithak karmāny akalpayat |

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

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

93. Uttamāngobhavāj jyaishthyād brahmaṇaḥ chaiva dhāraṇāt | sarvasvāvyāsa sarvasya dharmato brahmaṇaḥ prabhuh | 94. Tām hi savyamabhāḥ svad āsyāt tapas taptvā ”dito ’srijat |

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

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

97. Brāhmāneshu cha vidvāmso vidvattu kṛita-buddhayaḥ | kṛita-buddhistu karttārah karttrishu brahma-vedihā |

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

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

39. Yena yāṁ tu guṇenaishāṁ saṁśārāṁ pratipadyate | tāṁ samāśena vakṣhyāmi sarvasvāsyā yatḥākramam | 40. Devatvāṁ sātvikā yānti manushyatvāṁ cha rājastāṁ | tīryaktvāṁ tāmāṁ nityam ity esā tri-
tat etat satyam mantresu karmāṇi kavayo yāṁ opaśyaṁ tāṁ tretāyāṁ bahudhā santatāṁ | “This is true: the rites which sages behold in the hymns, are in great variety celebrated in the Tretā.” In the same way the M. Bh. iii. v. 11,248, says that sacrifices and rites prevail in the Tretā (tato yajnāḥ pravrattante dharmāḥ cha vividhāḥ kriyāḥ | tretāyāṁ ityādi). See also M. Bh. xii. 13,080. The word kṛita, as the name of the first yuga is thus explained in a previous verse of the former of these two passages (11,235): kṛtam eva na karttvayāṁ tasmān kāle yugottame | “In the time of that most excellent Yuga (everything) has been done, (and does) not (remain) to be done.”

"39. I shall now declare succinctly in order the states which the soul reaches by means of each of these qualities. 40. Souls endowed with the sattva quality attain to godhead; those having the rajas quality become men; whilst those characterized by tamas always become beasts—such is the threefold destination . . . 43. Elephants, horses, Śūdras and contemptible Mlechhas, lions, tigers, and boars form the middle dark condition . . . 46. Kings, Kshattriyas, a king’s priests (purohitāḥ), and men whose chief occupation is the war of words, compose the middle condition of passion . . . 48. Devotees, ascetics, Brāhmans, the deities borne on aerial cars, constellations, and Daityas, constitute the lowest condition of goodness. 49. Sacrificing priests, rishis, gods, the vedas, the celestial luminaries, years, the fathers, the Śādhyas, form the second condition of goodness. 50. Brahmā, the creators, righteousness, the Great One (mahāt), the Unapparent One (avyakta), compose the highest condition of goodness."

65 These "creators" (vīvasrījav) are thus mentioned in Taitt. Br. iii. 12, 9, 2. Ādāriyam Agniḥ chinvaṇaḥ pūreṣ vīvasrījo mṛtīḥ | satāṃ varaha-sahāraṇī dikshītāḥ satram āsata | 3. tapāḥ āśīr prāhaṁatīr Brahma brahmā 'bhavat svayam | satyaṁ ha hotaśkaṁ āśīr go vīvasrīeka āsata | amṛtam ebhya udgaṅyat sahasram parivaśsarān | bhūtaṁ ha prastotaśhām āśīd bhavishyat prati chāharat | prāga adhvaryur abhavañ ādān savānā sishāsatām | . . . 7. Vīvasrījav prathamāh satram āsata | . . . | tato ha jagne bhuvanasya gopāḥ hiraṇmayāḥ sūkunīr Brahma nāma | yena sūryas tapati tejasādāhāḥ | . . . 8. Etena vai vīvasrījav ādān vīvam asrījanta | vīvam evam asrījanta tasmaḥ vīvasrījav | vīvam enōn anto prasāyate | "2. The ancient and immortal creators of the universe, keeping fire kindled till they saw the new moon, and consecrated, were engaged in a sacrifice for 100,000 years. 3. Austere fervour was the householder; Prayer itself (brahma) was the brahmā priest; Truth was their hotṛi, when the creators were so occupied. Immortality was their udgātri for a thousand years. The Past was their prastotī, the Future their pratiḥarta; Breath was the adhvaryu, whilst they were seeking to obtain all this." After a good deal more of this allegory, the author proceeds in para.: 7. "These first
It will be observed that the different parts of this account of the mode in which the three qualities are distributed, are not quite in harmony. From v. 40 it would appear that all souls having the quality of passion become men; and yet we find from vv. 43, 48, and 49, that Śūdras belong to the tāmasa class, and Brāhmans, of different descriptions, to two of the Sātvika grades. According to the rule enunciated in v. 40, the latter ought to have been born as gods.

It is, further, remarkable that in this enumeration Śūdras are found in the same category with Mlechhas (v. 43), that the Vaiśyas are not accommodated with a position in any of the classes, that Kshatriyas and kings' domestic priests, who are of course Brāhmans, and others (who must be Brāhmans) fond of disputation on learned questions\(^{27}\) (though not stated to be heretical) are ranked together as "passionate" (v. 46), while other Brāhmans of different characters are placed in two of the higher grades, Brāhmans simply so called (viprāḥ) being regarded as "good" in the lowest degree (v. 48), and sacrificing priests (yajvānāḥ) sharing with rishis, gods, the vedas, etc., the honour of the middle condition of goodness. It is not clear whether the devotees, and ascetics, mentioned in v. 48, belong to the same caste as the Brāhmans with whom they are associated, or may also be men of the inferior classes. Nor is it evident for what reason the sacrificing priests (yajvānāḥ), specified in v. 49, are so much more highly estimated than the king's priests (rājnaḥ purohitāḥ) in v. 46, since the latter also officiate at sacrifices. The honourable position assigned to Daityas in the lowest class of "good" beings (v. 48) is also deserving of notice. We shall see in the following chapter that the Purāṇas variously describe mankind as belonging entirely to the "passionate" class (see v. 40, above) and as characterized by the three other "qualities," according to their caste.

\(^{27}\) Sūrstārthakalaha-priyāḥ cha | Comm.
AND OF THE ORIGIN OF THE FOUR CASTES.

SECT. VI.—Account of the System of Yugas, Manvantaras, and Kalpas, according to the Vishnu Purana, and other authorities.

I shall in the next section adduce the description given in the Vishnu Purana of the creation of living creatures, and the origin of the four castes, after first supplying in the present some explanation of the great mundane periods, the Yugas, Manvantaras, Kalpas, etc.

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

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

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

Krita Yuga with its mornings and evenings......4,800 divine years
Treta Yuga " " " " " .....3,600 " "
Dvapara Yuga " " " " " .....2,400 " "
Kali Yuga " " " " " .....1,200 " "

making...12,000 divine years. 69

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

68 Vishnu P. vi. 1, 4 ahorītram pitṛyāṁ tu māsa 'bdaś tridīvaukasām | See also Manu i. 66 and 67. The Taitt. Br. iii. 9, 22, 1, too, states: skāh vai etad devānām ahar yat saṁvatsaraḥ | "This period of a year is one day of the gods."


70 V. P. i. 3, 14. Kritaṁ tretā dvāparaṁ cha kalīs chaiva chaturyugam | prachāryate tat-sahasraṁ cha Brahmaṇo divasam mune | See also Manu i. 72.

71 V. P. i. 3, 15. Brahmaṇo divasaḥ brahmaṇ Manavaṁ cha chaturdaśa | bhavanti |
MYTHICAL ACCOUNTS OF THE CREATION OF MAN,

is consequently — the 14th part of a day of Brahmā. In the present Kalpa (= a day of Brahmā) six Manus, of whom Svāyambhūva was the first, have already passed away, the present Manu being Vaivasvata.72

In each Manvantara seven rishis, certain deities, an Indra, a Manu, and the kings, his sons, are created and perish.73 A thousand of the systems of 4 Yugas, as has been before explained, occur coincidently with these 14 Manvantaras; and consequently about 71 systems of 4 Yugas elapse during each Manvantara, and measure the lives of the Manu and the deities of the period.74 At the close of this day of Brahmā a collapse (pratisancharaḥ) of the universe takes place, which lasts through a night of Brahmā, equal in duration to his day, during which period the three worlds are converted into one great ocean, when the lotus-born god,75 expanded by his deglutition of the universe, and contemplated by the yogis and gods in Janaloka, sleeps on the serpent Sesha. At the end of that night he awakes and creates anew.76

A year of Brahmā is composed of the proper number of such days and nights; and 100 such years constitute his whole life. The period of his life is called Para, and the half of it Parārddha, or the half of a Para. One Parārddha, or half of Brahmā's existence, has now expired, terminating with the great Kalpa, called the Pādma Kalpa. The now existing Kalpa, or day of Brahmā, called Vārāha (or that of the boar), is the first of the second Parārddha of Brahmā's existence.77 The

72 This is stated by Manu i. 62 ff. (see above), as well as in the third book of the V. P. i. 3, which gives the names in the same order: Svāyambhuva Manus pūrvo Manus Śrīrochitah tathā | Aṣṭamisām Tāmasā chaiva Raivasvato Chākṣusah sathā | ahaḥ ete Manus 'tīčhaṃ sūṃprataṁ tu Raveḥ sutaḥ | Vaivasvato 'yaiḥ ṣayatāt sattamāṃ vartāte 'ntaram |

73 V. P. i. 3, 16. Septastahayaḥ surūḥ Śakro Manus tat-sūnavo nṛṣīh | ekakāle hi sṛṣyante samhiṣyante cha pūrvevat |

74 Ibid ver. 17. Chaturyaṅguṇāṃ sankhyātā śādikāḥ ḫy eka sapatiḥ | manvantaram Manoḥ kālaḥ swadīnāṃ cha sattama | See also Manu i. 79.

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


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

Of this elaborate system of Yugas, Manvantaras, and Kalpas, of enormous duration, no traces are found in the hymns of the Rig-veda. Their authors were, indeed, familiar with the word Yuga, which frequently occurs in the sense of age, generation, or tribe. Thus in i. 189, 8; iii. 26, 3; vi. 8, 5; vi. 15, 8; vi. 36, 5; x. 94, 12, the phrase yuge yuge means “in every age.” In iii. 33, 8; x. 10, 10, we have uttarā yugāni, “future ages,” and in x. 72, 1, uttare yuge, “in a later age;” in vii. 70, 4, pūrvāni yugāni, “former ages,” and in i. 184, 3, yuga jārṇā, “past ages.” In i. 92, 11; i. 103, 4; i. 115, 2; i. 124, 2; i. 144, 4; ii. 2, 2; v. 52, 4; vi. 16, 23; vii. 9, 4; viii. 46, 12; viii. 51, 9; ix. 12, 7; x. 27, 19; x. 140, 6 (in all of which places, except i. 115, 2, the word is combined with manushya, mānushā, manuṣhaḥ, or janānām), yuga seems to denote “generations” of men, or parārdhānya vartamānasya vai deīya | Vārūṇaḥ iti kalpo ‘yam prathamaḥ pari-kalpitah |

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

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

80 Sāyana takes the phrase for former “couples of husbands and wives,” mithunāni jāyopati-rūpaṇi.

81 In i. 92, 11 and i. 124, 2, Ushas (the Dawn) is spoken of as, praminati manushya yugāni, “wearing away human terms of existence, or generations.” In commenting on the former text Sāyana explains yugāni as equivalent to krita-tretādīni, “the Krita, Tretā, and other ages,” whilst in explaining the second, he takes the same word as signifying yugopalakshitanā nimāshādī-kālavayāvan, “the seconds and other component parts of time indicated by the word,” or as equivalent to yugmāni, “the conjunctions of men,”—since the dawn scatters abroad to their several occupations men who had been previously congregated together!” In his note on i. 144, 4, he gives an option of two different senses: manah sanbhandāṇi yugāni jāyopati-rūpaṇi hotrādvaryuvra-ripaṇi vā | “couples consisting of husband and wife, or of the hotṛ and adhvaryu priests.”

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

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

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

84 For the context of this line see Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1866, page 42.

85 An analogous idea is found in the S'atapatha Brāhmaṇa xiv. 7, 1, 33 ff. (=Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upanishad pp. 817 ff. of Cal. ed.) atha ye sataṁ manushitāṁ ānandāṁ sa ekāḥ pitrāṁ jitalokāṁ ānandāḥ | "now a hundred pleasures of men are one pleasure of the Pitris who have conquered the worlds." And so on in the same way; a hundred pleasures of the Pitris equalling one pleasure of the Karmadevas (or gods who have become so by works); a hundred pleasures of the latter equalling one pleasure of the gods who were born such, etc.
human or divine, had been elaborated. That, however, the authors of the Brāhmaṇas were becoming familiar with the idea of extravagantly large numbers is clear from the passage in the Taitt. Br. iii. 12, 9, 2, quoted above, p. 41, in the note on Manu xii. 50, where it is said that the creators were engaged in a sacrifice for 100,000 years.

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

Chatvāry āhuḥ sahasrāṇi varṣhāṇāṁ tu kṛitaṁ yugam | tasya tāvach chhati sandhyāḥ sandhyāṁśchaḥ tathāvidhāḥ | 70. Hareshu sasandhyāyeshu sasandhāmśesha cha trishu | ekāpyena varttante sahasrāṇi śatāni cha |

"They say that four thousand years compose the kṛita yuga, with as many hundreds years for its morning and the same for its evening. 70. In the other three yugas, with their mornings and evenings, the thousands and hundreds are diminished successively by one."

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

M. Bh. iii. 12826 ff. — Ādito manuṣya-vyāghra kṛitnasya jagataḥ kṣaye | chatvāry āhuḥ sahasrāṇi varshāyāṁ tat kṛitam yugam | tasya tāvachchhati sandhyāḥ sandhyāṇāḥsa tathāvidhaḥ |

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

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

The earliest known text in which the names of the four Yugas are found is a verse occurring in the story of Sunahṣepha in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa vii. 15: Kaliḥ sayāno bhavati sanjihānas tu dvāparaḥ | uttishthaṁs tretā bhavati kṛitam sampadyate charan | "A man while lying is the Kali; moving himself, he is the Dvāpara; rising, he is the Tretā; walking, he becomes the Kṛita."86 But this brief allusion leaves us

---

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

quite in the dark as to the duration which was assigned to these yugas in the age when the Brähmaṇa was compiled.

SECT. VII.—Account of the different creations, including that of the castes, according to the Vishnû Purâṇa.

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

“The first book of the six, into which the work is divided, is occupied chiefly with the details of creation, primary (sarga), and secondary (pratisarga); the first explains how the universe proceeds from Prakṛiti, or eternal crude matter; 87 the second, in what manner the forms of things are developed from the elementary substances previously evolved, or how they re-appear after their temporary destruction. 88 Both these creations are periodical; but the termination of the first occurs only at the end of the life of Brahmā, when not only all the gods and all other forms are annihilated, but the elements are again merged into primary substance, besides which only one spiritual being exists. The latter takes place at the end of every Kalpa or day of Brahmā, and affects only the forms of inferior creatures and lower worlds, leaving the substances of the universe entire, and sages and gods unharmed.” 89

mana : Kṛitaṁ tretā-yugam chaiva dvāparaṁ kaiś eva cha | rājno vṛttāvīśa sarvaṁ rājā hi yogam uchyate | 301. Kāliḥ prasupto bhavati sa jñānāt dvāparaṁ yogam | karmasv abhyudyatas tretā vicharaṁś tu kriyāṁ yogam | “301. The Kṛita, Tretā, Dvāpara, and Kali yogas are all modes of a king’s action; for a king is called a yuga. 302. While asleep he is the Kali; waking he is the Dvāpara age; intent upon action he is the Tretā, moving about he is the Kṛita.” The former of these two verses of Manu is reproduced nearly verbatim in the M. Bh. xii. 3408; and the same idea is expanded in the same book of the same poem, vv. 2674 ff., 2682, 2684, 2686, 2693 ff. The words kṛita, tretā, dvāpara, and kāli, are found in the Vāj.-Sanhitā, xxx. 18, and in the Taitt. Brahmāṇa, iii. 4, 1, 16; but in both places they denote dice, as does also the word kṛita in the Cāṇḍogya Upan. iv. 1, 4 (where see the commentary). On the Yugas the reader of German may also consult Weber’s Indische Studien, i. pp. 39, 87 ff., 282 ff.

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


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

"6. This lord of creatures, discovering by inference,—when the world had become one ocean,—that the earth lay within the waters, and being desirous to raise it up, (7) assumed another body. As formerly, at the beginnings of the Kalpas, he had taken the form of a fish, however, the statement with which the paragraph concludes, compare vol. i. p. 50, as well as vol. ii. p. 269, of the same work."
a tortoise, and so forth, \(^{90}\) (so now) entering the body of a boar (8),—
a form composed of the vedas and of sacrifice,—the lord of creatures,
who, throughout the entire continuance of the world, remains fixed,
the universal soul, the supreme soul, self-sustained, the supporter of
the earth (9),—being hymned by Sanaka and the other saints, who
had (at the dissolution of the lower worlds) proceeded to Janaloka,—
entered the water.” [He is then addressed by the goddess Earth in a
hymn of praise, as Vishnu, and as the supreme Brahma, vv. 10-24.
The boar then rises from the lower regions, tossing up the earth with
his tusk, and is again lauded by Sanandana and other saints in a
second hymn, in the course of which he himself is identified with
sacrifice, and his various members with its different instruments and
accompaniments, vv. 25-44]. “45. Being thus lauded, the supreme
soul, the upholder of the earth, lifted her up quickly and placed her
upon the great waters. 46. Resting upon this mass of water, like
a vast ship, she does not sink, owing to her expansion. Then, having
levelled the earth, the divine eternal Purushottasna heaped together
mountains according to their divisions. 47. He whose will cannot be
frustrated, by his unfailing power, created on the surface of the earth
all those mountains which had been burnt up in the former creation.
48. Having then divided the earth, just as it had been, into seven
dvipas, he formed the four worlds Bhurloka and others as before. 49.
Becoming next pervaded with the quality of passion, that divine being
Hari, assuming the form of Brahma, with four faces, effected the
creation. 50. But he is merely the instrumental cause of the things
to be created and of the creative operations, since the propertics of
the things to be created arise from Pradhana as their (material) cause. 51.
Excepting an instrumental cause alone, nothing else is required.
Every substance (vastu) is brought into the state of substance (vastuta)
by its own inherent power.” \(^{91}\)

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

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

The first of these texts is from the Taittiriya Sanhita, vii. 1, 5, 1 ff:  
Apo vai idam acro salilam asit | tasmin Prajapatir vayur bhutvah açhara | sa imam aparayan | taṁ varahoh bhutvā āharat | tāṁ Viśvākarmā bhutvā vyamārt | sā aprathata | sā prithivyah bhavat | tat prithivyai prithivītvam | tasyām ásrayat Prajāpatih | sa devān asrijata Vasūn Ruđrān Ádityān | te devāh Prajāpatim abruvan “praṣāyāmahai” iti | so ’bravīd “yathā aham yushmāms tapasa āsrīkhi evam tapasi pra- janaṃ ichāhaddi” iti | tebhṛ yon āyatanam prāyachhad “etena āyatanena āsrayata” iti | te ’gninā āyatanena āsrayan | te saṁvatsare svām gam āsrijanta |

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

sva-asaktī can be properly rendered, as Dr. Hall does, “by its potency.” The reading of the MSS. in v. 60, pradhāna-kāraṇiḥbhūtah seems to me doubtful, as it would most naturally mean “have become the Pradhāna-cause.” I conjecture prad- dhāna-kāraṇodbhūtah, which gives the sense which seems to be required.

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

53 After having noticed this passage in the Taittiriya Sanhita, I became aware that it had been previously translated by Mr. Colebrooke (Essays i. 75, or p. 44 of Williams & Norgate’s edition). Mr. Colebrooke prefaced his version by remarking, “The pre-
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The second passage is from the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, i. 1, 3, 5 ff. Āpo vai idam agre salīlam āśīt | tena Prajāpatir aśrāmyat "katham idam syād" iti | so 'paśyat pushkara-parnaṁ tishthat | so 'manyata "asti vai tad yasmin idam adhitishṭhati" iti | sa varāho rūpeḥ kritvā upa-nyamajat | sa prīthivīṁ adhaṁ ārghat | tasyā upahatya udamajat | tat pushkara-parne 'prathayat | yad "aprathata" tat prīthivyai prīthivit-vam | "abhūd vai idam" iti tad bhūmyai bhūmitvam | tāṁ diśo'nu vātaḥ samavahat | tāṁ sārkarābhir adṛśīnḥat |

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

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

Iyati ha vai iyam agre prīthivy āsa prādesa-mātrī | tāṁ Emūshāḥ iti varāhaḥ vyājghāna | so 'syāḥ patīḥ Prajāpatis tena eva enam etan-mithu- nena priyena dhūmavi samardhayati kṛītenā karoti |

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

Another of the incarnations referred to in the preceding passage of

sent extract was recommended for selection by its allusion to a mythological notion, which apparently gave origin to the story of the Varūha-avatāra, and from which an astronomical period, entitled Calpa, has perhaps been taken."  

94 The Commentator gives an alternative explanation, viz., that the word salīla is the same as sarīra, according to the text of the Veda, "these worlds are sarīra" ("ime vai lokāḥ sarīram" iti śrutāḥ).

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

Sa yat kurma nama | etad vai rupam kritva Prajapati praJah atri-jata | yad atri-jata akarat tat | yad akarat tasmats kurma | kasyapo vai kurma | tasmad ahuh "sarvaḥ praJah kasyapyah" iti | sa yah sa kurmo sau sa Adityah |

"As to its being called kurma (a tortoise); Prajapati having taken this form, created offspring. That which he created, he made (akarat); since he made, he is (called) kurmaḥ. The word kasyapa means tortoise; hence men say all creatures are descendants of Kasyapa. This tortoise is the same as Aditya."96

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

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

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

Sarvaṁ salilam evaśī prithivī tatra nirmita | tataḥ samabhavat Brah- 
ma svayambhur daivataiḥ saha97 | sa varahas tato bhūtvā praJahara va- 
sundharāṁ ityādi |

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

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

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

I now return to the narrative of the Vishnu Purāṇa.

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

99 The reading of the Vāyu P., in the parallel passage, is tasyābhidhīyāyato nityam sāttvikāḥ samavarttata | ārdhvasrotas trītyās tu sa chaivaṁ vidvān vyavasthitah | The combination sāttvikorṇḍham in the text of the Vishnu P. must be ārsha. 100 For nāvṛtāḥ the Vāyu P. reads saṁvīrtīḥ. 101 Itī sandhir ārshaḥ —Comm. But there is a form tama. The Vāyu P. has tamaḥ- saktīḥ.
tion, composed of gloom (tamas). 4. Gloom, illusion, great illusion, darkness, and what is called utter darkness—such was the five-fold ignorance, which was manifested from that great Being, 5. as he was meditating—an insensible creation under five conditions, devoid of feeling either without or within, closed up, motionless. 6. And since motionless objects are called the primary objects, this is called the primary (mukhya) creation. 7. Beholding this creation to be ineffective, he again contemplated another. As he was desiring it the brute (tiryakrutas) creation came forth. 8. Since (in its natural functions) it acts horizontally it is called Tiryakrutas. 9. The (creatures composing it) are known as cattle, etc., distinguished mainly by darkness (tamas) ignorant, following irregular courses, while in a state of ignorance having a conceit of knowledge, (10) self-regarding, self-esteeming, affected by the twenty-eight kinds of defects, endowed with inward feeling, and mutually closed. 11. As Brahmā, regarding this creation also as ineffective, was again meditating, another creation, the third, or ārdhvasrotas, which was good, rose upward. 12. They (the creatures belonging to this creation) abounding in happiness and satisfaction, being unclosed both without and within, and possessed both of external and internal feeling, are called the offspring of the Ārdhvasrotas creation. 13. This third creation, known as that of the gods, was one full of enjoyment. When it was completed, Brahmā was pleased. 14. He then contemplated another creation, effective and most excellent, since he regarded as ineffective the beings sprung from the primary and other creations. 15. While he, whose will is efficacious, was so desiring, the Arvāksrotas, an effective creation, was manifested. 16. They

102 The Vāyu P. here inserts an additional line, sarvatas tamasa chaiva dipaḥ kumbha-vad avyitah | “and covered on all sides with darkness, as a lamp by a jar.”

103 Vaihir-antarapraakāśascha appears to be the true reading, as the Commentator renders the last word by prakriṣṭo-juñna-sūnyāḥ, “devoid of knowledge.” But if this be the correct reading, it is grammatical, as antah and aprakāśa would properly make antar-aprakāśa, not anto’prakāśa. But the Purāṇas have many forms which are irregular (ārśa, “peculiar to the rishis,” “vedic,” or “antiquated” as the Commentators style them). The Taylor M.S. of the Vāyu Purāṇa reads in the parallel passage bahir-antarapraakāśa.

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

105 Bhaksheyōdi-vivekak-hīnāḥ | “Making no distinction in food, etc., etc.” Comm.

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{107} The Vēyu P. adds here: \textit{Lakṣaṇaḥ tārakāyaiśeṣa ashtadhaḥ cha vyavasthitāḥ | siddhātmāno manushyāḥ te gandharvasa-saha-dharmināḥ | ity eṣa tajjasah sargo hy arvākṣrotah prakīrtiteḥ | } Constituted with preservative(?) characteristics, and in an eightfold manner. These were men perfect in their essence, and in nature equal to Gandharvas. This was the lustrous creation known as Arvāksrotas."

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

\textsuperscript{109} This word is borrowed from the passage of the Taṇṭiriya Brāhmaṇa, ii. 3, 8, 3, quoted above, p. 23. Most of the particulars in the rest of the narrative are imitated from another passage of the same Brāhmaṇa, ii. 2, 9, 5 ff., also quoted above, p. 28.
also, being abandoned by him, became day, which is almost entirely good. Hence the Asuras are powerful by night and the gods by day.

31. He then assumed another body formed of pure goodness; and the Fathers were born from him, when he was regarding himself as a father.

32. The Lord, after creating the Fathers, abandoned that body also; which, when so abandoned, became twilight, existing between day and night.

33. He next took another body entirely formed of passion; and men, in whom passion is violent, were produced. The primeval Prajāpati speedily discarded this body also, which became faint light (jyotsna), which is called early twilight.

34. Hence, at the appearance of this faint light, men are strong, while the fathers are strong at evening-twilight.

35. Morning-twilight, night, day, and evening-twilight, these are the four bodies of Brahmā, and the receptacles of the three qualities.

36. Brahmā next took another body entirely formed of passion, from which sprung hunger, and through it anger was produced.

37. The Divine Being then in darkness created beings emaciated with hunger, which, hideous of aspect, and with long beards, rushed against the lord.

38. Those who said, 'Let him not be preserved' (rakshyatām) were called Rakshasas, whilst those others who cried, 'Let us eat (him)' were called Yakshas from 'eating' (yakshanāt).

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

110 In the Rāmāyaṇa, Sundara Kūṇḍa 82, 13 f. (Gorresio's edit.) we read: Rakshasāṁ rajanī-kālāḥ samyugashu praśāyate | 14. Tasmād rajan nītā-yuddhe jayo 'śmākaṁ na saṁśayaḥ | "Night is the approved time for the Rakshases to fight. We should therefore undoubtedly conquer in a nocturnal conflict."

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

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

113 See the passage from the Taitt. Sanh. vii. 1, 1, 4 ff. quoted above, p. 16, where the same origin is ascribed to horses.
principles according to which they were conducted. Of these verses I quote only the following: 55. Teshāṁ ye yāni karmāni prāk-srisṭhyāṁ pratīpedāre | tāṇy eva pratipadyante sriyamanāḥ punāḥ punaḥ | . . . 60. Yathārtav ritu-lingāni nānāśāpaṁ paryayo | dṛṣṭyante tāṇy eva tathā bhāva yugādiśu | 61. Karoty evaṃvikhaṁ srisṭim kalpa-dau sa punaḥ punaḥ | srisrkhāyaṣakti-yukto 'sa sa sriyā-sakti-pradhoditaḥ | “These creatures, as they are reproduced time after time, discharge the same functions as they had fulfilled in the previous creation . . . 60. Just as, in each season of the year, all the various characteristics of that season are perceived, on its recurrence, to be the very same as they had been before; so too are the beings produced at the beginnings of the ages. 61. Possessing both the will and the ability to create, and impelled by the powers inherent in the things to be created, the deity produces again and again a creation of the very same description at the beginning of every Kalpa.”

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

AND OF THE ORIGIN OF THE FOUR CASTES.

vaña muni-sattama | 11. Yathecchha-vāsa-niratāḥ sarvābadha-vivarjītaḥ |
śuddhānataḥ-karaṇāḥ śuddhāḥ sarvānushṭhāna-nirmalaḥ | 14. Sudhāccha tāsām manasi śuddhe 'ntaḥ-saṁsthite Ṣharaṅ | śuddha-jñānam prapaśyanti Vishv-ākhyam yena tatpadam | 15. Tātāḥ kalātmaka yo 'sa u chaṁśaṅ kathito Ṣhreeḥ | sa pātayaty agho ghoram alpam alpāpa-

sāravat | 16. Adharma-vīja-bhūtaṁ tu tamo-loha-samudbhavam | pra-

jāsu tāsu Maitreya pāgādikam asādham | 17. Tātāḥ sa sahaja śiddhis tāsām nāṭiva jāyate |
rasollāsādayaś chāṇyaḥ śiddhayo 'śtau bhavanti yāḥ | 18. Tāsu kṣīnāsva aśēhāsu varādhamāne cha pātakṣe | devarvādi-
bhava-duḥkhārttās tā bhavanti tataḥ praṇāḥ | 19. Tato durgāṇi tāṁ chakraṁ vārkhāyam pāvretam audakam | kritimāṁ cha tathā durgam pura-

karaṇātakādi yat | 20. Gṛihāṇi cha yathānāyaṁ aṁ teshu chakruḥ purā-

māṇāḥ cha śanī-dam | 29. Teshāṁ tu kāla-srishto 'sa pāpa-viṇḍur mahāmato | chetasaṁ vaṛiṅhe chakrus te na yajnesuvah mānasam | 30. Veda-vādāṁs tathā devāṁ yajnakarmādikāṁ cha yat | tat sarvam nīn-
damānāṁ te yajna-vyāsadaḥ-kāraṇāḥ | 31. Praṇavīttī-ṛīgamavyaṁkhetṛīti-
kārīṇo veda-nindakāṅ | ādṛātmāno ādṛāḥraṁ bāhūṅkṛuḥ kuṭilāsayaḥ | 32. Saṁsidhāyaṁ tu vārīṭyāṁ praṇāḥ sṛiṣṭvā Prajaṁpatiḥ | marya-
dāṁ sthāpyaṁsāya yathā-sthānam yathā-guṇam | 34. Varṇāṁ śa-ramāṇāṁ cha dharmān dharmān-bheritāṁ vara | lokāṁś sarva-varṇānāṁ samyag dharmānupālināṁ | 35. Prajaṁpatyam brāhmaṇānāṁ śṛiṇāṁ sthānam kriyaṁvatāṁ | sthānam aṁdram kṣāṭriyaṁāṁ saṅgrāmesvā anivruttināṁ | 36. Vaiśyaṁāṁ mārutam sthānavāṁ svā-dharmān anv-

varttināṁ | gāndharvaṁ śūdra-jātiṁāṁ paricharyāyuṁ varttināṁ |

“Maitreya says: 1. You have described to me the Arvāksrotas, or human, creation: declare to me, o Brahman, in detail the manner in which Brahма formed it. 2. Tell me how, and with what qualities, he created the castes, and what are traditionally reputed to be the

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

116 How does this agree with the statements made in the Taitt. Sanh. vii. 1, 1, 4 ff. as quoted above, p. 16, and in the Taitt. Br. iii. 2, 3, 9, p. 21, that the Śūdra is incapacitated for sacrifice, and that anything he milks out is no oblation?
117 This alludes to an expression in the Rig-veda, i. 22, 20. See the 4th vol. of this work, p. 54.
118 In regard to Xāga, "Time," see Wilson’s V. P. vol. i. p. 18 ff., and the passages from the Atharva-veda, extracted in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1865, pp. 380 ff.
out of the pairs (of susceptibilities to pleasure and pain, etc., etc.) 19. They then constructed fastnesses among trees, on hills, or amid waters, as well as artificial fortresses, towns, villages, etc. 20. And in these towns, etc., they built houses on the proper plan, in order to counteract cold, heat, and other discomforts. 21. Having thus provided against cold, etc., they devised methods of livelihood depending upon labour, and executed by their hands." The kinds of grain which they cultivated are next described in the following verses 22 to 25. The text then proceeds, verse 26: "These are declared to be the fourteen kinds of grain, cultivated and wild, fitted for sacrifice; and sacrifice is an eminent cause of their existence. 27. These, too, along with sacrifice, are the most efficacious sources of progeny. Hence those who understand cause and effect celebrate sacrifices. 28. Their daily performance is beneficial to men, and delivers from sins committed. 29. But that drop of sin which had been created by time increased in men's hearts, and they disregarded sacrifice. 30. Reviling the Vedas, and the prescriptions of the Vedas, the gods, and all sacrificial rites, etc., obstructing oblations, (31) and cutting off the path of activity, they became malignant, vicious, and perverse in their designs. 32. The means of subsistence being provided, Prajakāti, having created living beings, established a distinction according to their position and qualities (see verses 3 to 5 above), (and fixed) the duties of the castes and orders, and the worlds (to be attained after death) by all the castes which perfectly fulfilled their duties. 33. The world of Prajakāti is declared to be the (future) abode of those Brāhmans who are assiduous in religious rites; the realm of Indra the abode of those Kshattriyas who turn not back in battle; (34) that of the Maruts the abode of those Vaiśyas who fulfil their duties; and that of the Gandharvas the abode of the men of Sudra race who abide in their vocation of service." In the remaining verses of the chapter (35 to 39) the realms of blessedness destined for the reception of more eminent saints are briefly noticed, as well as the infernal regions, to which the wicked are doomed.

119 Pravṛitti-mārga-evayachchhitti-kāriyāḥ. The Commentator ascribes this to the human race being no longer sufficiently propagated, for he adds the explanation: yajñānamūshātvā devair avarsamād annābhāvāna praṇā-vṛddher asiddheḥ "because population did not increase from the want of food caused by the gods ceasing to send rain in consequence of the non-celebration of sacrifice."
MYTHICAL ACCOUNTS OF THE CREATION OF MAN,

At the beginning of the seventh section, without any further enquiry on the part of Maitreya, Parāśara proceeds as follows:


"1. Then from him, as he was desiring, there were born mental sons with effects and cause\textsuperscript{120} derived from his body. 2. Embodied spirits sprang from the limbs of that wise Being. All those creatures sprang forth which have been already described by me, (3) beginning

\textsuperscript{120} The Commentator explains these words kāryais taiḥ kāraṇaiḥ saha to mean "bodies and senses."
with gods and ending with motionless objects, and existing in the condition of the three qualities. Thus were created beings moving and stationary. 4. When none of these creatures of the Wise Being multiplied, he next formed other, mental, sons like to himself, (5) Bhrigu, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu, Angiras, Marichi; Daksha, Atri, and Vasishtha, all born from his mind. These are the nine Brahmās who have been determined in the Purānas. 6. But Sanandana and the others who had been previously created by Vedhas (Brahmā) had no regard for the worlds, and were indifferent to offspring. They had all attained to knowledge, were freed from desire, and devoid of envy. 7. As they were thus indifferent about the creation of the world, great wrath, sufficient to burn up the three worlds, arose in the mighty Brahmā. 8. The three worlds became entirely illuminated by the wreath of flame which sprang from his anger. 9. Then from his forehead, wrinkled by frowns and inflamed by fury, arose Rudra, luminous as the midday sun, with a body half male and half female, fiery, and huge in bulk. After saying to him, ‘Divide thyself,’ Brahmā vanished. 10. Being so addressed, Rudra severed himself into two, into a male and a female form. The god next divided his male body into eleven parts, (11) beautiful and hideous, gentle and ungentle; and his female figure into numerous portions with appearances black and white. 12. Brahmā then made the lord Svāyambhuva, who had formerly sprung from himself, and was none other than himself, to be Manu the protector of creatures. 13. The god Manu Svāyambhuva took for his wife the female Satarūpā, who by austere fervour had become freed from all defilement. 14. To that Male the goddess Satarūpā bore Priyavrata and Uttānapāda, and two daughters called Prasūti and Ākūti, distinguished by the qualities of beauty and magnanimity. 15. He of old gave Prasūti in marriage to Daksha, and Ākūti to Iluchi.

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

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

---

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

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

123 The discrepancies between current legends on different subjects are occasionally noticed in the text of the Vishnu Purana. Thus in the eighth chapter of the first book, v. 12, Maitreya, who had been told by Parashara that Sri was the daughter of Bhrigu and Khyati, enquires: Kshirabhadra Sriḥ puropannā śrūyate 'mrita-manthane | Bhriguo Khyatyūn samutpannety etad āha katham bhavōn | "It is reported that Sri was produced in the ocean of milk when ambrosia was churned. How do you say that she was born to Bhrigu by Khyati?" He receives for answer: 13. Nityaiva sū jagam-mūlā Vishṇoḥ Sriḥ anapāyinī (another MS. reads anuyāyinī) yathā sarvagato Vishṇus tathaicevaṁ decottama | Sri, the mother of the world, and wife of Vishnu, is eternal and undecaying" (or, according to the other reading, "is the eternal follower of Vishnu"). "As he is omnipresent, so is she," and so on. The case of Daksha will be noticed further on in the text. On the method resorted to by the Commentators in cases of this description Professor Wilson observes in a note to p. 203 (4to. edition), "other calculations occur, the incompatibility of which is said, by the Commentators on our text and on that of the Bhagavata, to arise from reference being made to different Kalpas; and they quote the same stanza to this effect: Kuśicit kuśicit puruśyaśtu virodha yuddi lakṣyate | kalpa-bhedādibhis tatra virodhaḥ sadhīr saḥ kṣyate | 'Whenever any contradictions in different Puranas are observed, they are ascribed by the pious to differences of Kalpas and the like.'"
being ineffective may have been suggested by some of the other details in the Brāhmaṇas, which I shall now proceed to cite. At all events some of the latter appear to have given rise to the statement in the fourth verse of the seventh chapter of the Vishnu P. that the creatures formed by Brahmā did not multiply, as well as to various particulars in the narratives which will be quoted below from the Vāyu and Mārkandeya Purāṇas. The Brāhmaṇas describe the creative operations of Prajāpati as having been attended with intense effort, and often followed by great exhaustion; and not only so, but they represent many of these attempts to bring living creatures of various kinds into existence, to sustain them after they were produced, and to ensure their propagation, as having been either altogether abortive, or only partially successful. The following quotations will afford illustrations of these different points:

Taitt. Br. i. 1, 10, 1. Prajāpatiḥ prayāḥ asrijata | sa virichāno 'man-yata | sa tapi 'tapiyata | sa ātmam vīyam apaśyat tad avarddha | "Prajāpati created living beings. He felt himself emptied. He performed austere abstraction. He perceived vigour in himself. It increased, etc."

Taitt. Br. i. 2, 6, 1. Prajāpatiḥ prayāḥ srisṭvā vṛttāḥ 123 'sayat | taṁ devāh bhūtān rasāṁ tejāḥ sambhrītya tenā enam abhishajjan "mahān avavartti" iti |

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

Taitt. Br. ii. 3, 6, 1. Prajāpatiḥ prayāḥ srisṭvā vyasraṁṣata | sa hi-dhayam bhūte 'sayat |

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

S. P. Br. iii. 9, 1, 1. Prajāpatir vai prayāḥ sarṣyāno virichānāḥ iva ananyata | tasmāt parāchyah prayāḥ āsūḥ | na asya prayāḥ śriye 'nnādyāya jainira | 2. Sa aikṣhata "avikṣy āham asmai (? yasmāi) u kāmāya aṣṭikāh na me sa kāṁaṁ samārdhi parāchyō mat-prajāḥ abhūvan na me prayāḥ śriye 'nnādyāya asthiṣhata" iti | 3. Sa aikṣhata Prajāpatiḥ "kathāṁ nu punar ātmānam āpyādyēya uṣa ma praṣaṁ samāvartterāṁs tishṭhērān me prayāḥ śriye annādyāya" iti | so 'rvhān śṛṇyām ēha-

123 Srāntāḥ—Comm.
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"Prajāpati when creating living beings felt himself as it were emptied. The living creatures went away from him. They were not produced so as to prosper and to eat food. 2. He considered: 'I have become emptied: the object for which I created them has not been fulfilled: they have gone away, and have not gained prosperity and food.' 3. He considered: 'how can I again replenish myself; and how shall my creatures return to me, and acquire prosperity and food?' Desirous of progeny, he went on worshipping and performing religious rites. He beheld this Ekādaśinī (Eleven); and sacrificing with it, he again replenished himself; his creatures returned to him, and gained prosperity and food. Having sacrificed, he became more brilliant."

S. P. Br. x. 4, 2. So 'yaḥ saṁvatsaraḥ Prajāpatiḥ sarvāṇi bhūtāṇi sasrje yach cha prāṇi yach cha aprāṇam ubhayān deva-manushyān | sa sarvāṇi bhūtāṇi srisṛtvā ririchāna iva mens | sa mṛtyor bibhiyānychakāra | 2. Sa ha ikshānchakre "kathāṁ na aham imāni sarvāṇi bhūtāni punar ātmānāu avopyes punar ātmānaḥ adhiṣṭhitaḥ kathāṁ na aham eva eṣāṁ sar-vēśāṁ bhūtānam punar ātmā syām" iti |

"This Year, (who is) Prajāpati, created all beings, both those which breathe and those that are without breath, both gods and men. Having created all beings he felt himself as it were emptied. He was afraid of death. 2. He reflected, 'How can I again unite all these beings with myself, again place them in myself? How can I alone be again the soul of all these beings?"

S. P. Br. x. 4, 4, 1. Prajāpatiṁ vai prajāḥ srijaṁānam pāyām mṛtyur abhiparījāghaṇā | sa tapo 'tapyata sahasraṁ saṁvatsarān pāyāmānāḥ vijāhāsan. |

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

S. P. Br. ii. 5, 1, 1. Prajāpatir ha vai idam agras ekaḥ eva āsa | sa aikshata "kathāṁ nu prajāyeva" iti | so 'krāmyat sa tapo 'tapyataḥ | sa prajāḥ asrijataḥ | taḥ asya prajāḥ sriśtaḥ parābhubhuh | tāni imāni vayaṁśi | purusho vai Prajāpater nadiṣṭham | dvipād vai āyam puru-shaḥ | tasmād dvipādo vayaṁśi | 2. Sa aikshata Prajāpatiṁ "yathā
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"1. Prajāpati alone was formerly this universe. He reflected, 'How can I be propagated?' He toiled in religious rites, and practised austere fervour. He created living beings. After being created by him they perished. They were these birds. Man is the thing nearest to Prajāpati. This being, man, is two-footed. Hence birds are two-footed creatures. Prajāpati reflected, 'As I was formerly but one, so am I now also only one.' He created a second set of living beings. They also perished. This was the class of small reptiles other than serpents. They say he created a third set of beings, which also perished. They were these serpents . . . 3. Worshipping and toiling in religious rites, Prajāpati reflected, 'How is it that my creatures perish after they have been formed?' He perceived this, 'they perish from want of food.' In his own presence he caused milk to be supplied to breasts. He created living beings, and preserved the breasts to then preserved. These are the creatures which did not perish.'

Taitt. Br. i. 6, 2, 1. Vaiśvadeva vai Prajāpatih prajāḥ asrijata | tāḥ srishtāḥ na prajāyanta | so'gnir akānayata "aham imah prajanyeyam" iti | sa Prajāpataye sucham adadhat | so 'sochat prajāṁ iohhamānah | tasmād yāṁ cha prajā bhunakti yaṁ cha na tav ubhau sochatah prajāṁ ichhamānau | tāv Agnim apy asrijat | tā Agnir adhyayit (2) Somo reto 'dadhat Savitā prajāyanat | Sarasvatī vācham adadhat | Puṣhā 'poshayat | to vai ete trih saṁvatsarasasya prayuyante ye devāḥ pushṭipatayah | saṁvatsaro vai Prajāpatih | saṁvatsareṇa eva asmai prajāḥ prajāyanat | tāḥ prajāḥ jātāḥ Maruto 'gīnan "asmān api na prāyukshata" iti | 3. Sa etam Prajāpatir mārutaṁ saptakapālam apasyat | tāṁ niravapat | tato vai prajābhya 'kalpatā | . . . sa Prajāpatih aśocat "yāḥ pūrvāḥ prajāḥ asrikshi Marutas tāḥ avadhishuh katham aparāḥ
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srideya’ iti | tasya būṣhma āṇḍam bhūtaṁ niravarttata | tad vyudharat |
        tad aposhayat | tat prajāyata |

"Prajāpati formed living creatures by the vaiśvadeva (offering to the Viśvedevas). Being created they did not propagate. Agni desired ‘let me beget these creatures.’ He imparted grief to Prajāpati. He grieved, desiring offspring. Hence he whom offspring blesses, and he whom it does not bless, both of them grieve, desiring progeny. Among them he created Agni also. Agni desired (?) them. Soma infused seed. Savitri begot them. Sarasvati infused into them speech. Pūshan nourished them. These (gods) who are lords of nourishment are employed thrice in the year. Prajāpati is the Year. It was through the year that he generated offspring for him. The Maruts killed those creatures when they had been born, saying ‘they have not employed us also. 3. Prajāpati saw this Māruts oblation in seven platters. He offered it. In consequence of it he became capable of producing offspring . . . Prajāpati lamented, (saying) ‘the Maruts have slain the former living beings whom I created. How can I create others?’ His vigour sprang forth in the shape of an egg. He took it up. He cherished it. It became productive."

Taitt. Br. iii. 10, 9, 1. Prajāpatir devān asrijata | te pāpmanā sandi-
tāḥ ajāyanta | tān vyādyat |

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

Taitt. Br. ii. 7, 9, 1. Prajāpatih prajāḥ asrijata | tāḥ asmāt srishtāḥ
parāchir āyaṇ | sa etam Prajāpatir odanam apaśyat | so ’nnam bhato
’tiṣṭhat | tāḥ anyatra annāyaṃ avitvā Prajāpatim prajāḥ upāvart-
tanta |

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

Taitt. Br. i. 6, 4, 1. Prajāpatih Savita bhūtvā prajāḥ asrijata | tā
enam atyamanyanta | tā asmād apākrāman | tā Varuṇa bhūtvā prajāḥ
Varuṇena agrāhayat | tāḥ prajāḥ Varuṇa-grihitāḥ Prajāpatim punar
upādhāvan nātham ichhamānāḥ |

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

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

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

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

Of the two sons of Manu Svāyambhuva and Satarūpā, the name of the second, Uttānapāda, seems to have been suggested by the appearance of the word Uttānapad in Rig-veda x. 72, 3, 4, as the designation (nowhere else traceable, I believe) of one of the intermediate agents in the creation.124 A Priyavrata is mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa vii. 34, and also in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa x. 3, 5, 14, (where he has the patronymic of Rauhīṇyana) but in both these texts he appears rather in the light of a religious teacher, who had lived not very long before the age of the author, than as a personage belonging to a very remote antiquity. Daksha also, who appears in this seventh chapter as one of the mindborn sons of Brahmā, is named in R. V. ii. 27, 1, as one of the Ādityas, and in the other hymn of the R.V. just alluded to, x. 72, vv. 4 and 5, he is noticed as being both the son and the father of the goddess Aditi. In the S. P. ii. 4, 4, he is identified with Prajāpati.125 In regard to his origin various legends are discoverable in the Purāṇas. Besides the passage before us, there are others in the V.P. in which he is mentioned. In iv. 1, 5, it is said that he sprang from the right thumb of Brahmā, and that Aditi was his daughter (Brahmaṇaśca dakṣiṇāṅgushtha-janmā Dakshaḥ | Prajāpater Dakshasyāpy Aditiḥ). In another place, V.P. i. 15, 52, it is said that Daksha, although formerly the son of Brahmā, was born to the ten Prachetasas by Mārīśhā (Daśāhhyas tu Prachetobhya Mārīśhāyaṃ Prajāpatiḥ | jañāno Daksha mahābhūgo yah pūraṃ Brahmaṇo ’bhavat |). This double pa-

124 See the 4th vol. of this work, pp. 10 f.
125 See the 4th vol. of this work, pp. 10 ff. 24, 101; Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, for 1865, pp. 72 ff.; Roth in the Journal of the German Oriental Society, vi. 76.
rentage of Daksha appears to Maitreya, one of the interlocutors in the Purāṇa, to require explanation, and he accordingly enquires of his informant, vv. 60 ff.: Angushṭhād dakṣiṇad Dakshaḥ pūrvaṁ jataḥ śrutam mayā | katham Prāchetaso bhūyaḥ sa sambhūto mahāmuno | eha me saṁśayo brahmān sumahān hridi varttate | yad daunitrāṣ cha somayā punaḥ śrokuvatām gataḥ | Parāśara uvācha | utpattiḥ cha nirodhaḥ cha nityau bhūteshu vai mune | rishayo ’tra na mulyanti ye chānyo divya- chakshushaḥ | 61. Yuge yuge bhavanty ete Dakṣhāyā muni-sattama | punaḥ chaiva nirudhyante vidvāṁs tatra na mulyati | 62. Kānishthyām jyaiśthhyam apy esām pūrvaṁ nābhūd dvijottama | tapa eva gariyo ’bhūt prabhāvāḥ chaiva kāraṇam |

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

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

I will merely add, in reference to Akūti, the second daughter of Manu Svāyambhūya and Satarūpā, that the word is found in the Rig-veda with the signification of "will" or "design;" but appears to be personified in a passage of the Taṭṭīrīya Brāhmaṇa, iii. 12, 9, 5 (the context of which has been cited above, p. 41), where it is said: Irā patni viścaśrījām ākūtīr apīnaḥ hvaḥ | "Irā (Idā) was the wife of the creators. Akūti kneaded the oblation."
SECT. VIII.—Account of the different creations, including that of the castes, according to the Vāyu and Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇas.

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

I shall first adduce a passage from the fifth chapter of the Vāyu (which to some extent runs parallel with the second chapter of the Vishnu Purāṇa 127), on account of its containing a different account from that generally given of the triad of gods who correspond to the triad of qualities (gūnas).


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

127 See pp. 27 and 41 f. of Wilson’s V. P. vol. i.
128 The Gaikowar MS. of the India office, No. 2102, reads āsthitāḥ, instead of āśritāḥ, the reading of the Taylor MS.
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Pradhāna, when agitated, the quality of passion (rajas) arose, which was there a stimulating cause, as water is in seeds. 14. When an inequality in the Guṇas arises, then (the deities) who preside over them are generated. From the Guṇas thus agitated there sprang three gods (15), indwelling, supreme, mysterious, animating all things, embodied. The rajas quality was born as Brahmā, the tamas as Agni, 139 the sattva as Vishnu. 16. Brahmā, the manifester of rajas, acts in the character of creator; Agni, the manifester of tamas, acts in the capacity of time; 17. Vishnu, the manifester of sattva, abides in a condition of indifference. These deities are the three worlds, the three qualities, (18) the three Vedas, the three fires; they are mutually dependent, mutually devoted. 19. They exist through each other, and uphold each other; they are twin-parts of one another, they subsist through one another. 20. They are not for a moment separated; they never abandon one another. Īśvara (Mahādeva) is the supreme god; and Vishnu is superior to Mahat (the principle of intelligence); while Brahmā, filled with rajas, engages in creation. Purusha is to be regarded as supreme, as Prakṛiti is also declared to be. 19

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


139 The Mārk. P. chap. 46, verse 18, has the same line, but substitutes Rudra for Agni, thus: Rojo Brahmā tamo Rudro Vishnuḥ sattvāḥ jatpatiḥ | The two are often identified. See Vol. IV. of this work, 282 ff.

130 See Wilson’s Vishnu Purāṇa, p. 57, with the translator’s and editor’s notes. Verses 1 to 6 are repeated towards the close of the 7th section of the Vāyu P. with variations.
9. Akarot sa tanum hy anyäm kalpadishu yathā purā | tato mahātmā manasa divyaṁ rūpam achintayat
10. Salilendrāputām bhūmin drishtvā sa tu samantasaḥ | "kim nu rūpam mahat kritvā uddhāreyam aham ma-him"
11. Jala-krīḍā-suruchiram vārahanī rūpam asmarat | adhirishyam sarva-bhūtānāṁ vāṁmayam dharma-sanānītam |

"1. When fire had perished from the earth, and this entire world motionless and moving, together with all intermediate things, had been dissolved into one mass, and had been destroyed—waters first were produced. As the world formed at that time but one ocean, nothing could be distinguished. Then the divine Brahmā, Purusha, with a thousand eyes, a thousand feet, (3) a thousand heads, of golden hue, beyond the reach of the senses—Brahmā, called Nārāyaṇa, slept on the water. 4. But awaking in consequence of the predominance (in him) of the sattva quality, and beholding the world a void—: Here they quote a verse regarding Nārāyaṇa : 5. 'The waters are the bodies of Nara: such is the name we have heard given to them; and because he sleeps upon them, he is called Nārāyaṇa.' 6. Having so continued for a nocturnal period equal to a thousand Yugas, at the end of the night he takes the character of Brahmā in order to create. 7. Brahmā then becoming Vāyu (wind) moved upon that water,132 hither and thither, like a fiery bright at night in the rainy season. 8. Discovering then by inference that the earth lay within the waters, but unbewildered, (9) he took, for the purpose of raising it up, another body, as he had done at the beginnings of the (previous) Kalpas. Then that Great Being devised a celestial form. 10. Perceiving the earth to be entirely covered with water, (and asking himself) 'what great shape shall I assume in order that I may raise it up?'—he thought upon the form of a boar, brilliant from aquatic play, invincible by all creatures, formed of speech, and bearing the name of righteousness.'"

The body of the boar is then described in detail, and afterwards the elevation of the earth from beneath the waters, and the restoration of its former shape, divisions, etc.133—the substance of the account being

132 This statement, which is not in the corresponding passage of the Vishnu P., is evidently borrowed, along with other particulars, from the text of the Taittirīya Sanhitā, vii. 1, 5, 1, quoted above p. 82.
133 Following the passage of the Taittirīya Sanhitā, quoted above, the writer in one verse ascribes to Brahmā as Viṣvakarma the arrangement of the earth, taśa teṣāṁ viśvirgha lokodadhi-girishu aha | Viśvakarma vihajante kalpadishu punah punah |.
much the same, but the particulars different from those of the parallel passage in the Vishnu Purana.

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

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

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


[133] This is also the case with the details given in the Mārk. P. xlvii. 15-27 and ff.
[134] The Mārk. P. however observes the same order as the Vishnu P.
[135] The reading in the passage of the Taitt. Br. ii. 2, 9, 6, from which this narrative is borrowed (see above, p. 28), is opahata,—which, however, does not prove that that verb with vi prefixed should necessarily be the true reading here; as the Taylor and Gaikowar MSS. have vyapohata throughout, and in one place evapohat.
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126 This line is omitted in the Gaikowar MS.
127 The Gaikowar MS. seems to read upapārśvābhyyām.
128 The Gaikowar MS. reads Brahmaḥ mādhyamāṁ tanum.
129 The Gaikowar MS. reads dīvā tanuṁ.
"Sūta says: 1. Then, as he was desiring, there sprang from him mind-born sons, with those effects and causes derived from his body. 2. Embodied spirits were produced from the bodies of that wise Being. 3. Then willing to create these four streams (ambhāmsi) gods, Asuras, Fathers, and men, he fixed his spirit in abstraction. As Svayambhubhū was thus fixed in abstraction, a body consisting of nothing but darkness (invested him). 4. While desiring this creation, Prajāpati put forth an effort. Then Asuras were first produced as sons from his groin. 5. Āsu is declared by Brahmans to mean breath. From it these beings were produced; hence they are Asuras.\textsuperscript{140} He cast aside the body with which the Asuras were created. 6. Being cast away by him, that body immediately became night. Inasmuch as darkness predominated in it, night consists of three watches. 7. Hence, being enveloped in darkness, all creatures sleep at night. Beholding the Asuras, however, the Lord of gods took another body, (8) imperceptible, and having a predominance of goodness, which he then fixed in abstraction. While he continued thus to fix it, he experienced pleasure. 9. Then as he was sporting, gods were produced in his mouth. As they were born from him, while he was sporting (divyataḥ), they are known as Devas (gods). 10. The root div is understood in the sense of sporting. As they were born in a sportive (divya)\textsuperscript{141} body, they are called Devatās. 11. Having created the deities, the Lord of gods then took another body, consisting entirely of goodness (sattva). 12. Regarding himself as a father, he thought upon these sons: he created Fathers (Pitrīs) from his armpits in the interval between night and day. 13. Hence these Fathers are gods: therefore that sonship belongs to them. He cast aside the body with which the Fathers were created. 14. Being cast away by him, it straightway became twilight. Hence day belongs to the gods, and night is said to belong to the Asuras. 15. The body intermediate between them, which is that of the Fathers, is the most important. Hence gods, Asuras, Fathers, and men (16) worship intently this intermediate body of Brahmā. He then took again another body. But from that body, composed altogether of passion (rajas),

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

\textsuperscript{141} Divya properly means "celestial." But from the play of words in the passage, the writer may intend it to have here the sense of "sportive."
which he created by his mind, he formed mind-born 143 sons who had almost entirely a passionate character. 18. Then from his mind sprang mind-born sons. Beholding again his creatures, he cast away that body of his. 19. Being thrown off by him it straightway became morning twilight. Hence living beings are gladdened by the rise of early twilight. 20. Such were the bodies which, when cast aside by the Great Being, became immediately night and day, twilight and early twilight. 21. Early twilight, twilight, and day have all the character of pure goodness. Night has entirely the character of darkness (tamas); and hence it consists of three watches. 22. Hence the gods are beheld with a celestial body, and they were created from the mouth. As they were created during the day, they are strong during that period. 23. Inasmuch as he created the Asuras from his groin at night, they, having been born from his breath, during the night, are unconquerable during that season. 24, 25. Thus these four streams, early twilight, night, day, and twilight, are the causes of gods, Asuras, Fathers, and men, in all the Manvantaras that are past, as well as in those that are to come. 26. As these (streams) shine, they are called ambhaṇīs. This root bha is used by the intelligent in the senses of pervading and shining, and the Male, Prajāpati, declares (the fact). 27. Having beheld these streams (ambhaṇīsi), gods, Dānavas, men, and fathers, he again created various others from himself. 28. Abandoning that entire body, the lord created another, a form consisting almost entirely of passion and darkness, and again fixed it in abstraction. 29. Being possessed with hunger in the darkness, he then created another. The hungry beings formed by him were bent on seizing the streams (ambhaṇīsi). 30. Those of them, who said ‘let us preserve (rakṣama) these streams,’ are known in the world as Rākshasas, wrathful, and prowling about at night."

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

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

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


143 The narrative in the 49th chapter of the Markandeya Purana (verses 3-13) begins at this verse, the 37th of the Vayu Purana, and coincides, though with verbal differences, with what follows down to verse 47. After that there is more variation.
MYTHICAL ACCOUNTS OF THE CREATION OF MAN,

tasya satyābhīdhyāyīnas tada | mithunānāṁ sahasram tu so 'spijā vai
mukhāt tada | 38. Janās tu hy upapadyante sattvoddiktaḥ suchetasaḥ\textsuperscript{144} | sahasram anyad vakshasto mithunānāṁ sasarja ha | 39. Te sarve rajaso-
driktaḥ sushminaḥ chaṣṭya asushminaḥ\textsuperscript{145} | spriṣṭvā sahasram anyat tu
dvandvānāṁ ārutāḥ punaḥ | 40. Rajas-tamobhyām udrikta āhāśilas tu
to smritāḥ | pāddhyām sahasram anyat tu mithunānāṁ sasarja ha | 41.
 Udriktaṁ tamasa sarve niḥṣrikā hy ālpa-tejasāḥ | tato vai harshamānas
to dvandvotpannās tu prāṇīnāḥ | 42. Anyonya-kriśhāvaiśhāta maithe-
ṇāyopachakramuḥ | tataḥprabhriti kalpe 'smin maitheṇotpatīr uchyate |
43. Māsi māsy ārttavaṁ yat tu na tada "sit tu yoshitām\textsuperscript{146} | tasmāt tada
na sushuviṁ sevitāv api maitheṇaḥ | 44. Āyushā 'nte prasāyante mith-
unāny eva tāḥ sakrit | kūṣṭhakaḥ kūṣṭhikāḥ chaiva utpādyante munur-
shatām\textsuperscript{147} | 45. Tataḥ prabhrīti kalpe 'smin mithunānāṁ hi sambhavaḥ |
dhyānte tu manasa tāsām prajānāṁ jayat sakrit | 46. Sābda-viśhayaḥ
sūdhāḥ pratyekam pancha-lakṣhayaḥ | ity evam mānasī\textsuperscript{148} pūrvam prāk-
riṣṭhir yā Prajāpateḥ | 47. Tasyānवāvāye sambhūtā yair idam pārītaṁ
jagat | sariṭ-sarāḥ-samudrāṇiḥ cha sevante parvatān api | 48. Tadā
nātyanta-śītoshnā yuge tasmin charanti vai | prithvī-rasodbhavāṁ nāma
ahāraṁ hy āhāranti vai\textsuperscript{149} | 49. Tāḥ prajāḥ kāma-chārīnayo mānasim
siddhiṁ āsthitaḥ | dharmaḥ dharmaṁ na tāsv āstāṁ nirvīśeshāḥ prajās tu
tāḥ | 50. Tulyam āyuḥ sukham rūpaṁ tāsāṁ tasmin krite yuge | dhar-
maḥ dharmaṁ na tāsv āstāṁ kalpadau tu krite yuge | 51. Svena senaṁ-
kāreṇa jahnire te krite yuge | chatvāri tu sahasrāṇī varṣhānāṁ divya-
sankhyāyaḥ | 52. Ādyāṁ krita-yugam prāhuḥ sandhyānāṁ tu chatuḥ-
śatam | tataḥ sahasraśas tāsa prajāsū prathitāv api | 53.\textsuperscript{150} Na tāśām
pratīghāto 'sti na dvandvāṁ nāpi cha klamaḥ | parvato-dhākṣe-vinyo hy
aniṣkāśrayas tu tāḥ | 54. Viśokāḥ sattva-bahulaḥ hy ekānta-suḥkītaḥ
prajāḥ | tāḥ vai nīshkāma-chārīnayo nityam mudita-mānasāḥ | 55. Pāsa-

\textsuperscript{144} For suchetasaḥ the Mārk. P. reads sutejasāḥ.
\textsuperscript{145} For asushmināḥ the Mārk. P. reads amarshināḥ, "irascible."
\textsuperscript{146} I have corrected this line from the Māraṇgadeya Purāṇa, 49, 9 b. The reading of
the MSS. of the Vaiṣṇava Purāṇa cannot be correct. It appears to be: mūṣe mūṣe
ārttavāṁ yat yat tat tadāśid hi yoshitām | The negative particle seems to be indis-
pendable here.
\textsuperscript{147} This half verse is not found in the Mārk. P.
\textsuperscript{148} The Mārk. P. has mānasī, "human," instead of mānasī, "mental."
\textsuperscript{149} This verse is not in the Mārk. P.; and after this point the verses which are
common to both Purāṇas do not occur in the same places.
\textsuperscript{150} Verses 53–56 coincide generally with verses 14–18 of the Mārk. P.
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vaḥ pakṣhinaś chaiva na tadāsan sarṣripañ | nodbhijja nārakaś
dharmar-prasūtataḥ | 56. Na mula-phala-pushpaṁ cha nārttavam
rițavo na cha | sarva-kāma-sukhaḥ kālo nātyartham hy uṣhṇa-śītataḥ |
57. Manobhilasitāḥ kāmās tāsāṁ sarvatra sarvadaḥ | uttishtantii prithivi-
yāṁ vai tābhīr dhyāta āsotvaṁ | 58. Balavara-kaṁ tāsāṁ siddhiḥ
dā roga-nāsitii | asamkāryaś sartraiś cha prajās tāḥ sthirayaunavaṁ |
59. Tāsāṁ viśuddhāt sankalpāj jayanto mithunāḥ prajāḥ | samam janma
cha rūpaṁ cha mriyante chaiva tāḥ samam | 60. Tāda satyam aloḥaḥ
dha kshama tushṭīḥ sukhaṁ damaḥ | nirvīśeṣḥa tu tāḥ sarvaṁ rūpāyuk-
śila-cleshṭiśaḥ | 61. Abuddhipurvakāṁ vṛttam prajānāṁ jayate svayam |
apravṛttiḥ krita-yugo karmanoḥ śubhapāpayoḥ | 62. Varṇasrama-va-
vasthāḥ cha na tadā "sa na sankaraṁ | anichhādesa-yuktaṁ ve vartti-
yanti parasparam | 63. Tulya-rūpāyushaḥ sarvaḥ adhamottama-varj-
itāḥ | sukha-prayaḥ hy asokāḥ cha udpadyante krito yugo | 64. Nitya-
prahrishta-manasa mahāsattvā mahābalāḥ | lābhālaḥ bhav na tāsv āstām
mitrāmitre priyāpiye | 65. Manasa vishayas tāsāṁ nīrhhāṇām pravar-
tate | na lipsanti hi tāḥ nyayaṁ nānugrihantii chaiva hi | 66. Dhyānām
parām krita-yugo tretāyaṁ jnānam uchya te | pravṛttāṁ dvāpare yajnāṁ
dānam kali-yuge varam | 67. Sattvaṁ kritaṁ rojas tretā dvāparaṁ tu
rojas-tamaḥ | kalau tamas tu viñeyam yuga-vrītta-vaśena tu | 68. Kālaḥ
krite yuge te esha tasya saṁkhyāṁ nibodhāta | chatvāri tu sahasrani var-
śhāṇāṁ tat kritaṁ yugam | 69. Sandhyāṁsau tasya divyāṁit śatāṁ
ashtau cha saṁkhyāyā | tadā tāsām bahuśvayur na cha klesa-vipata-
tayaḥ | 70. Tataḥ kritayaṁ tasmīn sandhyāṁśe hi gata tu vai | pāda-
vaśiśto bhavati yuga-dharmas tu sarvasaḥ | 71. Sandhyāyām apy atita-
yāṁ anta-kāle yugasya vai | pādasas chāvaśiśto tu sandhyā-dharme
yugasya tu | 72. Evaṁ krite tu niḥśese siddhis tu antardadhe tāda |
tasyāṁ cha siddhau bhrashtāyaṁ mānasāṁ abhavat tataḥ | 73. Siddhir

151 The Mār. P. has nākraḥ, "crocodiles," in its enumeration.
152 The Mār. P. here inserts some other lines, 186-21a, instead of 57 and 58a of
the Vāyu P.
153 The Mār. P. inserts here the following verses: 24. Chatvāri tu sahasrāni
varśhāṇāṁ mānushaṁ tu | auhy-pramāṇāṁ jīvante na cha klesād vipatayaḥ |
25. Kavaśhit kvaśhit punaḥ sā bhūt kṣhitr bhūgyena sarvasaḥ | kālena gachhatā nāsām
upayānti yatāḥ prajāḥ | 26. Tathā tāḥ kramāsaḥ nāśaṁ jagmūh sarvatra siddhyāḥ |
tāsu sarvasaṁ nāshitaṁ prachyaṁ naraṁ (tataḥ in one MS.) | prayaścaḥ kalpa-
vrīkṣhaṁ te sambhūtaṁ griha-samīśhitaṁ | 154 Instead of bahuśvayur, etc., the Gaikowar MS. has prayaṁti na cha klesa
bahuśva ha |

155 Verses 27–35 of the Mārk. P. correspond more or less to this and the following verses down to 98.
156 This and the following verses correspond more or less closely to the Mārk. P. 30 ff.
chit kvachit | tasyām evālpa-siṣṭāyām sandhyā-kāla-vaṣāt tadā | 95.
varttataṁ tu tadā tāsām dvandvāny abhyutthināi tu | śītavātātapatais
tvraṁs tatas tāḥ duḥkhitaḥ bhrīṣam | 96. Dvandaśvās tāḥ pīḍyamanaṁ tu
chakrur āvaraṇāṁ cha | kriṅe vā dvanda-pratikāram niketāṁ hi bhejire |
97. Pūrvaṁ nikāma-chārāṁ te aniketāśrayā bhrīṣam | yathā-yogyāṁ
yathā-ṛiti nikenetah avasan punah | 98. Maru-dhanasvī nīṃneshu par-
cavasau dārīṣu cha157 | saṁśrayanti cha durgāṇi dhanvānāṁ sāsvatoda-
kam | 99. Yathā-yogāṁ yathā-kāmaṁ sameshuvām vishamēṣu cha | āṛabhpās
te niketā vāi karttūṁ śītōṣṇa-pāraṇaṁ | 100. Tatas tā māpayāmāśaṁ
khetāṇi cha puruṣaṁ cha | grāmaṁ śa chaiva yatāḥ-bhāgaṁ tathaivāntaṁ-
puruṣaṁ cha | . . . 123.158 Kṛiteshu teshu śāneshu punaṁ chakrur grin-
hami cha | yathā cha pūrvam aśan vāi vṛkṣhāṁ tu graha-saṁśhitaiḥ |
124. Tathā karttūṁ samārabṛhadḥuśūnātyātvaṁ punaḥ punaḥ | vṛidhāḥ
chaiva gataḥ śāṅkaṁ nataṁ chaiva cāpara gataḥ | 125. Aṁ ārdhvaṁ gataṁ
cānyaṁ enam tiryagagataṁ parah | buddhyā 'nvishyā tathā 'nāyā vā vṛk-
sha-śāṅkaṁ yathā gataḥ | 126. Tathā kṛitaṁ tu taṁ śāṅkhaṁ tāsmaṁ
chālaṁ sa tuṁ śṛṁtiḥ | evan prasiddhaṁ śāṅkhubhyāṁ śalaṁ chaiva
grihāṇi cha | 127. Tasmāt tā vāi śṛṁtiḥ śalaḥ śalāvam chaiva
tāsū tat | prasādayati manas tāsu manaḥ prasādayaṁ cha tāḥ | 128.
Tasmād grihāṇi śalaḥ cha prāsanāśa chaiva sanjñitaṁ | kriṅe vā dvand-
vesopaghātaṁs tān vārttopyaṁ achintayaṁ | 129.159 Nasṁteṣu ma-
dhunā vārdhāṁ kalpa-vṛkṣheshu vāi tadā | vishāda-vyākulaṁ tā vāi
prajas trishna-kshudhāntiḥ | 130. Tathā prādurbhau tāsāṁ sid-
dhāṁ tretā-yuge punaḥ | vārttārtha-sādhiḥ hy anāṇa vriṣṭhis tāsāṁ hi
kāmaṁ | 131. Tāsāṁ vriṣhty-udakāniha yāni ninnair gatiṇi tu | vriṣṭhyā ninnaiḥ
(nirabhavan eōraḥ-khatāṁ nīmnagāḥ | 132. Ecaṁ
nadyāṁ pravṛttas tu dvitiye vriṣṭhi-sarjane | ye prastād apāṁ stokā
dāpanaṁ prithīvitaśe | 133. Apāṁ bhūmes eō cha sāmyogāṁ oshadhāyaṁ tāsu
chābhavan | pushpa-mūlaphalīnas tu oshadhāyaṁ tāḥ prajñire | 134.
Aphāla-kriṁṭhāṁ chānuṁtā grāmāyānayaṁ chaturdaśa | rūtu-pushpa-phal-
āśe daiva vriṣṭhāḥ guṇṁaḥ eōa jajnire | 135. Prādurbhauvaṁ eōa tretāyaṁ
ädopaṁ aushingyaṁ tu | tenaushadhena vartiente prajāṁ tretáyuge
tadā | 136. Tathā punar abhūt tāsāṁ rueo lobhas eōa sarvasaṁ | avasyam-

157 I have corrected this line from Märk. P. xlix. 35.
158 Verses 52–54 of the Märk. P. correspond in substance to verses 123–128 of the Vāyu P.
159 Verses 55–62 of the Märk. P. correspond to verses 129–137 of the Vāyu P.
bhāvinā 'ṛthena tretā-yuga-vaśena tu | 137. Tatas tāh paryagrihṇanta
nadīḥ kahetraniṃ pareatan | viśkhān guṇmaudhāṅkha chaiva praṣahya tu
yathā-balam | 138. Siddhātmānas tu ye pṛvacca vyākhyatāḥ prāk krite
mayā | Brāhmaṇo mānasās te vai utpanna ye janād iha | 139. Sāntās
cha sushmiṇās chaiva karmāṅkha duḥkhisnās tadā | tataḥ pravarttamānas te
tretāyāṃ ājñire punah | 140. Brāhmaṇaḥ kṣattriyaḥ vaiśyāḥ śudrā
dhōjanās tathā | bhāvitāḥ pṛvacca-jātiṣvāḥ karmabhis ācha śubhāsubhāhāḥ
| 141. Itas tebhyaḥ balā te tu satyasīrā hy ahiśaśakāḥ | vita-lohā jīvas-
māno nivāsantī sma teshu vai | 142. Pratigrihṇanti kurvanti tebhyaḥ
cānaye 'īpa-tejasāḥ | evaṃ vipratipanneshu prapanneśu paraśparam |
143. Tena dōṣeṇa tēṣām tāḥ oṣadhiyo mishatām tādā | 144. Agraṣad bhūr yuga-balād
grāmyāranyāḥ chaturāsā | phalam grihṇanti pusphaśeśa phalāḥ patraiḥ
puniḥ punah | 145. Tatas tāsū pranashṭāsa vibhrāntās tāḥ prajās
tādā | Sevanāśchāvam prabhuḥ jagnuḥ kshāhāvaiśtāḥ prajapātim |
146. vṛttī-arthaṃ abhiliṣpantāḥ adāu tretā-yugasya tu | Brāhmaṇa Sevanāśchāv
bhagavān jñātā tāsāṃ māṁṣhitam | 147. Yuktam pratyaksa-duśrṣṭena
darśanena viḥāryya cha | grastāḥ prāhīryāḥ oṣadhiyo jñātā pratyāhārti
puniḥ | 148. Krītā vatsaṃ sumerum tu dūdāha prithivim āmaṃ | dūgā-
yāṃ gaus tādā tena viṣāṇi prithivī-śale | 149. Ājñire tānī viṣāṇi grāmyā-
ryānās tu tāh punah | oṣadhiyo phala-paṅkāntāḥ sāṇa-saptadāsas tu tāḥ |
. . . . 155. Utpannāḥ prathamaṃ hy etā adāu tretā-yugasya tu | 156. Aṅhala-krīṣṭā oṣadhiyo
grāmyāranyās tu sarvasaḥ | viśkhā guṇma-
lata-valāho virūḍhas triṇa-jātayaḥ | 157. Mālaḥ phalais cha rohīnyo
'grikhaṇa pusphaśe cha yāh phalam | prithvī dūgāḥ tu viṣāṇi yāṃ pūr-
vaḥ Sevanāśchāv | 158. Ritu-puspha-phalās tā vai oṣadhiyo ājñire tv au
| 159. Tatas tāsāṃ vṛttī-arthaṃ vārtttopāyaḥ chakāra ha | Brāhmaṇa Sevanāśchāv
bhagavān hasta-siddhaṃ tu karmā-jam | 160. Tatas-prabhṛty athau-
shadhiyo kṛṣṭa-pachyās tā ājñire | samśiddhāyāṁ tu vārttāyāṁ tatas
tāsāṃ Sevanāśchāv | 161. Maryādāḥ sthāpyamāsaṣa yathārabdhāḥ
paraśaram | 162. Ye vai pariṣṭhirāras tāsāṃ āsan badhātmakaḥ |
163. Nareshāṁ kṛta-trāṇāṁ sthāpyamāsa kṣattriyaṃ | upatisṭhitāṃ ye tān

100 Mārkm. P. verse 63a.
101 Mārkm. P. verse 68b.
102 Verses 64–67 of the Mārkm. P. correspond to verses 146–149 of the Vāyu P.
103 Verses 73–75 of the Mārkm. P. correspond to verses 155–160a of the Vāyu P.
104 This with all what follows down to verse 171 is omitted in the Mārkm. P.
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165 I conjecture siddhyāyā dātā to be the proper reading. The MSS. have siddhyāyādātā, or siddhyāyādātā, etc.

166 Verses 173 f. are found in the Märk. P. verses 77 f.; but all that follows down to verse 193 is omitted there
192. Antar-bhāva-praduṣṭasya kuryato hi parākramāt | sarvasvam api
yo dadyāt kaluseṇāntarātmanā | 193. Na tena dharma-bhāk sa syād
bhāva eva hi kāraṇam | . . . 199. Evaṁ varṇāsramāṇāṁ vai prati-
bhāge kṛte tadā | 200. Yadā svya na vyavardhana praṇā varṇāsramat-
mikāḥ | tato 'nyā mānasīḥ so 'tha tretā-mādhya 'svijat praṇāḥ | 201. Āt-
manas tāḥ sarirāchcha tulyāḥ chaivātmanā tu vai | tasmin tretā-yugo
praṇte mādhya praṇte kramena tu | 202. Tato 'nyā manasīs tatra pra-
ṇāḥ srasṭtum prachakrame | tataḥ satea-rajodriktāḥ praṇāḥ so 'thāsvijat
praṇbhuḥ | 203. Dharmārtha-kāma-mokshanāṁ vārtta-yās chaiva sādhik-
āḥ | devāḥ cha pitarās chaiva rishayo manavāc tathā | 204. Yuga-
rūpāh dharmaṇa yair imā vichitaḥ praṇā | upashthite tadā tasmin praṇā-
dharme (-sarge?) Svayamābhavaḥ | 205. Abhidhānu praṇāḥ sarvā nānā-
rūpāḥ tu mānasīḥ | pūrvokta ya mayā tubhyaiḥ jana-lokāṁ samāsritaḥ | 206. Kalpe'tite tu tā hy āsan devādyās tu praṇā iha | dhyāyatas tasya tāḥ
saraṇāḥ sambhūty-artham upasṭhitāḥ | 207. Manvantara-kramenaḥ ka-
nishṭhe praṇāme mataḥ | khyātyā 'nubandhais tais tais tu savārthaṁ
iha bhāvitaḥ | 208. Kuśalākūśala-prāyaṁ karmabhīs tāḥ sādā praṇāḥ |
tat-karma-phala-kesaṇa upasṭhitāḥ praṇajñīre | 209. Devāsvra-pitri-
tvais tu pāsu-pakshi-sarīri-paiḥ | evāh-sa-rākṣa-kātavais tais tair bhāvair
upaśṭhitaḥ | ādhibhūtyam praṇānāṁ cha ātmanaṁ vai vinimane |

"22. At the beginning of the Kalpa, in the first Krita age, he
created those living beings (23) which I have formerly described to
thee; but in the olden time, at the close of the Kalpa, those crea-
tures were burnt up by fire. 24. Those of them who did not reach
the Tapoloka took refuge in the Janaloka; and when the creation
again commences, they form its seed. 25. Existing there as a seed
for the sake of another creation, they then, as they are created, are
produced with a view to progeny. 26. These are declared to accom-
plish, in the present state (the four ends of human life, viz.), duty,
the acquisition of wealth, the gratification of love, and the attain-
ment of final liberation,—both gods, Fathers, Rishis, and Manus.
27. They, then, filled with austere fervour, replenish (all) places.
These are the mental sons of Brahmā, perfect in their nature. 28.
Those who ascended to the sky by works characterized by devotion to
external objects, but not by hatred, return to this world and are born
in every age. 29. As the result of their works, and of their destination,
(returning) from the Janaloka, they are born of the same character (as
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before), in consequence of the (previous) deeds by which they are bound.\textsuperscript{167} 30. It is to be understood that the cause of this is their tendency (or fate), which itself is the result of works. In consequence of these works, good or bad, they return from Janaloka and are born, (31) and receive various bodies in (different) wombs. They are produced again and again in all states, from that of gods to that of motionless substances. 32. These creatures, as they are born time after time, receive the same functions as they had obtained in each previous creation. 33. Destructiveness and undestructiveness, mildness and cruelty, righteousness and unrighteousness, truth and falsehood—actuated by such dispositions as these, they obtain (their several conditions); and hence particular actions are agreeable to particular creatures. 34. And in succeeding periods they for the most part obtain the forms and the names which they had in the past Kalpas. 35. Hence they obtain the same names and forms. In the different Kalpas they are born with the same name and form. 36. Afterwards, when the creation had been suspended, as Brahmā was desirous to create, (37) and, fixed in his design, was meditating upon offspring,—he created from his mouth a thousand couples of living beings, (38) who were born with an abundance of goodness (satva) and full of intelligence.\textsuperscript{168} He then created another thousand couples from his breast: (39) they all abounded in passion (rajās) and were both vigorous and destitute of vigour.\textsuperscript{169} After creating from his thighs another thousand pairs, (40) in whom both passion and darkness (tamas) prevailed, and who are described as active,—he formed from his feet yet another thousand couples (41) who were all full of darkness, inglorious, and of little vigour. Then the creatures sprung from the couples (or thus produced in couples) rejoicing, (42) and filled with mutual love, began to cohabit. From that period sexual intercourse is said to have arisen in this Kalpa. 43. But at that time women had no monthly discharge: and they consequently bore no children, although cohabit-

\textsuperscript{167} *Karma-saṁśaya-bandhanāt*. I am unable to state the sense of *saṁśaya* in this compound.

\textsuperscript{168} *Suchetanāh*. The reading of the Mārk. P. *сутйaṣaḥ*, "full of vigour," is recommended, as an epithet of the Brāhmans, by its being in opposition to *aīpa-tejasāḥ*, "of little vigour," which is applied to the Śūdras a few lines below.

\textsuperscript{169} The reading of the Mārk. P. *amaraṁnaḥ*, "irascible," gives a better sense than *aśūṣmnaḥ*, "devoid of vigour," which the Vāyu P. has.
ation was practised. 44. At the end of their lives they once bore twins. Weak-minded boys and girls were produced when (their parents) were on the point of death. 45. From that period commenced, in this Kalpa, the birth of twins; and such offspring was once only born to these creatures by a mental effort, in meditation (46),—(offspring which was) receptive (?) of sound and the other objects of sense, pure, and in every case distinguished by five marks. Such was formerly the early mental creation of Prajapati. 47. Those creatures by whom the world was replenished, born as the descendants of this stock, frequented rivers, lakes, seas, and mountains. 48. In that age (yuga) they lived unaffected by excessive cold or heat, and appropriated the food which was produced from the essences of the earth. 49. They acted according to their pleasure, existing in a state of mental perfection. They were characterized neither by righteousness nor unrighteousness; were marked by no distinctions. 50. In that Kṛtā yuga, in the beginning of the Kalpa, their age, happiness, and form were alike: they were neither righteous nor unrighteous. 51. In the Kṛtā age they were produced each with authority over himself. Four thousand years, according to the calculation of the gods, (52) and four hundred years for each of the morning and evening twilights, are said to form the first, or Kṛtā, age. 170 Then, although these creatures were multiplied by thousands, (53) they suffered no impediment, no susceptibility to the pairs of opposites (pleasure and pain, cold and heat, etc.) and no fatigue. They frequented mountains and seas, and did not dwell in houses. 54. They never sorrowed, were full of goodness (sattva), and supremely happy; acted from no impulse of desire, 172 and lived in continual delight. 55. There were at that time no beasts, birds, reptiles, or plants, 172 (for these things are produced by unrighteousness), 173 (56) no roots, fruits,

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

171 Perhaps we should read here nikāma-chārinyo instead of nishkāma- : if so, the sense will be, “they moved about at will.”

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

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

mencement of the Tretā' age Brahmā—having at the beginning of the Kalpa created animals and plants—employed them in sacrifice.” Although the order of the words renders the sense in some degree uncertain, it appears to be that which Prof. Wilson assigns in his translation (i. 84), “Brahmā, having created, in the commencement of the Kalpa, various [animals and] plants, employed them in sacrifices in the beginning of the Tretā’ age.” This interpretation is supported by the Commentator, who remarks: Tad evam kalpasyādīva eva paśūn oshadhīṣ cha sṛiṣṭi' namataṃ tretā-yuga-mukhe prōptā sati samyag grāmyārya-vyāstāḥyā tadā 'dheveś sānatayā (samyaktyayā?) yuvāja krita-yoge yajnasyāpravṛttah | “Having then thus at the very beginning of the Kalpa created animals and plants, he afterwards, when the commencement of the Tretā’ age arrived, employed them properly, according to the distinction of domestic and wild, in sacrifice,—since sacrifice did not prevail in the Kṛta age.” This agrees with the course of the preceding narrative which makes no allusion to plants and animals having been produced in a different Yuga from the other beings whose creation had been previously described. (See Wilson i. 82–84.) The parallel passage in the Vāyu P. x. 44–46, is confused.

174 The Märk. P. xlix. 24 inserts here the following lines: “They lived for four thousand years of mortals, as the measure of their existence, and suffered no calamities from distress. 25. In some places the earth again enjoyed prosperity in every respect. As through lapse of time the creatures were destroyed, too those perfections everywhere gradually perished. 26. When they had all been destroyed, creeping-plants fell from the sky, which had nearly the character of Kalpa-trees (i.e. trees which yield all that is desired), and resembled houses.”
and in force. There existed among them no such things as gain or loss, friendship or enmity, liking or dislike. 65. It was through the mind (alone, i.e. without passion?) that these disinterested beings acted towards each other. They neither desired anything from one another; nor shewed any kindness to each other. 175 Contemplation is declared to be supreme in the Krīta age, knowledge in the Tretā; sacrifice began in the Dvāpara; liberality is the highest merit in the Kali. 67. The Krīta age is goodness (satīva), the Tretā is passion (rajas), the Dvāpara is passion and darkness (tamas), in the Kali it is to be understood that darkness (prevails), according to the necessary course of these ages. 68. The following is the time in the Krīta age: understand its amount. Four thousand years constitute the Krīta; (69) and its twilights endure for eight hundred divine years. Then their life was (so long?) 176 and no distresses or calamities befel them. 70. Afterwards, when the twilight in the Krīta was gone, the righteousness peculiar to that age was in all respects reduced to a quarter (of its original sum). 71. When further the twilight had passed, at the close of the Yuga, and the righteousness peculiar to the twilight had been reduced to a quarter, (72) and when the Krīta had thus come altogether to an end,—then perfection vanished. When this mental perfection had been destroyed, there arose (73) another perfection formed in the period of the Tretā age. The eight mental perfections, which I declared (to have existed) at the creation, (74) were gradually extinguished. At the beginning of the Kalpa mental perfection alone (existed), viz., that which existed in the Krīta age. 75. In all the Manvantaras there is declared to arose a perfection proceeding from works, produced by the discharge of the duties belonging to castes and orders, according to the fourfold division of Yugas. 76. The (morning) twilight (deteriorates) by a quarter of the (entire) Krīta,—and the evening twilight by (another) quarter;—(thus) the Krīta, the morning twilight, and the evening

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

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

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

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

---

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

181 Dhanvānām sūśvatodakam. Perhaps we should read here with the Mārkaṇḍa. P. xlix. 35, vārkaṃ pārvatam anadakam ‘‘(fortresses) protected by trees, built on mountains, or surrounded by water.’’

182 Whatever may be thought of this rendering of the phrase, vṛikṣāḥ grihāsam-asthitāḥ, the Mārkaṇḍa. P. (xlix. 32), at least, is quite clear: grihākūrā yathā pūrvaś tathā āsām maśāraḥ | tathā saṁsārmītya tat sarvāṁ chakran evaṃmi tāḥ prajāḥ | ‘‘As they had formerly had trees with the shape of houses, so recalling all that to mind, these people built their dwellings.’’
AND OF THE ORIGIN OF THE FOUR CASTES

are called rooms (śālāḥ). In this way rooms and houses derive their appellation from branches. 127. Hence rooms are called śālā, and in that their character as rooms (śālātvam) consists. And inasmuch as the mind takes pleasure in them, and as they have gladdened (prāśādayan), the mind, (128) houses, rooms, and palaces are termed respectively griha, śālā, and prāśāda. Having adopted these means of defence against the ‘opposites,’ they devised methods of subsistence. 129. The kalpa-trees having been destroyed along with their honey, those creatures, afflicted with thirst and hunger, became disquieted by dejection. 130. Then again another perfection arose for them in the Tretā age,—which fulfilled the purpose of subsistence,—viz., rain at their pleasure. 131. The rain-water, which flowed into the hollows, burst out in the form of springs, water-courses, and rivers, through the rain. 132. Thus at the second fall of rain rivers began to flow. When the drops of water first reached the ground, then (133) from the conjunction of the waters and the earth plants sprang up among them, which bore both flowers, roots, and fruits. 134. Fourteen kinds of plants, cultivated and wild, were produced without ploughing or sowing, as well as trees and shrubs which bore flowers and fruit at the proper season. 135. This was the first appearance of plants in the Tretā age, and by them men subsisted at that period. 136. Then there again arose among them, universally, desire and cupidity, through a necessary process, and as a result of the Tretā age. 137. They then appropriated to themselves, by force and violence, rivers, fields, hills, trees, shrubs, and plants. 138. Those perfect beings, who were described by me as existing formerly in the Kṛita,—the mind-born children of Brahmā, who had been produced in this world when they came from the Janaloa,—(139) who were (some) tranquil, (some) fiery, (some) active, and (others) distressed,—were again born in the Tretā, (140) as Brāhmans, Kṣattriyas, Vaiśyas, Śudrās, and injurious men, governed by the good and bad actions (performed) in former births. 141. Then those who were weaker than they, being truthful and innocent, dwell among them, free from cupidity, and self-restrained; (142) whilst

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

134 The text here does not seem to be in a satisfactory state. The Calcutta edition of the Mārk. P. reads vṛṣṭhyāvaruddhāhair śhovat, etc.
others, less glorious than they, took and did.\textsuperscript{185} When they had thus become opposed to each other,—(143) through their misconduct, while they struggled together, the plants were destroyed, being seizing with their fists like gravel. 144. Then the earth swallowed up the fourteen kinds of cultivated and wild plants, in consequence of the influence exerted by the Yuga: for men had seized again and again the fruit, together with the flowers and leaves. 145. After the plants had perished, the famished people, becoming bewildered, repaired to Svayambhū the lord of creatures, (146) in the beginning of the Tretā age, seeking the means of subsistence.\textsuperscript{186} Learning what they desired, (147) and determining by intuition what was proper to be done, the Lord Bhrāmā Svayambhū, knowing that the plants had been swallowed up by the earth, milked them back. 148. Taking Sumeru as a calf, he milked this earth. When this earth (or cow)\textsuperscript{187} was milked by him, roots were

\textsuperscript{185} It is difficult to extract any satisfactory sense out of this line.

\textsuperscript{186} The S. P. Br. ii. 4, 2, 1, also speaks of different classes of creatures applying to the creator for food: Prajāpatiḥ vai bhūtany upāśīdān | praṇāh vai bhūtāgni | “vi no āhehi yatāḥ śivāna” iti | tato devā yajnopaviṭino bhūtvā daksāhiṇān jāne ācyya upāśīdān | tān abravīd “yajno vo ‘namam amṛitaśc ca uṛg vah sūryo vo jyotir” iti | 2. Atha enam pitaraḥ prāchānāvītanāḥ savayān jāvā ācyya upāśīdān | tān abravīd “māsi māsi vo ‘namam svādhā vo manojava vaś chandramā vo jyotir” iti | 3. Atha enam manshāhā prāvṛtītāḥ upatāhān kṛitvā upāśīdān | tān abravīd “śyāṃ prātār vo ‘namam prāṇāḥ vo mātyav vo ‘gnār vo jyotir” iti | 4. Atha enam pāvāvāḥ upāśīdān | tebhyaḥ svāśāman eva chakāra “yadā eva yuyam kadāca labhedvai yadi kāle yady anākāle atha eva anātha” iti | tvāmad ete yadā kadāca labhante yadi kāle yady anākāle atha eva aśnanti | 5. Atha ha enam ṣaśvad āpy asurāḥ upaseitra ity āhuh | tebhāras tamasi cha māyān cha pradadāt | asty aha eva asura-māyā iti eva | paraḥsūda ha tv eva śah prāṇāḥ | tāh imāh prāṇāḥ tathāeva upajyānti yatāhā evābhā eva Prajāpatiḥ adadāt | “All beings resorted to Prajāpati,—(creatures are beings),—(saying) ‘provide for us that we may live.’ Then the gods, wearing the sacrificial cord, and bending the right knee, approached him. To them he said, ‘let sacrifice be your food, your immortality your strength, the sun your light.’ 2. Then the Fathers, wearing the sacrificial cord on their right shoulders, and bending the left knee, approached him. To them he said, ‘you shall eat monthly, your oblation (svādha) shall be your rapidity of thought, the moon your light.’ 3. Then men, clothed, and inclining their bodies, approached him. To them he said, ‘ye shall eat morning and evening, your offspring shall be your death, Agni your light.’ 4. Then cattle repaired to him. To them he accorded their desire, (saying), ‘Whenever ye find anything, whether at the proper season or not, eat it.’ Hence whenever they find anything, whether at the proper season or not, they eat it. 5. Then they say that the Asuras again and again resorted to him. To them he gave darkness (tamasa) and illusion. There is, indeed, such a thing as the illusion, as it were, of the Asuras. But those creatures succumbed. These creatures subsist in the very manner which Prajāpati allotted to them.’

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

188 See the note on verse 55, above.
189 Yathārarahbāḥ. The Märk. P. has yathā-nyāyam yathā-guṇam, “according to fitness and their qualities.”
190 Itareshām kṛita-trāṇān. The M. Bh. xii. 2247, thus explains the word Kśattriya: brāhmaṇām kṣhata-trāṇāt tataḥ kṣhatriya uchyate | “(a king) is called Kshatriya because he protects Brāhmans from injuries.”
191 Vaiśasāṁ karma. The former word has the senses of (1) “hindrance, impediment,” and (2) “slaughter,” assigned to it in Wilson’s Dictionary.

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

The substance of the curious speculations on the origin and primeval condition of mankind contained in the preceding passage may be stated as follows: In verses 22–34 we are told that the creatures, who at the close of the preceding Kalpa had been driven by the mundane conflagration to Janaloka, now formed the seed of the new creation, which took place in the Kṛta Yuga, at the commencement of the present

103 I confess that I have had great difficulty in attaching any sense to the last words.
Kalpa. These were mind-born sons of Brahmā, perfect in nature, and they peopled the world. As a rule, we are informed, those beings who have formerly been elevated from the earth to higher regions, return again and again to this world, and, as a result of their previous works, are born in every age, in every possible variety of condition, exhibiting the same dispositions and fulfilling the same functions as in their former states of existence. It is next stated, verses 35–40, that when creation had, in some way not explained, come to a stand-still, four classes of human beings, consisting each of a thousand pairs of males and females, characterized respectively by different qualities, physical and moral, were produced from different members of the Creator's body. 194 These creatures sought to propagate the race, but abortively, for the reason specified (43). Children however were produced by mental effort (45 and 59), and in considerable numbers (52). The state of physical happiness, absolute and universal equality, moral perfection, and complete dispassion, in which mankind then existed, is depicted (48–65). The means of subsistence and enjoyment, which they are said to have drawn from the earth (48 and 57), were not of the ordinary kind, as we are informed (55 f.) that neither animals nor plants, which are the products of unrighteousness, existed at that period. No division into castes or orders prevailed during that age of perfection (62). A gradual declension, however, had been going on, and at the end of the Kṛita Yuga, the perfection peculiar to it had altogether disappeared (70–79). Another kind of perfection, peculiar to the Tretā, however, subsequently arose (73 and 80), and in the different Yugas there has existed a perfection springing from the performance of the duties belonging to each caste and order (75). The perfection described as prevailing in the Tretā was of a physical kind, consisting in the production of rain and the growth of trees, shaped like houses, which at the same time yielded the materials of all sorts of enjoyments (80–82). Passion, however, in its various forms began to take the place of the previous dispassion (84). The constitution of women, which had formerly incapacitated them for effective impregnation, became ultimately so modified as to ensure the successful propagation of the species, which

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sūta uvācha | 1. Evam bhūtesu lokesu Brahmamā loka-karttīrṇā\(^{125}\) |

\(^{125}\) This form \(karttīrṇā\) (one which, as is well known, may be optionally employed in
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1. When the worlds had thus been formed by Brahmā their creator, but the creatures, for some reason did not engage in action, Brahmat, enveloped in gloom, and thenceforward dejected, formed a resolution tending to ascertain the fact. 3. He then created in himself (a body) of his own, formed of pure gloom (tamas), having overpowered the passion (rajas) and goodness (sattva) which existed (in him) naturally. 4. The Lord of the world was afflicted with that suffering, and la-

the neuter, but not in the masculine) is here used for metrical reasons. Such irregularities are, as we have seen, designated by the Commentators as ārṣa. It is unlikely that Brahman should be here used in a neuter sense.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Prajapatiṁ vai svāṁ duhitaram abhyadhyaṁ | Divam ity anye āhur
Ushasan ity anye | tāṁ riṣyo bhūtvā rohitāṁ bhūtāṁ abhyait | tām
deva apāśyan | “akritan vai Prajapatiṁ karoti” iti | te tam aichhan
yāḥ enam ārishyati | etam anyonyasmin na avindan | teshāṁ yā eva
ghoratamāṁ taṁvā āsams tāḥ ekadhā samabhāran | tāḥ sambhritāṁ esha
deva ‘bhavat | tad asya etad bhūtavan-nāma | bhavati vai sa yo ’syā etad
evaṁ nāma veda | tām deva abravann “ayaṁ vai Prajapatiṁ akar
imam vidhyā” iti | sa “tathā” ity abravit | “sa vai vo varasṁ
viṁai” iti | “viṁishva” iti | sa etam eva varasṁ atrimita paśuṁ
ādhipatyam | tad asya etat paśuṁan-nāma | paśuṁan bhavati yo ’syā
etad evaṁ nāma veda | tam abhyāyatyā avidhyat | sa viṁhaḥ ēṛḍāṁ
udopāpataḥ ityādi201 |

201 See the translation of this passage given by Dr. Haug in his Aitareya Brāhmaṇa
"Prajāpati lusted after his own daughter. Some call her the Sky, others Ushas. Becoming a buck, he approached her after she had become a doe. The gods saw him; (and said) Prajāpati does a deed which was never done (before). They sought some one who should take vengeance on him. Such a person they did not find among themselves. They then gathered together their most dreadful bodies. These when combined formed this god (Rudra). Hence (arises) his name connected with Bhūta (Bhūtapati). That man flourishes who thus knows this name of his. The gods said to him, ‘This Prajāpati has done a deed which was never done before: pierce him.’ He replied, ‘so be it,’ (adding), ‘let me ask a boon of you.’ They rejoined, ‘ask.’ He asked for this boon, viz., lordship over cattle. Hence arises his name connected with Pāśu (Pāśwapati). He who thus knows his name, becomes the owner of cattle. He then attacked (Prajāpati) and pierced him. He, when pierced, soared upwards,” etc. etc.


vol. ii. pp. 218 ff.; and the remarks on this translation by Professor Weber, Indische Studien, ix. 217 ff.; and also Professor Roth’s explanation of the word bhūṣavat in his Lexicon.

202 This seems to be imitated in the line of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa iii. 12, 30, quoted in vol. iv. of this work, p. 40: naitat pūravat kṛitaṁ tevad ye na karishyanti chāpāre | “This was never done by those before thee, nor will those after thee do it.”

203 Bhāvati. In the Brāhmaṇa's this verb has frequently the sense of prospering, as opposed to parābhāvati, “he perishes.” See Brāhmaṅg and Roth’s Lexicon, s. v., and the passages there referred to.
vismaya-sphurād-oshṭham cha pāśchātyam udagāt tataḥ | 41. Chatur-
tham abhavat pāśhād vāmaṁ kāma-saṅgatam | tato 'nyād abhavat
tasya kāmāñūrataya tathā | 42. Upatantyās tadā 3kāśe alokeṇa kutu-
halat | srishty-arthan yat kriyam tena tapaḥ paramadārūgam | 43. Tat
sarvam nāsaṁ agamat sva-sutopagamaṇḍhaya | tenāsu vaktam abhavat
panchamaṁ tasya dhīmataḥ | 44. Āvirbhavaj jātābhīṣha taś vaktранcha-
vrīṇot prabhūḥ | tatas tāṁ abraviḍ Brahmā putrān atma-saṁuddhavaṇ 
| 45. “Prajās srijadhvaṁ abhitaḥ sa-devāsura-mānushaḥ” | evam uktās
tataḥ sarve sosrijur vividhaḥ prajāḥ | 46. Gatesha teshu srishtyartham
praṇāmaṇavaṇaṁ imāṁ | upayema sa viśvātmā S'atarūpāṁ anindītām | 
47. Sambhavā tasyā sārdādam atikāmāturom viśhuḥ | valajjāṁ chakame
devaḥ kamalodara-mandire | 48. Yāvaḥ abda-'stāmaṁ divyaṁ yathā 'nyaḥ
prākṛito janāḥ | tataḥ kālena mahāta tasyāḥ putro 'bhavaḥ Mansūḥ | 49.
Svāyambhuva iti khyātaḥ sa Viśvaṁ iti naḥ śrutam | tad-raṇa-guṇa-saṅga-
nyād adhipāraṁ uchyate | 50. Vairāja yatra te jāthaḥ bahavaḥ saṃsi-
vratāḥ | Svāyambhuva mahābhāgāḥ saṁta saṁta tathā 'pare | 51. Svā-
rochāhiḍyāḥ sarve te Brahma-tvaṇa-svarūpiṇaḥ | Auttami-pramukhās
taṇḍav yeshāṁ tvaṁ saṁta 'dhunā | (Adhyāya 4.) Manuṛ uvāča | 
1. Aho kaśṭataraṁ chaitaṅgāgamanāṁ viśhuḥ | Kṛthaṁ na doshaṁ
agamat karnaṁ tena Padmaṁ | 2. Parasparancha sambandaḥ sago-
traṇaṁ abhūt katham | vaiśvāṅkaṁ tattutānāṁ chhinti ma saṁsayaṁ
viśhuḥ | Mātsya uvāča | 3. Divyeyam ādi-sriṣṭis tu rajo-guṇa-saṁuds-
bhavaḥ | atindriyendriya taṇḍav atindriya-saṅgirikā | 4. Divya-tejomayi
bhāpa divya-jnāna-saṁuddhavaḥ | na chānyaṁ abhītāḥ sakhya jñataṁ vai
maṁsa-chakshuḥ | 5. Yathā bhujangaḥ sarpaṇāṁ akāśe sarva-pakshi-
taṁ | vidanti mārgaṁ divyānāṁ divyā eva na mānavaḥ | 6. Kāryā-
kārinya devaṣča subhaṁ subhaṁ-phala-pradāḥ | yasmāt tasmād na rājendra
tad-viĉhāro niṣṭaṁ subhaḥ | 7. Anyachcha sarva-devanāṁ adhiṣṭhātā
chaturmiṇakaḥ | gāyatrī Brahmanaḥ taṇḍav anga-bhūta niṅgayate | 8.
Anārtta-mūrttimad vāpi māthvaṁcha prachakshate | Viśranchir yatra
bhagavāns tatra devi Sarasvatī | 9. Bhāratī yatra yatraiva tatra tatra
Prajāpatiḥ | yatāhāsanā rahitaḥ ohārā vai (? na) dṛṣyate kvaĉit | 
10. Gāyatrī Brahmanāḥ pūršvam tathaṁ na vimuncati | veda-rāṣṭī
smrito Brahmā Sāvitrī tad-adhiṣṭhītā | 11. Tasmād na kaśchid dosaḥ
syāt Sāvitrī-gamanā viśhuḥ | tathāpi lojjāvaṇaṁ Prajāpatiḥ abhūt purā | 
12. Sva-sutopagamaṇḍ Brahmā saṁdaḥ Kusumāyuḥām | yasmād maṁpi

204 Instead of tenāsu the Galkowar MS. reads tenordhva.
bhavatā manah saṁkhobhitam saratḥ | 13. Tasmāt tvad-deham achirād

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

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

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

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

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

\[200\] The word means "He whose weapons are flowers."
as authoritative, may also have thought it necessary to discover some device for counteracting the scandal. On the other hand, the original writer seems to cut himself off from the privilege of resorting to any mystical refinements to explain away the offence, by having in the first instance represented Brahmā’s indulgence as on a level with that of ordinary beings. And even after the apology has been concluded, we are still told that Brahmā could not help feeling ashamed of what he had done. The writer of the explanation ought to have perceived that if his defence was of any value, the deity for whom he was apologizing had no ground for humiliation. But he did not venture to expunge the popular features of the story. The grounds on which the apology proceeds are partly of the same character as those which the writer of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa assumes in the passage (x. 33, 27 ff.) which is given in the fourth volume of this work, pp. 42 ff., viz., that the gods are not to be judged on the same principles as men,—that “the celestials have laws of their own” (sunt superis sua jura). The Bhāgavata Purāṇa has, however, different measures for Brahmā and for Krishṇa; for whilst the adultery of the latter is defended in the verses just referred to, no desire is shown to vindicate the former in the other passage, iii. 12, 28 ff., adduced in the same volume, page 40.

As regards the details of the story according to the different Purāṇas, I may observe that while the Viṣṇu, the Vāyu (see above, pp. 65, and 106), and the Mārkandeya Purāṇa, xl. 13 ff., represent Satarāpī as the wife of Manu Svāyambhuva, the Matsya Purāṇa, as we have just seen, declares her to have been the spouse of Brahmā himself, and the mother of Manu Svāyambhuva.200 This is repeated in the twenty-sixth verse of the fourth chapter:


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

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

Vāmadevaś tu bhasavān asrijad mukhato dvijān | rājanyān asrijad bāhvor Viś-śūdrāv āru-pādayoh | . . . 35. Svāyambhuvo Manur dhīmāṁs tapas taptvā sudūṣcharam | patnīm avāpa rūpāṅhyāṁ Anantāṁ nāma nāmataḥ | Priyavrataottānapādu Manus tasyāṁ aṣṭaṁ ajarānāt |

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

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

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

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

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

Rāmāyaṇa (Bombay edition) ii. 110, 1. Krūdham ājnāya Rāmaṁ tu Vasishṭhāḥ pratyuvācha ha | Jābalir api jānte lokasyāya gatāgatim | 2. Nivarttayiśu-kāmas tu tvām etad vākyam abravit | imām loka-samut-
AND OF THE ORIGIN OF THE FOUR CASTES. 115


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

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


211 On account of a materialistic and immoral argument which had been addressed to him by Jâbâli to induce him to disregard his deceased father's arrangements regarding the succession to the throne. See Journ. Roy. As. Soc. vol. xix. pp. 303 ff.

212 The name Ikshvâku occurs in R. V. x. 60. 4. See Professor Max Müller's article in Journ. Roy. As. Soc. for 1866, pp. 451 and 462.

“5. Having heard the words of Rāma, the bird (Jaṭāyu) made known to him his own race, and himself, and the origin of all beings. 6. ‘Listen while I declare to you from the commencement all the Prajāpatis (lords of creatures) who came into existence in the earliest time. 7. Kardama was the first, then Vīkṛta, Sesa, Saṁśraya, the energetic Bāhubutra, (8) Sthāṇu, Marichi, Atri, the strong Kratu, Pulastya, Angiras, Prachetas, Pulaha, (9) Daksha, then Vivasvat, Arīṣṭanemi, and the glorious Kaśyapa, who was the last. 10. The Prajāpati Daksha is famed to have had sixty daughters. 11. Of these Kaśyapa took in marriage eight elegant maidens, Aditi, Diti, Danu, Kālākā, (12) Tāmrā, Krodhavaśā, Manu,215 and Analā. Kaśyapa, pleased, then said


I should have doubted whether Manu could have been the right reading here, but that it occurs again in verse 29, where it is in like manner followed in verse 31 by Analā, so that it would certainly seem that the name Manu is intended to stand for a female, the daughter of Daksha. The Gauḍa recension, followed by Signor Gorrino (iii. 20, 12), adopts an entirely different reading at the end of the line, viz. Balāṁ Atibalāṁ āpi, “Balā and Atibalā,” instead of Manu and Analā. I see that Professor Roth s.v. adduces the authority of the Amara Kosa and of the Commentator Pāṇini for stating that the word sometimes means “the wife of Manu.” In the following text of the Mahābhārata i. 2563, also, Manu appears to be the name of a female: Aṇavadyāṁ Manuḥ Vaiśāṁ Asuraṁ Mārgaṇapriyāṁ | Anūpāṁ Subhaṅgāṁ Bhūṣiṁ iti Prādhā eyajyata | “Prādhā (daughter of Daksha) bore Aṇavadyā, Manu, Vaiśā, Asura, Mārgaṇapriya, Anūpā, Subhaṅgā, and Bhūṣī.”
to these maids, (13) ‘ye shall bring forth sons like to me, preservers of the three worlds.’ Aditi, Diti, Danu, (14) and Kālakā assented; but the others did not agree. Thirty-three gods were borne by Aditi, the Ādityas, Vasus, Rudras, and the two Aśvins.” [The following verses 15–28 detail the offspring of Diti, Danu, Kālakā, Tāmā, Krodhavaśa, as well as of Kraunchi, Bhasī, Syenī, Dhritarāshtri, and Sūkī the daughters of Kālakā, and of the daughters of Krodhavaśa. (Compare the Mahābhārata, i. 2620–2635; and Wilson’s Vishnu Purāṇa, vol. ii. pp. 72 f.) After this we come upon Manu and the creation of mankind.] “29. Manu, (wife) of Kaśyapa,216 produced men, Brāhmans, Kshattriyas, Vaiśyas, and Sūdras. 30. ‘Brāhmans were born from the mouth, Kshattriyas from the breast, Vaiśyas from the thighs, and Sūdras from the feet,’ so says the Veda. 31. Analā gave birth to all trees with pure fruits.”

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

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

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

217 The boy is said, in 73, 5, to have been aprupta-yavamam bālam pancha-varsha-sahasrakam | “a boy of five thousand years who had not attained to puberty!” The Commentator says that varsha here means a year, but a day (varsha-sabdo ’tra
of which (as he was himself unconscious of any fault) he attributed to some misconduct on the part of the king. Rāma in consequence convoked his councillors, when the divine sage Nārada spoke as follows:

8. Śrīnu rājana yatāh kāle prāpto bālasya sankhyāh | śrutvā kart-
tavyatāṁ rājan kurushva Raγhunandana | 9. purā krita-yuge rājan brāhmaṇaḥ vai tapasvināḥ | 10. brāhmaṇaṁ tadda rājan na tapasvī ka-
thanchana | tasmin yuge praṇavātebrahmabhūte tv anāvrite | 11. Amri-
tyavas tadda sarve jānīre dārgha-dārsīnaḥ | tatas tretā-yugamāṁ nāma mā-
navānāṁ vapushmatāṁ | 12. Ksatvāyāṁ yatā jāyante pūrvena tapasā 
'neitāḥ | vīryyena tapasā chaiva tv dīkāḥ pūrva-janmanī | mānavā ye 
mahātmānas tatra tretā-yuge yuge | 13. Brahma ksattraṁ cha tat sar-
avāṁ yat pūrvam avarāṁ cha yat | yugapor ubhayaṁ asīt sama-vīryya-
saṁaṁvitam | 14. Apaśyantaṁ tu te sarve viśesah adhikāṁ tataḥ | sthā-
panāṁ chaikvāt tatra chāturvedavyaṁ sammatam | 15. Tasmin yugo 
praṇavātebrahmabhūte hy anāvrite | adharmaḥ pādam ekaṁ tu pārayat 
prithivitale | . . . . 19. Pātite tv anīte tasminn adharmena mahītele 
subhāny evācharal lokaḥ satya-dharma-parāyaṇaḥ | 20. Tretā-yuge cha 
varttante brāhmaṇāḥ keṣatriyāś cha ye | tapo 'tapyanta te sarve śūrā-
shām apare janāḥ | 21. Sva-dharmaḥ paramas teshāṁ vaiṣya-śūdraṁ 
tadā 'gamat | pūjāṁ cha sara-vārṇanāṁ śūdrāś chakrur viśeṣhātaḥ | 
. . . . 23. Tataḥ pādam adharmaśa dvitiyaṁ avātārayat | tato 
dvāpara-sankhyā sā yugasya samajāyata | 24. Tasmin dvāpara-sankhye 
tu varttamāne yuga-kṣaye | adharmas chaṁritaṁ chaiva várvidhe puru-
sharshabhā | 25. Asmin dvāpara-sankhyāste tapo vaiṣyaṁ samāśiśat | 
trihyo yugebhyaṁ trīn varṇāṁ kramād vai tapa āviśat | 26. Trihbyo 
yugebhyaṁ trīn varṇāṁ dharmascha parināśhitaḥ | na śūdra labhate 
dharmaṁ yugeṣ tu varnashabhā | 27. Hīna-varṇo nippaśrāṣthā 
tapyaṁ samahat tapaḥ | dhaviśyaḥcchhādravyonyāṁ hi tapaś-charyaṁ 
kalau yuge | 28. adharmaḥ paramo rājan dvāpare śūdra-janaṇanaḥ | 
sa vai viśaya-paryante tava rājan mahātapāḥ | 29. Adya tapyaṁ 
durbuddhis tena bāla-badho hy ayam |

Nārada speaks: 8. “Hear, o king, how the boy’s untimely death occurred: and having heard the truth regarding what ought to be
dīnaparaṁ”—just as it does in the ritual prescription that a man should perform a 
sacrifice lasting a thousand years (“sahara-saṁutsaraṁ satram upūṣita” “et ut”),—
and that thus some interpreters made out the boy’s age to be sixteen, and others under 
fourteen. But this would be a most unusual mode of reckoning age.
done, do it. 9. Formerly, in the Kṛita age, Brāhmans alone practised austere fervour (tapas). 10. None who was not a Brāhman did so in that enlightened age, instinct with divine knowledge (or, with Brahma), unclouded (by darkness). 11. At that period all were born immortal, and far-sighted. Then (came) the Tretā age, the era of embodied men, (12) in which the Kshattriyas were born, distinguished still by their former austere fervour; although those men who were great in the Tretā age had been greater, both in energy and austere fervour, in the former birth. 13. All the Brāhmans and Kshattriyas, both the former and the later, were of equal energy in both Yugas.\textsuperscript{218} 14. But not perceiving any more distinction (between the then existing men) they all\textsuperscript{219} next established the approved system of the four castes. 15. Yet in that enlightened age, instinct with righteousness, unclouded (by darkness), unrighteousness planted one foot upon the earth." [After some other remarks (verses 16–18), which are in parts obscure, the writer proceeds:] 19. "But, although this falsehood had been planted upon the earth by unrighteousness, the people, devoted to true righteousness, practised salutary observances. 20. Those Brāhmans and Kshattriyas who lived in the Tretā practised austere fervour, and the rest of mankind obedience. 21. (The principle that) their own duty was the chief thing pervaded the Vaiśyas and Śūdras among them; and the Śūdras especially paid honour to all the (other) classes. . . . 23. Next the second foot of unrighteousness was planted on the earth, and the number of the Dvāpara (the third yuga) was produced. 24. When this deterioration of the age numbered as the Dvāpara, had come into existence,

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{218} The Commentator says, this means that in the Kṛita age the Brāhmans were superior, and the Kshattriyas inferior (as the latter had not then the prerogative of practising tapas), but that in the Tretā both classes were equal (ubhayor yugayar madhye kṛita-yugo brahma pūraham tapo-viryāḥḥyāṁ utkṛṣṭam kṣatratāṁ chāvarain eča tābhyāṁ tapo-viryāḥḥyāṁ nyūnam āsīt | tat sarvaṁ brahma-kṣattra-rūpam ubhayam tretayāṁ sama-virya-samanvitam āsīt | kṛite kṣattriyāṁ tapasya anadhi-kārū padosajyabhyāṁ brāhmaneṇḥbhyaṁ teshāṁ nyūnam tretayāṁ tu ubhayo vapi tapo-ādhi-kārūd ubhāv api tapo-viryāḥḥyāṁ samaṣa | But in the previous verse (12) it is said that the Kshattriyas were born in the Tretā distinguished by their former tapas. But perhaps they were formerly Brahmans, according to verses 9, 10, and 12.

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{219} Manu and other legislators of that age, according to the Commentator (Manuvadāyaḥ sarve tātākāliḥ dharma-pravartanānādhi-kritāḥ). He adds that in the Kṛita age all the castes were spontaneously devoted to their several duties, although no fixed system had been prescribed (kṛite tu vinaiṣa sthāpanam svayam eva sarve varṇāḥ svaya-sa-dharma-ratōḥ).
unrighteousness and falsehood increased. 25. In this age, numbered as
the Dvāpara, austere fervour entered into the Vaisyas. Thus in the
course of three ages it entered into three castes; (26) and in the three
ages righteousness (dharma) was established in three castes. But the
Śūdra does not attain to righteousness through the (lapse of these
three) ages. 27. A man of low caste performs a great act of austere
fervour. Such observance will belong to the future race of Śūstras in
the Kali age, (28) but is unrighteous in the extreme if practised by
that caste in the Dvāpara. On the outskirts of thy territory such a
foolish person, of intense fervour, is practising austerity. Hence this
slaughter of the boy.”

Here then was a clue to the mystery of the young Brāhman’s death
A presumptuous Śūdra, paying no regard to the fact that in the age220 in
which he lived the prerogative of practising self-mortification had
not yet descended to the humble class to which he belonged, had been
guilty of seeking to secure a store of religious merit by its exercise.
Rāma mounts his car Pushpaka, makes search in different regions, and
at length comes upon a person who was engaged in the manner alleged.
The Śūdra, on being questioned, avows his caste, and his desire to
conquer for himself the rank of a god by the self-mortification he was
undergoing. Rāma instantly cuts off the offender’s head. The gods
applaud the deed, and a shower of flowers descends from the sky
upon the vindicator of righteousness. Having been invited to solicit
a boon from the gods, he asks that the Brāhman boy may be resuscit-
tated, and is informed that he was restored to life at the same moment
when the Śūdra was slain. (Sections 75 and 76.)221

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

Amarendra mayā buddhyā praśāh srishtās tathā prabhā | eka-vargāh
sama-bhūṣā eka-rūpāś cha sarvasaḥ | 20. Tāsāṁ viśishto hi darśane
lakṣhaṇe ’pi vā | tato ’ham ekāgramanās tāḥ praśāḥ samachintayam |
21. So ’ham tāsāṁ viśeṣāh riśtham striyam ekāṁ vinirmame | yad yat
praśāḥm pratyangam viśiṣṭāṁ tat tad uddhīrtam | 22. Tato mayā

220 The Tretā, according to the Commentator.
221 See the Rev. Professor Banerjea’s Dialogues on the Hindu philosophy, pp. 44 ff.,
where attention had previously been drawn to the story.
rupa-gunair ahalya stri vinirmita | halam nama ha vairapyam halyam 
tat-prabhavam bhavet | 23. Tasya na vidyata halyam tenahalyeti visrutah | 
Ahalyety eva cha maya tasya nama prakirtitam | 24. Nirmityam cha 
devendra tasyam naryam surarshabha | bhuvishyatiti kasyaishah mama 
chintah tato ‘bhavat | 25. Tvam tu Sakra tadah narnam janiho manasa 
prabho | sthanaahokitayat patnih mamaithei purandara | 26. Sa maya 
nyasa-bhutah tu Gautamasya mahatmanah | nyastah bahuni varshfi tena 
niryatitah cha ha | 27. Tatas tasya parijnaya mahasthairyam mahamuni 
h | jnatva tapasi siddhi cha patny-artham sparsita tadah | 28. Sa 
tayah saha dhaarmatma ramate sma mahamuni | aasan nirasa devah tu 
Gautame dattayah tayah | 29. Tvam krudhhas tu iha kamaatma gatva 
tasyaaramam muneh | drishtavams cha tadah tam strih diptam agni 
sikhah iva | 30. Sa tvayah dharshita Sakra kamaatena samanyunah | 
Drishtas tvam cha tadah tena aasrane paramarshinah | 31. Tatah krudhhena 
tenasi sapta paramatejasah | gato ‘si yena devendra dasa-bhaga-viparyayam |

"19. O chief of the immortals (Indra) all creatures were formed by 
my will of one class (or colour), with the same speech, and uniform in 
every respect. 20. There was no distinction between them in ap 
pearance, or in characteristic marks. I then intently reflected on these 
creatures. 21. To distinguish between them I fashioned one woman. 
Whatever was most excellent in the several members of different cre 
tures was taken from them, (22) and with this (aggregate) I formed a 
female, faultless in beauty and in all her qualities. Hala means ‘ugli 
ness,’ and halya, ‘what is produced from ugliness.’ 23. The woman in 
whom there is no halya, is called Ahalya. And this was her name to 
which I gave currency. 24. When this female had been fashioned, I 
anxiously considered to whom she should belong. 25. Thou, Indra, 
didst, from the eminence of thy rank, determine in thy mind, ‘She 
must be my spouse.’ 26. I, however, gave her in trust to the great 
Gautama; and after having retained her in charge for many years, he 
restored her. 27. Knowing then the great steadfastness of that distin 
guished Muni, and the perfection of his austere fervour, I, in due form, 
gave her to him for his wife. 28. The holy sage lived with her in the 
enjoyment of connubial love. But the gods were filled with despair 
when she had been given away to Gautama. 29. And thou, Indra, 
angry, as well as inflamed with lust, wentest to the Muni’s hermitage,
and didst behold that female brilliant as the flame of fire. 30. She was then corrupted by thee who wert tormented by lust, as well as heated by anger.222 But thou wert then seen by the eminent rishi in the hermitage, (31) and cursed by that glorious being in his indignation. Thou didst in consequence fall into a reverse of condition and fortune,” etc., etc.

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

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

Vaiśampayana uvāca | hanta te kathayishyāmi namaskṛitya Svayambhuve | surādīnāṁ ahaṁ samyak lokānāṁ prabhavāpyayam | Brahmano mānasāḥ putrāḥ viditāḥ śaṇ-maharshayaḥ | Marichir Atry-angirasaḥ Pulastyaḥ Pulahaḥ Kratuḥ | Marīcheḥ Kaśyapaḥ putrāḥ Kaśyapāt tu praṇā imaḥ | praṇajire mahābhāgār Daksaka-kanyās trayodasa | 2520. 
Aḍītir Ditir Danuḥ Kāla Danayuḥ Śṁihikā tathā | Krodhā Pradhā eha Viśvā cha Viṁatā Kapila Muniḥ | Kaḍrāś cha manuṣayāghra Daksaka-kanyāvā Bhārata | etāsāṁ viśya-sampannam putra-pautram anantakam |

"Vaiśampayana said: I shall, after making obeisance to Svayambhū, relate to thee exactly the production and destruction of the gods and other beings. Six222 great rishis are known as the mind-born sons

222 In regard to this story of Indra and Ahalyā, as well as to that of Brahmā and his daughter, above referred to, see the explanation given by Kumārila Bhatta, as quoted by Professor Max Müller in his Hist. of Anc. Sansk. Lit. p. 529 f. The name of Ahalyā is there allegorically interpreted of the night, to which this name is said to have been given because it is absorbed in the day (aṁi iñyāṇatayū). Indra is the sun.

223 Another passage (Śūntī-p. 7569 ff.) raises the number of Brahmā’s sons to seven by adding Vasishṭha: Ekaḥ Svayambhūr bhagavān ādyo Brahmā sanātanaḥ | Brahmanāḥ saṁta eva putrā mahātmānah Svayambhuvaḥ | Marīcheḥ Atry-Angirasaḥ Pulastyaḥ Pulahaḥ Kratuḥ | Vasishṭhaḥ cha mahābhāgāḥ saṁdṛśo eva Svayambhūvaḥ | saṁta Brahmāṇa ity ete purīṣe niḥchayaḥ gacchāḥ | “There is one primeval eternal lord, Brahmā Svayambhū; who had seven great sons, Marīche, Atri, Angiras, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu, and Vasishṭha, who was like Svayambhū. These are the seven Brahmās who have been ascertained in the Puranic records.” In another part of the same Śūntīparvan, verses 12685 ff., however, the Prajāpati is increased to twenty-one: Brahmā, Śrāgura Manuḥ Daksha Bṛigu Dharmas tathā Yamaḥ | Marīcheḥ Angirā tiṁscha Pulastyaḥ Pulahaḥ Kratuḥ | Vasishṭhaḥ Paramesṭhiḥ cha Viśavān Soma eva cha | Kārdamaḥ c ṣāpi yaḥ prokaḥ Krodha Vikrita eva cha | ekaviṁśatir utpannas te praṇāpatayaḥ smṛtāḥ | “There are reputed to have been twenty-one Prajāpati produced, viz. Brahmā, Śrāgura, Manu, Daksha, Bṛigu, Dharma, Yama, Marīche,
of Brahmā, viz., Marichi, Atri, Angiras, Pulasthya, Pulaha, and Kratu. Kaśyapa was the son of Marichi; and from Kaśyapa sprang these creatures. There were born to Dakṣa thirteen daughters of eminent rank, (2520) Aditi, Diti, Danu, Kālā, Danāyu, Siṁhikā, Krodhā, Pradhā, Viśvā, Vinatā, Kapilā, and Muni. Kadrā also was of the number. These daughters had valorous sons and grandsons innumerable."

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

Dakṣhas tv āyātāṃguṣṭhād dakṣinād bhagavān rishiḥ | Brahmaṇaḥ prithivīpāla śantātmā sumahātapah | vāmād āyātāṃguṣṭhād bhāryā tasya mahātmānaḥ | tasyām panchāśatam kanyāḥ sa evājanaya muniḥ |

... 2577. Dadau cha daśa Dharmāya saptaviṃśatim Indave | divyena vidhina rājan Kaśyapāya trayodasa | ... 2581. Paitāmaḥ Manur devas tasya putrāh prajāpatiḥ | tasyāśṣau Vasavah putrāḥ teshām vakhṣyāmi vistaram | ... 2595. Stanaṁ tu dakṣinām bhītva Brahmano nara-vigrahaḥ | nissrito bhagavān Dharmā sarva-loka-sukhāvahāḥ |

trayas tasya varāḥ putrāḥ sarva-bhūta-manoharāḥ | Śamaḥ Kāmaḥ cha Harshāḥ cha tejasā loka-dhārīṇāḥ | ... 2610. Āruṣhi to Manoh kanyā tasya patri maniśiṣaḥ | ... 2614. Devas putrā Bahmajas tv anyas yayos tishtahi lakshaṇam | loke Dhātā Vidhātā cha yau sthitau Manunā saha | tayor eva vrasā devi Lakshmi padma-grīhā śubhā | tasyās tu mānasāḥ putrās turaśāḥ vyoma-chaṅiṇāḥ |

... 2617. Prajānām annakāmānām ananya-parībāhakshanāt | Ādharmas tatra sanjātaḥ sarva-bhūta-viṣāṣakaḥ | tasyāpi Nirṛitir bhāryā nairṛtī yena Rākṣasāḥ |

glorās tasyās trayas putrāḥ pāpa-karma-ratāḥ sadā | Bhayo Mahā-bhayas chaiva Mrityur bhūtanākasa tathā | na tasya bhāryā putro vā kaśchid āstya antako hi saḥ |

Angiras, Atri, Pulasthya, Pulaha, Kratu, Vasīṣṭha, Paramesṭhin, Viśvasvat, Soma, the person called Kardama, Krodha, and Viśvāt. (Here, however, only twenty names are specified including Brahmā himself.) Compare this list with those quoted above, p. 116, from the Rāmāyaṇa, iii. 14, 7 ff., from Manu in p. 36, and from the Vīṣṇu P. in p. 65.

234 That Muni is a name, and not an epithet, is shown (1) by the fact that we have otherwise only twelve names; and (2) by her descendants, both gods and gandharvas, being afterwards enumerated in verses 2550 ff. (īty eta deva-gandharvā Maṇuṇyāḥ pariśriśitaḥ). Kapilā, another of the thirteen daughters of Dakṣa is said to have been the mother of Ambrosia, Brāhmaṇa, kine, Gandharvas and Apsarasas (anurītam brāhmaṇā āsavo gandharvāpurasas tathā | apatyam kapilāyās tu purīne pariśriśitaḥ | ).
'2574. Daksha, the glorious rishi, tranquil in spirit, and great in austere fervour, sprang from the right thumb of Brahmā. 225 From the left thumb sprang that great Muni’s wife, on whom he begot fifty 226 daughters. Of these he gave ten to Dharma, twenty-seven to Indu (Soma), 227 and according to the celestial system, thirteen to Kaśyapa.”

I proceed with some other details given in the verses I have extracted:

2581. “Pitāmaha’s descendant, Manu, the god and the lord of creatures, was his (it does not clearly appear whose) son. The eight Vasus, whom I shall detail, were his sons. . . . . . 2595. Dividing the right breast of Brahmā, the glorious Dharma (Righteousness), issued in a human form, bringing happiness to all people. He had three eminent sons, Sama, Kāma, and Harsha (Tranquillity, Love, and Joy), who are the delight of all creatures, and by their might support the world. . . . . . 2610. Arushi, the daughter of Manu, was the wife of that sage (Chyavana, son of Bhrigu). . . . . . 2614. There are two other sons of Brahmā, whose mark remains in the world, Dhātṛ, 228 and Vidhātṛ, who remained with Manu. Their sister was the beautiful goddess Lakshmi, 229 whose home is in the lotus. Her mind-born sons are the steeds who move in the sky. . . . . . 2617. When the creatures who were desirous of food, had devoured one another, Adharma (Urighteousness) was produced, the destroyer of all beings. His wife was Nirṛti, and hence the Rākshasas are called Nairṛtas, or the offspring of Nirṛti. She had three dreadful sons, continually addicted to evil deeds, Bhaya Mahābhaya (Fear and Terror) and Mrityu (Death) the ender of beings. He has neither wife, nor any son, for he is the ender.” 230

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

Adip. 3128. Tejobhir uditāḥ sarve maharshi-sama-tejasah | daśa Pra-

---

225 See above, p. 72 f. The Maśya P. also states that Daksha sprang from Brahmā’s right thumb, Dharma from his nipple, Kāma from his heart, etc.
227 The Taitt. Sanhitā, ii. 3, 5, 1, says Prajāpati had thirty-three daughters, whom he gave to King Soma (Prajāpates trayastrīnād duhitara āsan | tāḥ Somāya rūṣne ’dādīt) 228 Dhātṛ had been previously mentioned, in verse 2523, as one of the sons of Aditi. See also Wilson’s Vishnū P. ii. 152.
229 See Wilson’s Vishnū P. i. pp. 109, 118 ff., 144 ff. and 152.
230 The Vishnū P. (Wilson, i. 112) says he had five children.
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chetasah putrāḥ sataḥ punya-janāḥ smritāḥ | mukhajanāgninā yais te.
pūrvaṁ dagdāḥ mahāwajāḥ | tebhyaḥ Prāchetaso jayes Daksha Dakshād
imāḥ prajāḥ | sambhutāḥ purusha-vyāhre svā hit lokapitāmahaḥ
Vṛiṇiṣyā saha santamaya Dakṣaḥ Prāchetaso munīḥ | atma-tulyān ajay
nayat sahasrān śaṁśita-veratān | sahasra-sankhyān sambhūtatān Dakṣa-
putrāṁ cha Nāradaḥ | moksha adhyayāpāyāmasya sankhyā-jnānam anuttarām.
tataḥ panchāsataṁ kanyāḥ putrikāḥ abhisandadhe | Prajāpatiṁ
prajāḥ Dakṣaḥ sriśrīshur Janamejaya | ādau cha āsā Dharmāya
Kaśyapāya trayoṣa | kalasya nayane yuktāḥ saptaviṁśatim Indavo |
3185. Trayoṣāsānam pratānam yā tu Dakṣāyaṁ varaḥ | Mārlīccha
Kaśyapas tasyām ādiyān samajjanat | Indrādīn vṛyṛya-sampannān
Vivasvantam athāpi cha | Vivasvataḥ suto jahe Yamo Vaivasvataḥ pra-
hūḥ | Mārtandaṁya Manur dhīmān ajayata sutaḥ prabhūḥ | Yamaṁ
chāpi suto jahe khyātas tasyānāyaṁ prabhūḥ | dharmātmā sa Manur
dhīmān yatrat vaśaṁ pratekṣhitāḥ | Manor vaśaṁ mānavānmaṁ tato 'yam
prathito' bhavat | brahma-ksatradayās tasmād Manor jātāṁ tu mānavāḥ | tato 'bhavāḥ mahārajā brahma kshattreṇa sangatam | 3140. Brāhmaṇā
mānavās teshāṁ sāṅgam vedaṁ adhārayan | Venaṁ Dhṛishtuṁ Naris-
yantam Nabhāgekshvākum eva cha | Kṛūṣham atha Sāryatiṁ tathā
carviṣṭāṁ sanvān Ilam | Prishadvraṁ navamam prabhūḥ kṣattra-dharma-
parāyaṇam | Nabhāgariṣṭa-daśaṁ Manoḥ putrān prachakshate | panchāsata tu Manoḥ putrās tathāvāyaṁ 'bhavan kṣhitau | anyonya-bhedat te
seve vinedur iti naḥ śrutam | Purāravas tato vidvān Ilayaṁ samapad-
yata | sa vai tasyābhad madā pitā chaiveti naḥ śrutam |

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

231 “Trees and plants,” according to the Commentator (mahāprobhāva vṛkṣhau-

232 The same account of Daksha's birth is given in the Śaṁtip. 7573: Daśānāṁ
tanayas tu eko Daksha nīma prajāpitāḥ | tasya dov nīmanu loke Dakshaḥ Ka iti cho-
hyate | “These ten Praheetas had one son called Daksha, the lord of creatures. He
is commonly called by two names, Daksha and Ka.” (Compare vol. iv. of this work,
p. 13, note 30, and p. 24; and the Sātapatha Brāhmaṇa, vii. 4, 1. 19, and ii. 4, 4, 1,
there quoted.) The following verse 7574 tells us that Kaśyapa also had two names,
the other being Aśraṁtānemi. See Rām. iii. 14, 9, quoted above.
for their religious observances, to whom Nārada taught the doctrine of
final liberation, the unequalled knowledge of the Sāṅkhya. Desirous of
creating offspring, the Prajāpati Dakṣa next formed fifty daughters, of
whom he gave ten to Dharma, thirteen to Kaśyapa, and twenty-seven,
devoted to the regulation of time, to Indu (Soma). . . . . 3135. On
Dākṣāyani, the most excellent of his thirteen wives, Kaśyapa, the
son of Marichi, begot the Ādityas, headed by Indra and distinguished
by their energy, and also Vivasvat. To Vivasvat was born a son, the
mighty Yama Vaivasvata. To Mārtanda (i.e. Vivasvat, the Sun) was
born the wise and mighty Manu, and also the renowned Yama, his
(Manu’s) younger brother. Righteous was this wise Manu, on whom
a race was founded. Hence this (family) of men became known as the
race of Manu. Brāhmans, Kṣatriyas, and other men sprang from this
Manu. From him, o king, came the Brāhman conjoined with the Kshat-
triya. Among them the Brāhmans, children of Manu, held the
Veda with the Vedāngas. The children of Manu are said to have been
Vena, Dhrisñu, Narishyanta, Nābhāga, Ikshvāku, Kārusha, Saryāti,
Ilā the eight, Prishadra the ninth, who was addicted to the duties of a
Kṣatriya, and Nābhāgārīṣṭa the tenth. Manu had also fifty other
sons; but they all, as we have heard, perished in consequence of mutual
dissensions. Subsequently the wise Purūravas was born of Ilā, who,
we heard, was both his mother and his father.”

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

The Sāntiparvan, verses 27.9 ff., contains an account of the origin
of castes which has evidently proceeded from an extreme assertor of
the dignity of the Brahmical order. The description given of the
prerogatives of the priestly class is precisely in the style, and partly in
almost the identical words, of the most extravagant declarations of

233 This phrase kālasya nayane yuktāḥ had previously occurred in verse 2580,
where it is followed by the words srrvā nukshatra-yogino loka-yutr-vidhānataḥ |
“all identified with the lunar asterisms, and appointed to regulate the life of men.”
See also Vishnu P. i. 15, 60, and Professor Wilson’s translation ii. p. 10, note 1,
and p. 28, note 1.

234 i.e. Aditi. See verses 2520, 2522, and 2600 of this same book.

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

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

Ya eva tu satāḥ asataḥ cha nicarttayet | sa eva rājñā karttayvo
rājan rāja-purohitāḥ | 2750. Ātṛapy udāharantimam itihāsam purātanam | Purūravasā Ailasyā saṁvādam Mātariśvānaḥ | Purūravā uvācha |
Kutāḥ svid brāhmaṇo jāta varṇāḥ chāpi kutas trayāḥ | kasmāchcha bhavati
śresṭhas tan me vyākhyātum arhasi | Mātariśvācaḥ | Brahmaṇo mukhataḥ śrīśto brāhmaṇo rāja-sattama | bāhuḥhyāṁ kṣatviryaḥ śrīśta
ūṛubhyāṁ vaiśya eva cha | varṇānāṁ parichāryyārtham trayāṇām Bha-

See also the fourth volume of this work, pp. 141 ff. and 152.
MYTHICAL ACCOUNTS OF THE CREATION OF MAN,

ratasahabha | varnas chaturtha sambhata paubhyam sudy vinirmita | brahasman jayamano hi prithivyam anujayate237 | ivara sarva-bhutanam dharmako-koshasya guptaye | 2755. Atah prithivyad yantaram kshattriyam danga-dakara | deviyan Dandam akarot praajanam anu triptaye | vaisyas tu dhana-dhanyena trin varnana bhritya iman | sudy hy etan parichared iti Brahasmanusasanam | Aila uvacha | dvijaya kshattrabandhara va kasyeyam prithvi bhavet | dharmatah saha vitten samyag Vayo prachakshya me | Vayur uvacha | viprasya sarvam evaitad yat kinchij jagatigatam | jyeshte nabhijaneneha tad dharmakusala vidu | svam eva brahmano bhunkte svam vasta svam dadati cha | gurur hi sarvavarvanam jyeshtah kreshtah cha vai devah | 2760. Patyabhave yathaiva stri devaram kurute patim | esha te prathamah kalpa apady anyo bhaved atah |

"2749. The king should appoint to be his royal priest238 a man who will protect the good, at restrain the wicked. 2750. On this subject they relate this following ancient story of a conversation between Pururavas the son of Il, and Matarisvan (Vayu, the Windgod). Pururavas said: You must explain to me whence the Bråhman, and whence the (other) three castes were produced, and whence the superiority (of the first) arises. Matarisvan answered: The Bråhman was created from Bråhmå's mouth, the Kshattriya from his arms, the Vaisya from his thighs, while for the purpose of serving these three

237 Manu, i. 99, has adhijayate.
238 Våya-puterhita. The king's priest (våya-puterhita) is here represented as one who should be a confidential and virtuous minister of state. Such is not, however, the character always assigned to this class of persons. In Manu xii. 46, quoted above (p. 41f.), the purohita is placed in a lower class than other Brahmans. And in the following verse (4527) of the Anusasanaparvan, taken from a story in which the Rishis utter maledictons against anyone who should have stolen certain lotus roots, part of the curse spoken by Visvamitra is as follows: varshichhara'stu bhritaka vijnas chhustu purohita | ayujyesya bhavatu rityu visa-staimyan karoti ya | “Let the man who steals lotus roots be a hireling trafficker in rain incantations (?) and the domestic priest of a king, and the priest of one for whom no Bråhman should officiate.” Again, in verse 4679, the same person says: karotu bhritaka varshhãna vijnas chhustu purohita | rityug astu hy ayujyesya yas te harati pushkaram | “Let him who steals thy lotus perform as a hireling incantations to cause drought, and be a king's domestic priest, and the priest of one for whom no Brahmam should officiate.” I have had partly to guess at the sense of the words varshichhara and avarehãm. The Commentator does not explain the former; and interprets the latter (for which the Edinburgh MS. reads avarshhã) by vyikshi nibandham, “causing drought.” He adds, papishthah eva avarehãh, “those who cause drought are most wicked.”
castes was produced the fourth class, the Sūdra, fashioned from his feet. The Brāhmaṇa, as soon as born, becomes the lord of all beings upon the earth, for the purpose of protecting the treasure of righteousness. 2755. Then (the creator) constituted the Kshattriya the controller of the earth, a second Yama to bear the rod, for the satisfaction of the people. And it was Brahmā’s ordinance that the Vaiśya should sustain these three classes with money and grain, and that the Sūdra should serve them. The son of Ilā then enquired: Tell me, Vāyu, to whom the earth, with its wealth, rightfully belongs, to the Brāhmaṇa or the Kshattriya? Vāyu replied: All this, whatever exists in the world, is the Brāhmaṇa’s property by right of primogeniture: this is known to those who are skilled in the laws of duty. It is his own which the Brāhmaṇa eats, puts on, and bestows. He is the chief of all the castes, the first-born and the most excellent. Just as a woman when she has lost her (first) husband, takes her brother in law for a second; so the Brāhmaṇa is thy first resource in calamity; afterwards another may arise.”

A great deal is shortly afterwards added about the advantages of concord between Brāhmaṇas and Kshattriyas. Such verses as the following (2802): “From the dissensions of Brāhmaṇas and Kshattriyas the people incur intolerable suffering” (mitho bhedaḥ brāhmaṇa-kshattriyanām praṇā duḥkhaṁ dussahaṁ cha viśanti) afford tolerably clear evidence that the interests of these two classes must frequently have clashed.

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

Vanaparvan, 13436. Nādhyaṇaṇād yājanād vā anyasmād vā prati-grahat | dosho bhavati viprāṇāṁ jñalitāgni-samā dvijāḥ | durvedā vā suvedā vā prakrtāḥ saṁskritās tathā | brāhmaṇā nävamantavyā bhasma-channā ivāgnaḥ | yathā śmaśāne diptaujāḥ pārako naiva dushyati | evaṁ vidvān avidvān vā brāhmaṇo daivatam mahat | prakūraś cha puravāraś prāśādaiḥ cha prithag-vidhaḥ | nagarḥi na sobhante hīnāni brāhmaṇottamaś | vedāvyā prīttata-sampannā jñānavantas tapasvinaḥ | yatra tishtanti vai vipraś tān-nāma nagaraṁ nṛpa | vraje vā ṣvī athavā

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

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

Brāhmañānām paribhavād asurāḥ samite śayāḥ | brāhmañānām prasādācha cha devāḥ svarga-nivāsānāḥ | aṣākyaṁ sraṣṭāṁ akāśam ačālyo hitavān giriḥ | adhāryyāḥ setunā Gangā durjayā brāhmaṇā bhūvi | na brāhmaṇa-virodhena sakyaḥ sāstum vasundhārāḥ | brāhmaṇā hi mahātmāno devānām api devatāḥ | tān pujayava satataṁ dānena pariḥcharyyāḥ | yadichhasi mahāṁ bhoktum imāṁ sūgara-mekhalāṁ |

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

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

Sāntiparvan, 10861. Janaka uvācha | varṣo viśeṣaḥ-varṇānāṁ mahāreṇa kena jāyate | etat śivāmy ahaṁ jñātum tad brūhi evadātiḥ vara | yad etaj jāyate 'patyāṁ sa evāṁ iti śrutīḥ | kathām brāhmaṇāto jāto
viśeshe grahāṇāṁ gatah | Parāśara uvācha | Evam etad mahārāja yena jātaḥ sa eva saḥ | tapasas te apakarṣhaṇa jātigrahaṇatām gataḥ | sukṣhetrāchcha svajāḥ cha punyo bhavati sambhavaḥ | ato 'nyataraṇa hinaḥ avaro nāma jāyate | 10865. Vaktrād bhujābhyaṁ ārubhyaṁ paḍbhyaṁ chaivātha jajnire | śṛjataḥ Prajāpater lokān iti dharmavido viduḥ | mu-khajā brāhmaṇāṁ tāta bahujāḥ ksattriyāḥ smṛitāḥ | āryajā dhanino rājan pādajāḥ parichārakaḥ | chaturvāṁ eva vṛkṣāṁ aganaḥ puruṣharṣhabha | ato 'nye vyatiriktaḥ ye te vai sankarajāḥ smṛitāḥ | . . . .

10870. Janaka uvācha | Brahmaṇaikena jātānaṁ nānātvaṁ gotraṁ katham | bahūnīha hi loka vai gotrāṇi muni sattama | yatra tatra kathām jātaḥ svayonim (?svyonim) munaya gataḥ | śuddha-yaṇau samutpānā viyonau cha tathā 'pare | Parāśara uvācha | rājan naitād bhaved grāhyam apakrishtaṁ janmanā | matātmanāṁ samuṭpattis tapasā bhāvitaṭmanām | utpādyā putrān munaya nrīpate yatra tatra ha | svenaiva tapasā teshām rishitvam pra-ladhuṁ punaḥ | . . . . 10876. Ete svāṁ prakṛtiṁ prāptā Vaideha tapasābrayāt | pratisaṁhitā veda-vido damena tapasaica hi |

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

The speaker then names a number of sages (10876) “famed for their acquaintance with the Veda, and for their self-command and austere fervour,” as “having all attained to their respective conditions by practising the latter observance.”

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

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

Anuśāsana-parva, 6570. Deva uvācha | Brāhmaṇyaṁ devi dushprāpyaṁ nisargād brāhmaṇaḥ-śubho | kshatriyo vaisyaśūdrāv u niṣargād iti mo matiḥ | karmaṇa dushkriteṇaḥ sthānād bhraṣyati vai dvijāḥ | jyestham varṇam anuprāpya tasmād rakheta vai dvijāḥ | sthito brāhmaṇa-dharmena brāhmaṇyam upajīvati | kshatriya vai ‘tha vaisyo vai brahmabhūyam sa gachhati | yas tu brahmataham utsṛṣyā kshattraṁ dharmaṁ nishecate | brāhmaṇyāt sa paribhrasṭaḥ kṣatrā-yonaḥ prajāyaṭe | vaisya-karma cha yo vipro lobha-moha-vyapāśrayaḥ | brāhmaṇyāṁ durlabham prāpya karoty alpa-matiḥ sadā | sa dvijena vaisyatām eti vaisyo vai śūdratām iṣya | svā-dharmāt prachyuto vīpras tataḥ śūdratām āp- nute | . . . 6590. Ebhī su karmabhīr devi subhāir ahaṁritais tathā | śūdra brāhmaṇatām yāti vaisyaḥ kṣatriyatām vrajaṭ | śūdra-karmaṇi sarvāṇi yathāyāyam yathāvidhi | śuśrūṣāṁ pārśhavyaṁ cha jyesṭhaṁ varṇa prajñanatāḥ | kuryaṁ ityādi |

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

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

Vana-parva, verses 12459 ff.: Sarpa uvācha | brāhmaṇāḥ ko bhaved rājan vedyāṁ kīṁ cha Yudhisthīra | 12470. Braviḥy atimatim tvāṁ hi vākyair anumimāmaḥ | Yudhisthīra uvācha | satyam dānam khamā śīlam ānṛisāṁsyām tapo ghrīṇā | ārāṁyantī yatra nāgendra sa brāhmaṇaḥ iti smṛtiḥ | vedyāṁ sarpa param Brahma nīrūkhkham asukham cha yāt | yatra gatvā na sočanti bhavataḥ kīṁ vivekshītam | Sarpa uvācha | cāturvarṇyam pramāṇaḥ cha satyaṁ cha brahma chaiva ha | Śudresu āpi cha satyaṁ cha dānam akrodha iva cha | ānṛisāṁsyam ahimā cha ghrīṇā chaiva Yudhisthīrṣa | vedyāṁ yaḥ chaṭra nīrdukkhaṁ asukhaṁ cha na-
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rūdhīpa | tābhyaṁ hīnam padaṁ chānyad na tad astīti lakṣyate | Yuddhishthira uvācha | 12457. Südro tu yad bhavel lakṣhma doije tach cha na vidyate | na vai südro bhavel chhūdro brāhmaṇaḥ na cha brāhmaṇap | yatraitai lakṣyate sarpa vrītam sa brāhmaṇaḥ smritāḥ | yatraitād na bhavet sarpa tam südram iti nirdīśet | yat punar bhavata proktam na vedyam vidyatīti cha | tābhyaṁ hīnam ato ’nyatra padaṁ nāsti iti ched api | evam etād matam sarpa tābhyaṁ hīnam na vidyate | yathā śtoshyayor madhya bhaved noshyaṁ na śītāḥ | evam vai sukhā-duḥ- khābhyaṁ hīnam nāsti padaṁ kvachīt | eṣāh mama matiḥ sarpa yathā vā manyate bhavān | Sarpa uvācha | 12480. Yadi te vrītata rājan brāhmaṇaḥ prasamikṣhitaḥ | vrīthaḥ jātiḥ tado ’yushman kṛitrī yāvad na vidyate | Yuddhishthira uvācha | jātiḥ atra mahāsarpasya manushyate te mahāmate | sankarat sarva-varṇānāṁ dushparikṣhyeti me matiḥ | sarve sarvasv apatyāni janayanti sadā narāḥ | vān maithunam ato janma maraṇāṁ cha samam nṛṇāṁ | idam ārham pramāṇāṁ cha “ye ya-jāmahe” iti api | tasmāc chīlam pradhānenaṁ vidur ye tattvadarsināḥ | “prāṇa nābhī-varaḍhanāt puṇoṣa jāta-karma vidhyate” | “tadā ’syā mātā sāvitrī pīta te ācārīya uchyate” | 12485. “Tāvach chhūdra-sama hy esha yāvad vede na jāyate” | tasmān evam mati-devādhe Manuḥ Svāyamībhavo ’bravit | kṛita-krityāḥ punar varṇā yadi vrīttaṁ na vidyate | sankaras tatra nāgendra balavān prasamikṣhitaḥ | yatredānim mahāsarpasya samskritaṁ vrīttam ishyate | tam brāhmaṇam aham pūrvam uktavān bhujagottama |

“12469. The Serpent said: Who may be a Brāhma, and what is the thing to be known, o Yuddhishthira;—tell me, since by thy words I infer thee to be a person of extreme intelligence. Yuddhishthira replied: 12470. The Smṛiti declares, o chief of Serpents, that he is a Brāhma, in whom truth, liberality, patience, virtue, innocence, austere fervour, and compassion are seen. And the thing to be known is the supreme Brahma, free from pain, as well as from pleasure,—to whom, when men have attained, they no longer sorrow. What is your opinion? The Serpent replied: The Veda (brahma) is beneficial to all the four castes and is authoritative and true.220 And so we find in

220 Such is the sense assigned by the Commentator to this line, the drift of which is not very clear. The comment runs thus: Sarpas tu brāhmaṇaḥ-padena jāti-māram vivakṣhitvā südro tāl lakṣhayam vyabhichārayati “ḥatūrvarṇayam” iti śūradena | ṇatūrvarṇāṁ varṇānaṁ hitam | satyaṁ pramāṇaṁ cha dhārrma-vyapasthāpakaṁ brahma vedāḥ | śūḍrācchāra-smṛiter api veda-mūlakaṁvīt sarve ’py ācārādiḥ śruti-mūlakah
Sūdras also truth, liberality, calmness, innocence, harmlessness, and compassion. And as for the thing to be known, which is free from pain and pleasure, I perceive that there is no other thing free from these two influences. Yudhishthira rejoined: 12475. The qualities characteristic of a Sūdra do not exist in a Brāhmaṇ (nor vice versa). (Were it otherwise) the Sūdra would not be a Sūdra, nor the Brāhmaṇ a Brāhmaṇ. The person in whom this regulated practice is perceived is declared to be a Brāhmaṇ; and the man, in whom it is absent, should be designated as a Sūdra. And as to what you say further, that there is nothing other than this (Brahma) to be known, which is free from the susceptibilities in question; this is also (my own) opinion, that there is nothing free from them. Just as between cold and heat there can be neither heat nor cold, so there is nothing free from the feeling of pleasure and pain. Such is my view; or how do you consider? The Serpent remarked: 12480. If a man is regarded by you as being a Brāhmaṇ only in consequence of his conduct, then birth is vain until action is shown. Yudhishthira replied: O most sapient Serpent, birth is difficult to be discriminated in the present condition

iyor arthak | evam cha satyādiḥkaṁ yadi śūdre'py asti tarhi so 'pi brāhmaṇa eva svād iti āha “śūdresva api” iti | "The serpent, however, understanding by the term Brāhmaṇ mere birth, shows in a sloka and a half that Yudhishthira’s definition fails by being applicable also to a Sūdra. Chātuvatāyā means ‘beneficial to the four castes.’ (Such is the Veda), which is also ‘true’ and ‘authoritative,’ as establishing what is duty. Inasmuch as the Smṛti which prescribes a Sūdra’s conduct is itself founded on the Veda; all conduct, etc., is based on the Veda. And so if (the characters of) truth, etc., are found also in a Sūdra, he too must be a Brāhmaṇ—such is his argument in the words ‘In Sūdras also.’” According to this explanation the connection between the first line and the second and third may be as follows: The Veda is beneficial to all the castes, and therefore Sūdras also, having the advantage of its guidance, although at second hand, may practise all the virtues you enumerate; but would you therefore call them Brāhmans?

241 This verse is not very lucid; but the sense may be that which I have assigned. The Commentator says: Itaras tu brāhmaṇa-paḍena-brāhma-viḍāṁ vividhītvā sūdrāder api brāhmaṇatvam abhyupagamyā pariharati “Śūdra to” iti | Sūdra-lakṣaṇa-kāmūḍikāṁ ā brāhmaṇe ‘sti na brāhmaṇa-lakṣaṇa-kāmūḍikāṁ śūdre ‘sti ity arthāḥ | śūdra ‘pi īmūḍy-īmēta brāhmaṇaḥ | brāhmaṇa ‘pi kāmūḍy-īmēta śūdra eva ity arthāḥ | “The other (Yudhishthira), however, understanding by the word Brāhmaṇa one who knows the Veda (or, Brahma), and conceding the fact of a Sūdra’s Brāhmaṇhood, obviates by the words ‘but in a Sūdra,’ etc. (the objection thence drawn). The qualities, lust, etc., distinctive of a Sūdra, do not exist in a Brāhmaṇ, nor do the qualities tranquillity, etc., characteristic of a Brāhmaṇ exist in a Sūdra. A Sūdra distinguished by the latter is a Brāhmaṇ; while a Brāhmaṇ characterized by lust, etc., is a Sūdra.”
of humanity, on account of the confusion of all castes. All (sorts of)

242 In the tenth vol. of his Indische Studien, p. 83, Professor Weber adduces some curious evidence of the little confidence entertained in ancient times by the Indians in the chastity of their women. He refers to the following passages: (1) Nidāna Sutra, iii. 8. Uchchāvaca-charanādyā strīgya bhavanti | saha deve-sākṣhye cha manusya-sākṣhye cha yahīṁ putro vāksaye tētēma putro bhaviṣyāmi | yūṁchēcha putrān vāksaye te me putrāḥ bhaviṣyantī | "Women are irregular in their conduct. Of whatsoever men, I, taking gods and men to witness, shall declare myself to be the son, I shall be their son; and they whom I shall name as my sons shall be so." (2) S'atapatha Brāhmaṇa, iii. 2, 1, 40. Atha yad "brāhmaṇaḥ" ityāha | anaddāhā iśvai asya atāḥ purā jānam bhavati | idām hy āhū "rakṣhāṇīst yositham anusahante tād u tārakṣhānī eva reta uddhāhī iti | atha atra addhā jāyate yo brāhmaṇo yo yajñī jāyate | tasmād api rājapayā vā vāisyān vā "brāhmaṇaḥ" īty eva brāhcat īty eva brāhmaṇo hi jāyate yo yajñī jāyate | tasmād āhū "na savana-kṛitäḥ hanyad emasvē ha eva savana-kṛitā" iti | "Now as regards what he says (this) Brāhmaṇ (has been conse-
crated)" before this his birth is uncertain. For they say this that 'Rakṣhasas follow after women, and therefore that it is Rakṣhasas who inject seed into them.'" (Compare what it said of the Gandharvas in Atharva V. iv. 37, 116, and Journ. Roy. As. Soc. for 1865, p. 301.) So then he is certainly born who is born from sacred science (brahma) and from sacrifice. Wherefore also let him address a Rājanya or a Vāisyā as 'Brāhmaṇ,' for he is born from sacred science (brahma, and consequently a Brāhma-
man) who is born from sacrifice. Hence they say "let no one slay an offerer of a libation, for he incurs the (sin of Brahmanicide?) by so doing." (3) On the next passage of the S'.' P. Br. ii. 5, 2, 20, Professor Weber remarks that it is assumed that the wife of the person offering the Varuṇa praghāsa must have one or more para-
mours: Atha pratiprastāti pratiparāti | sa patiṇām udāmśayan prichhati | kena (jātṛga Comm.) charaśi iti | Varunyān vai etat striḥ kariyo yad anyasya saty anyena charati | atho "na iś ma'ntaḥ-saṃpu jukvadā" iti tasmāt prichhati | niruktāni vai eṇāh kāṇyo bhavati | satyaḥ hi bhavati | tasmād vā iśa prichhati | sā yad na prati-
janita jñātibho ha asya tad ahaśi aṣṭi | "The pratiprastāṭri (one of the priests) returns. Being about to bring forward the wife, he asks her, 'with what (paramour) dost thou keep company?' For it is an offence incurring punishment from Varuṇa that being the wife of one man she keeps company with another. He inquires 'in order that she may not sacrifice with me while she feels an inward pang.' For a sin when declared becomes less: for it is not attended with falsehood. Therefore he enquires. If she does not confess, it will be ill for her relations." (This passage is explained in Kātyāyanā's S'rauta Sūtras, v. 5, 6-11.) (4) S'. P. Br. i. 3, 2, 21. Tad uha utuca Yañjvalkyo "yathābhitam patnīyaḥ astu | kas tad ivaśyeta yat para-
punāś vā patnīḥ syāt" | "Yañjvalkya said this (in opposition to the doctrine of some other teachers): 'let the prescribed rule be followed regarding a wife. Who would mind his wife consorting with other men?'" The last clause has reference to the consequence which the other teachers said would follow from adopting the course they disapproved, viz., that of the wife of the man who did so would become an adulteress. (5) Taitt. S. v. 6, 8, 8. Na aṃśīn chitvā rāmāṁ upeyād "ayonau reto dhasāmi" iti | na dṛṣṭiyān chitvā 'nyaya striyaṃ upeyāt | na trīśeṣu chitvā kāṃchana upeyāt | reto vai etad niḥhatte yad aṃśiḥ chiture | yad upeṣyād retasvā vyādhīyeta | "Let not a man, after preparing the altar for the sacred fire, approach a woman (a S'raa-woman, according to the Commentator), (considering) that in doing so, he would be discharging seed into an improper place. Let no man, after a second time preparing the fire-
men are continually begetting children on all (sorts of) women. The speech, the mode of propagation, the birth, the death of all mankind are alike. The text which follows is Vedic and authoritative: ‘We who (are called upon) we recite the text.’

Hence those men who have an insight into truth know that virtuous character is the thing chiefly to be desired. ‘The natal rites of a male are enjoined to be performed before the section of the umbilical cord (Manu, ii. 29). Then Sāvitrī (the Gāyatrī, Manu i. 77) becomes his mother and his

altar, approach another man’s wife. Let no man, after a third time preparing the fire-altar, approach any woman: for in preparing the fire-altar he is discharging seed. Should he approach (a woman in forbidden cases) he will miscarry with his seed.” This prohibition of adultery in a certain case, seems to prove that it was no uncommon occurrence, and is calculated, as Professor Weber remarks, to throw great doubt on the purity of blood in the old Indian families.

To explain the last elliptical expression I will quote part of the Commentator’s remarks on the beginning of Yudhishthira’s reply: Vāgādīnām eva maithunasyāpi śūdhrasya jatī durmeyā | tathā cha śrutī “na cha itad vihitā brāhmaṇāh smo vagya abrahamāna vā” iti brāhmaṇya-samsāyaṁ upanyasyati | nanu jñātī-anischahe katham “brāhmaṇo āham” ityādy abhimāna-praśastam vāgādau pravarteta ity āsāṅkyāla “idam ārsham” iti | atra “ye yajāmahe” ity anena cha ye vayaṁ smo brāhmaṇāḥ anye vā te vagya yajāmahe iti brāhmaṇye navaḥdāranaṁ darśitaṁ | mantra-lingam api “ya evaṁ sa san yaje” iti | . . . Tasmād aśeṣa eva brāhmaṇya-nirṣhayahetur veda-praṁāṇaṁ ity upasanaḥ | “As the mode of propagation is common to all the castes, just as speech, etc. are, birth is difficult to be determined. And accordingly, by the words: ‘We know not this, whether we are Brāhmans or no Brāhmans,’ the Veda signifies a doubt as to Brāhmaṇhood. Then, having raised the difficulty ‘how, if birth is undetermined, can a man engage in sacrifice, etc., with the previous consciousness that he is a Brāhman, etc.? the author answers in the words ‘this text is Vedic, etc.’ It is both shewn by the words ‘we who . . . recite,’ (which mean) ‘we, whoever we are,—Brāhmans or others,—we recite,’ that the fact of Brāhmaṇhood is unascertained; and this is also a characteristic of the formula, ‘whosoever I am, being he who I am, I recite.’ The comment concludes: ‘Hence he briefly infers from the authoritative character of the Veda, that conduct is the cause of certainty in regard to Brāhmaṇhood.’

Prof. Aufrecht has pointed out to me that the words ye yajāmahe occur in S’ P’ Br. i. 5, 2, 16, and in Taitt. S. i. 16, 11, 1. The Commentator on the last-named passage refers in explanation of them to Asvālayana’s S’rauta Sūtras, i. 5, 4 f., where it is said that these two words constitute the formula called āṣṭas, which comes in at the beginning of all the gāyās which are unaccompanied by any aṁṣya. The Commentator interprets the two words thus: sarve “ye” vagyaṁ hātāro dhvaryaṁ “yaja” iti preskhitaṁ te vagyaṁ “yajāmahe” gāyāṁ paṭhāmaḥ | “All we hotri priests who are called upon by the adhvaryu by the word ‘recite,’ we recite, i.e., repeat the gāyā.” (See Haug’s Ait. Br. ii. p. 133, and note 11.) Prof. Aufrecht thinks the words in the Commentator’s note ye evaṁ sa san yaje may be a free adaptation of Atharva V. vi. 123, 3, 4. It does not appear from what source the words na cha itad vihitā etc. are derived.
religious teacher his father (Manu, ii. 170, 225). 12485. Until he is born in the Veda, he is on a level with a Sūdra' (Manu, ii. 172);—so, in this diversity of opinions did Manu Svāyambhuva declare. The castes (though they have done nothing) will have done all they need do,244 if no fixed rules of conduct are observed. In such a case there is considered to be a gross confusion of castes. I have already declared that he is a Brāhmaṇa in whom purity of conduct is recognized.”

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


244 The Commentator thus explains the word kṛita-kṛityāḥ: Kṛita-kṛityāḥ śūdra-tulyāḥ | tathā cha smṛitiḥ “na śūdra pūtakaṁ kinekā na cha saṃskāram arhati” iti teshāṁ samkāriṇarhatva-nishāpata-vābhidhanāt kṛita-kṛityateva darśayati | tadavat travarśikā api syur ity arthāḥ | “Kṛita kṛityāḥ (lit. having done what was to be done) means, like Sūdras; so the Smṛiti (when it says), ‘No sin exists in a Sūdra, nor is he fit for purificatory rites,’ shews, by declaring the unfitness of this class for such rites, and its freedom from sin, that it has the character of kṛita-kṛityateva, i.e. of having done all it had to do. And such (in the event supposed) would be the case with men of the three (uppa) classes also.”

245 The Calcutta edition reads na, “not,” which cannot be right. The MS. in the Library of the Edinburgh University has naḥ, “of us.”
tyakta-svadhāma raktāṅgā te dvijāh kshattratām gataḥḥ | gobhyo vṛttāṁ samāsthyāa pitāṁ krishy-upajīvinaḥ | svadhāma nānuttīsthunī ce dvijā vaisyatāṁ gataḥḥ | hiṃsānṛita-priyā lubdhāḥ sarva-karmopajīvinaḥ | krishnāḥ saucā-paribhrashtās te dvijāḥ śādṛatāṁ gataḥḥ | ity etaiḥ karmanbhīr vyastā dvijā varṇāntaraṁ gataḥḥ | dharman yajna-krīyā teshāṁ nityāṁ na pratisidhyate | ity ete chaṭuro varṇā yeshām brāhma sarvasvaṭiḥ | vihitā Brāhmaṇā pārvaṁ lobhat te ajnānātām gataḥḥ | 6945.


Bharadvāja uvāca | Brāhmaṇaṁ kena bhavati kshatrito vā dvijottamaḥ | vaisyaḥ śūdraḥ cha viprārdoḥ tad brāhi vaḍātāṁ vara | Bhrigaruv uvāca | Jata-karmādiḥbhir yas tu saṁskāraṁ saṁskritāḥ suchīḥ | vedādhyayana-sampannāḥ saṁśtu karmasv avasthitaḥ | saucchāchāra-sthitāḥ samyag vighasāti guru-priyāḥ | nitya-vratī satyaparaḥ sa vai brāhmaṇa uchyate | satyaṁ dānam athādro ko niṣaṁsyaṁ trapā ghrīnaḥ | tapas cha dṛiṣyate yatra sa brāhmaṇa iti smṛitaḥ | kshattra-jain svate karma vedādhyayana-sangataḥ | dāna-dāna-ratir yas tu sa vai kshatryaya uchyate | 6955. Vasyāt aśu paśubhyāḥ cha krishy-adāna-ratiḥ suchīḥ | vedādhyayana-sampannāḥ sa vaisyaḥ iti sanjñitaḥ | sarva-bhakṣya-ratir nityāṁ sarva-karma-karo 'suchīḥ | tyakta-vedas tv anācchāraḥ sa vai śūdraḥ iti smṛitaḥ | śādō chaśaḥ bhavel lakṣhyāṁ dvijō tach na cha na vidyaye | sa vai śūdro bhavēcch caḥdṛ śro brāhmaṇo na cha |

“Bhrigaruv replied: 6930. ‘Brahma thus formerly created the Prajāpatis, Brahmanic,’246 penetrated by his own energy, and in splendour equalizing the sun and fire. The lord then formed truth, righteousness, austere fervour, and the eternal veda (or sacred science), virtuous practice, and purity for (the attainment of) heaven. He also formed the gods, Dānava, Gandharva, Daitya, Asura, Mahoraga, Yaksha,“

246 Brāhma-tantra = vedakāneśṭhānam | Comm.
247 Brāhmaṇān, “Brāhma,” is the word employed. It may mean here “sons of Brāhma.”
Rākshasas, Nāgas, Piśāchas, and men, Brāhmans, Kshattriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras, as well as all other classes (vāraṇā) of beings. The colour (vāraṇa) of the Brāhmans was white; that of the Kshattriyas red; that of the Vaiśyas yellow, and that of the Śūdras black. 246 6935. Bharadvāja here rejoins: ‘If the caste (vāraṇa) of the four classes is distinguished by their colour (vāraṇa), then a confusion of all the castes is observable. Desire, anger, fear, cupidity, grief, apprehension, hunger, fatigue, prevail over us all: by what, then, is caste discriminated? Sweat, urine, excrement, phlegm, bile, and blood (are common to all); the bodies of all decay: by what then is caste discriminated? There are innumerable kinds of things moving and stationary: how is the class (vāraṇa) of these various objects to be determined?’ Bhrigu replies: ‘There is no difference of castes 2490 this world, having been at first created by Brahmā entirely Brahmanic, 250

246 It is somewhat strange, as Professor Weber remarks in a note to p. 215 of his German translation of the Vaiṣya Sūchā, that in the passage of the Kāthaka Brāhmaṇa xi. 6, which he there quotes, a white colour is ascribed to the Vaiṣya and a dark hue to the Rājanya. The words are these: Yach chhukōnām (brāhīnām) adityēbhya nirvopati tasmād chhukāna iṣe vaisya jāyate | yat kṛishṇānām vāruṇānām tasmād dhāmya iṣe rūjānāh | “Since the Vaiṣya offers an oblation of white (rice) to the Ādityas, he is born as it were white; and as the Vāruṇa oblation is of black (rice) the Rājanya is as it were dusky.”

249 Compare with this the words attributed in Sāntiparvan, verses 2819 ff., to King Muchukunda, who had been reproached by the god Kuvera with trusting for victory to the aid of his domestic priest instead of to his own prowess: Muchukundas tatāḥ krudhāḥ pratyunāca Dhanesavaṇaḥ | nyāya-pūrṇam asamkravādham asambhrāntam idām vachāḥ | brahma kshattrām idām śrihṣṭam eka-yoni svayambhūvā | prthivy-bala-viśiṁśānaṁ tainā lokam paripālant | tapo-mantra-balam niyam brāhmanaḥ pratishthitam | astra-bhū-balam niyam kshattriveṣu pratishthitam | tābhāyaṁ sambhūya karttavyam prajñānī paripālantam | “Muchukunda then, incensed, addressed to the Lord of riches these reasonable words, which did not partake of his anger or excitement: ‘Brāhmans and Kshattriyas were created by Brahmā from the same womb (or source) with different forces appointed to them: this cannot (neither of these separate forces can?) protect the world. The force of austerities and the sacred texts abides constantly in the Brahmans; and that of weapons and their own arms in the Kshattriyas. By these two forces combined the people must be protected.’”

250 Brāhmam is the word employed. That it is to be understood in the sense of “Brāhmanical” appears from the following lines in which the word devāḥ must be taken in the special signification of Brāhmans and not of “twice-born men” (who may be either Brāhmans, Kshattriyas, or Vaiśyas) in general. The Brāhman is considered to have been formed of the essence of Brahmā, and to represent the original type of perfect humanity as it existed at the creation. The Commentator takes the word brāhmam as brāhmagni-jītīnāt, “having the caste of Brāhmans;” and he explains the different colours mentioned in the next verses as follows: red (vākta)
became (afterwards) separated into castes in consequence of works. 6940. Those Brāhmans (lit. twice-born men), who were fond of sensual pleasure, fiery, irascible, prone to violence, who had forsaken their duty, and were red-limbed, fell into the condition of Kṣatāтриyaś. Those Brāhmans, who derived their livelihood from kine, who were yellow, who subsisted by agriculture, and who neglected to practise their duties, entered into the state of Vaiśyas. Those Brāhmans, who were addicted to mischief and falsehood, who were covetous, who lived by all kinds of work, who were black and had fallen from purity, sank into the condition of Śūdras. Being separated from each other by these works, the Brāhmans became divided into different castes. Duty and the rites of sacrifice have not been always forbidden to (any of) them. Such are the four classes for whom the Brahmanic 531 Sarasvatī was at first designed by Brahmā, but who through their cupidity fell into ignorance. 6945. Brāhmans live agreeably to the prescriptions of the Veda; while they continually hold fast the Veda, and observances, and ceremonies, their austere fervour (tapas) does not perish. And sacred science was created the highest thing: they who are ignorant of it are no twice-born men. Of these there are various other classes in different places, Piśāchas, Rākṣhasas, Pretas, various tribes of Mlechhas, who have lost all knowledge sacred and profane, and practise whatever observances they please. And different sorts of creatures with the purificatory rites of Brāhmans, and discerning their own duties, are created by different rishis through their own austere fervour. This creation, sprung from the primal god, having its root in Brahma, undecaying, imperishable, is called the mind-born creation, and is devoted to the prescriptions of duty.’ 6950. Bharadvāya again enquires: ‘What is that in virtue of which a man is a Brāhman, a Kṣatāтриya,

means “formed of the quality of passion” (rajo-guṇa-maya); yellow (piṭa) “formed of the qualities of passion and darkness” (rajas-tamo-maya), and black (kṛṣṇa or asita) “formed of darkness only” (kevala-tanomaya).

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

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

It is related in the Vanaprastha that Bhīmasena, one of the Pāndus,

Dūnam viprebhyah | ādūnam prajabhyah, "Giving to Brāhmans, receiving from his subjects."—Comm.

Paśūn vājīyūya ṣapayogīnaḥ | vatarobhūvī vīśati pratīṣṭhāṁ labhate | "Who perceiving cattle to be useful for trade, 'enters,' obtains a basis (for his operations)."—Comm. As we have seen above p. 97, these etymologies are frequently far-fetched and absurd.

On this verse the Commentator annotates as follows: etat satyōdi-septakam dvajā turavāyike | dharma eva varṇa-vibhūge kūraṇān na jātīr ity arthaḥ | "These seven virtues, beginning with truth (mentioned in verse 6953), exist in the twice-born man of the first three classes. The sense is that righteousness, and not birth, is the cause of the division into classes." This explanation is not very lucid. But the sense seems to be that the seven good qualities referred to are the proper characteristics of the three upper castes, while the defects specified in verse 6956 are the proper distinctive marks of the Sūdras. Thus the Sūdra who has the four defects will remain a Sūdra, but a Brāhman who has them will be no Brāhman.
in the course of a conversation with his brother. Hanûmat the monkey chief, had requested information on the subject of the Yogas and their characteristics. Hanûmat's reply is given in verses 11234 ff.:


---

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

256 The MS. in the Edinburgh University Library reads as the last pūda: dānā-dhārayaṇa-viśramāḥ.

257 The Edinburgh MS. reads vedāḥ instead varṇāḥ.

258 Kopātam—Comm.

259 Vairam—Comm.
MYTHICAL ACCOUNTS OF THE CREATION OF MAN,

kritāḥ | sattvasya cheha vibhrāṁśat satyas
kaśchid avasthitāḥ | sattvāt
prachyavamanānāṁ vyādhayo bhavō 'bhavan | 11255. Kāmāḥ chopadra-
vāscheiva tadā vai daiva-kiritāḥ | yair ardhyamānāṁ subhiśram tapas
tapyanti mānavāḥ | kāma-kāmaḥ svarga-kāmaḥ yajñāṁs tavanvi chāpairo |
evaṁ dvāparam asādyā praṇāḥ kahiyanty adharmataḥ | pādenaikena Kaun-
teyā dharmāḥ kali-yuge sthitāḥ | tāmasāṁ yugam asādyā kriṣhṇa bhavati 
Kesāvāḥ | vedāhārāḥ praśāmyanti dharmāya-yajna-kriyās tathā | itayo vyā-
dhayas trāṇāṁ deśāḥ krodhādayās tathā | upādavāś cha varattante 
adhayāḥ kahū bhavyam tathā | yugeshu āvarttamaneshu dharmo vyāvart-
tate punaḥ | dharmo vyāvarttamaru tu loko vyāvarttate punaḥ | loko 
kaṁgha kshāyāṁ yānti bhāvā lokapraavarttakāḥ | yuga-kshaya-krītā dhar-
māḥ prārthānāṁ vikurvate | etat kaliyugāṁ nāma achirād yat pravart-
tate | yugāṁvarttanaṁ te etat Kurvanti chiraṁvināḥ |

"11234. The Krita is that age in which righteousness is eternal. In the time of that most excellent of Yugas (everything) had been done (krita), and nothing (remained) to be done. Duties did not then languish, nor did the people decline. Afterwards, through (the influence of) time, this yuga fell into a state of inferiority.\textsuperscript{201} In that age there were neither Gods,\textsuperscript{202} Dānavas, Gandharvas, Yakshas, Rākshasas, nor Pannagas; no buying or selling went on; the Vedas were not classed\textsuperscript{203} as Śāman, Rich, and Yajush; no efforts were made by men:\textsuperscript{204} the fruit (of the earth was obtained) by their mere wish: righteousness and abandonment of the world (prevailed).

\textsuperscript{200} The Edinburgh MS. reads sattves instead of satyes.

\textsuperscript{201} In thus rendering, I follow the Commentator, whose gloss is this: Mukh-
yam oṣṇy amukhyatāṁ gatam | "although the chief, it fell into inferiority." In 
Böhtlingk and Roth's Lexicon this line is quoted under the word yugatā, to which the sense of "superiority, excellence," is assigned.

\textsuperscript{202} Compare with t.i.is the verses of the Vāyu Purāṇa quoted in p. 90, which state that in the Krita age there were neither plants nor animals; which are the products of unrighteousness.

\textsuperscript{203} I do not venture to translate "there was then no [division of the Veda into] Śāman, Rich, and Yajush, nor any castes," (1) because the Edinburgh MS. reads vedāḥ instead of varṇāḥ, and the Commentator does not allude to the word varṇāḥ; and (2) castes (varṇāḥ) are referred to below (verses 11242 f.) as existing, though without much distinction of character. The Commentator explains: trayā-dharmasya chitta-
śādhyā-arthatvat tasyāḥ cha tadāṁm evahāvatvāt na sāmāṁ āsan | "As the ob-
ject of the triple veda is purity of heart, and as that existed naturally at that period, there were no (divisions of) Śūman, etc."

\textsuperscript{204} I follow the Commentator whose gloss is: "Mūnāvi kriyā" kriṣhy-ūdy-ūrom-
ūhā-bhūta] kintu "abhidhāya phalam," sankalpaṁ eka sarvam sampadyate |
AND OF THE ORIGIN OF THE FOUR CASTES.

No disease or decline of the organs of sense arose through the influence of the age; there was no malice, weeping, pride, or deceit; no contention, and how could there be any lassitude? no hatred, cruelty, (11240) fear, affliction, jealousy, or envy. Hence the supreme Brahma was the transcendent resort of those Ṭyogins. Then Nārāyaṇa, the soul of all beings, was white.355 Brāhmans, Kṣatvṛiyas, Vaiṣṇavas, and Śūdras possessed the characteristics of the Kṛita.356 In that age were born creatures devoted to their duties. They were alike in the object of their trust, in observances and in their knowledge. At that period the castes, alike in their functions, fulfilled their duties, were unceasingly devoted to one deity, and used one formula (mantra), one rule, and one rite. Though they had separate duties, they had but one Veda, and practised one duty.357 By works connected with the four orders, and dependent on conjunctures of time,355 (11245) but unaffected by desire, or (hope of) reward, they attained to supreme felicity. This complete and eternal righteousness of the four castes during the Kṛita was marked by the character of that age and sought after union with the supreme soul. The Kṛita age was free from the three qualities.358 Understand now the Tretā, in which sacrifice commenced,359 righteousness decreased by a fourth, Vishnu became red;

355 In verse 12981 of this same Vanaparvan the god says of himself: svetāḥ kṛita-yuge varṇah pītas tretāyuge mama | rakto dvāparam āsādyā kṛishṇah kali-yuge tathā | “My colour in the Kṛita age is white, in the Tretā yellow, when I reach the Dvāpara it is red, and in the Kali black.”

356 The Commentator’s gloss is: kṛitiḥ svetāḥ siddhiḥ lakṣaṇoḥ ihaḥ daṁ tāṣa itu-dāṁ vinā yede | “They were men whose characteristics, tranquillity, etc., were effected, spontaneously accomplished.” On verse 11245 he explains the same term kṛita-lakṣaṇaḥ by kṛita-yuga-sūchakah, “indicative of the Kṛita age.”

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

358 Kūla-yoginā. The Commentator explains: kūlo darsādeḥ | tad-yuktena | “connected with time, i.e. the appearance of the new moon, etc.”

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

360 Compare Sūnti-parva, 13088. Idam kṛita-yugaṁ nāma kūlaḥ śreṣṭhaḥ pra-varttitaḥ | ahiṁsāyā yajña-śaśavo yuge’smīn na tadvanyāḥ | chatushpati sakalo dhar-mo bhavishyantya utra va suvīrāḥ | totaś tretā-yugam nāma trayī yatra bhavishyati | prekshītā yatra paśavo bhadram prāpyantai vai makāḥ | “This Kṛita age is the most excellent of periods: then victims are not allowed to be slaughtered; complete and
and men adhered to truth, and were devoted to a righteousness dependent on ceremonies. Then sacrifices prevailed, with holy acts and a variety of rites. In the Tretā men acted with an object in view, seeking after reward for their rites and their gifts, and no longer disposed to austerities and to liberality from (a simple feeling of) duty. 11250. In this age, however, they were devoted to their own duties, and to religious ceremonies. In the Dvāpara age righteousness was diminished by two quarters, Vishṇu became yellow, and the Veda fourfold. Some studied four Vedas, others three, others two, others one, and some none at all. 271 The scriptures being thus divided, ceremonies were celebrated in a great variety of ways; and the people being occupied with austerity and the bestowal of gifts, became full of passion (rājasī). Owing to ignorance of the one Veda, Vedas were multiplied. And now from the decline of goodness (saṭteca) few only adhered to truth. When men had fallen away from goodness, many diseases, (11255) desires and calamities, caused by destiny, assailed them, by which they were severely afflicted, and driven to practice austerities. Others desiring enjoyments and heavenly bliss, offered sacrifices. Thus, when they had reached the Dvāpara, men declined through unrighteousness. In the Kali righteousness remained to the extent of one-fourth only. Arrived in that age of darkness, Vishṇu became black: practices enjoined, by the Vedas, works of righteousness, and rites of sacrifice, ceased. Calamities, diseases, fatigue, faults, such as anger, etc., distresses, anxiety, hunger, fear, prevailed. As the ages revolve, righteousness again declines. When this takes place, the people also decline. When they decay, the impulses which actuate them also decay. The practices generated by this declension of the Yugas frustrate men’s aims. Such is the Kali Yuga which has existed for a short time. Those who are long-lived act in conformity with the character of the age. 39

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

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

271 The Commentator explains anrichas ("without the Rig-veda") by krita kṛityāḥ. On the sense of the latter word see above.
AND OF THE ORIGIN OF THE FOUR CASTES.


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

272 See the passage from S'ankara's Commentary on the Brahma Sūtras i. 3, 32, in the 3rd vol. of this work, pp. 49 f., and note 49 in p. 55; and S'atapatha Brahmaṇa, ii. 3, 4, 4, ubhayo ha vai idam agrat saha 'āsur devaḥ cha manushyāv cha | tad yad ha sma manushyānāṁ na bhavati tad ha devin yuḥchante "idaṁ vai no nāsti idaṁ no 'ste" iti | te tasyai eva yuḥchayai devesheṇa devaś tirobhūtā "na id hinānāṁ na id devaśhō 'śūnī" iti | "Gods and men, together, were both originally (component parts of) this world. Whatever men had not what they asked from the gods, saying, 'We have not this; let us have it.' From dislike of this solicitation the gods disappeared, (saying each of them) 'let me not hurt (them), let me not be hateful.'" Compare also the passage of the S'. P. Br. iii. 6, 2, 26, referred to by Professor Weber in Indische Studien, x. 158: "Te ha sma ete ubhayo deva-manushyāḥ pitarāḥ sampi-bante | sā esā sampā | te ha sma drisyāmānā eva purā sampi-bante uta etarhy aḍīś-yamānāḥ | "Both gods, men, and fathers drink together. This is their symposium. Formerly they drank together visibly: now they do so unseen." Compare also Plato, Philebus, 18: "Kai de μην παλαίοι, κραίνει τιμαί καὶ ἐγγυνεῖ τινὰ ποιεῖτε, ταῦταν φήμην παρέδωκαν, "And the ancients who were better than ourselves, and dwelt nearer to the gods, have handed down this tradition." 273 Compare the passage of the Nirukta, i. 20, beginning, sākṣāt-krīta-ādharmāṇa rishayo baddhūvah, quoted in the 2nd vol. of this work, p. 174.
habitants of the earth became subject to desire and anger, and subsisted by deceit and fraud. Governed by cupidity and delusion, devoted to carnal pursuits, sinful men by their evil deeds walked in crooked paths leading to hell,” etc., etc.

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

389. Chatvāri tu sahasrāṇi varṣhāṇāṁ Kuru-sattama | ayaḥ-sankhyā
kṛita-yuge sankhyātā rāja-sattama | tathā triṇi sahasrāṇi tretāyāṁ ma-
nuyāḍhīpa | deśe sahasre dvāparo cha bhūvi tishṭhanti sāṃpratan | na
pramāṇa-sthitir āhy āsti tishya 'śmin Bhāratarāhābhā | garbha-sthāṁ cha
miyānte cha tathā jātā miyānti cha | mahā-balā mahāsattvāḥ prajnā-
guna-samanvītāḥ | prajāyante cha jātās cha sataśo 'tha sahasrāsaḥ | jātāḥ
kṛita-yuge rājan dhanināḥ priya-darśinaḥ | prajāyante cha jātās cha mu-
nayovai tapodhanāḥ | mahotsāhāḥ mahātmāno dhārmikāḥ satya-vādināḥ | priya-
darśanā vapiṣṭhante mahāvīryā dhanurdhārāḥ | varārāḥ yuddhi jā-
yante kshattriyāḥ sūra-sattamāḥ | tretāyāṁ kshattriyā rājan sarve vai
chakravarttānaḥ | ayaḥmanto mahāvīrā dhanurdhāra-varā yuddhi | jāyante
kshattriyāḥ vṛtā tretāyāṁ vasa-varttānaḥ | sarve vṛṇā mahāraja jāyante
dvāparo sati | mahotsāhā vīryavantāḥ paraspara-jayvishināḥ | tejasā
'Ipenna saṁyuktāḥ krodhanāḥ purusā nripa | lubhāḥ anṛtakās chaiva
tishye jāyante Bhārata | ivaḥ mānas tathā krodho māyā 'sūyā tathaiva
cha | tishye bhavati bhūtānāṁ rāgō lobhaṁ cha Bhārata | sankshepo vart-
rājan dvāparo 'śmin narāḍhīpa |

“389. Four thousand years are specified as the duration of life in the Kṛta age, three thousand in the Tretā, and two thousand form the period at present established on earth in the Dwāpara. There is no fixed measure in the Tishya (Kali): embryos die in the womb, as well as children after their birth. Men of great strength, goodness, wisdom, and virtue were born, and born too in hundreds and thousands. In the Kṛta age men were produced opulent and beautiful, as well as munis rich in austere fervour. Energetic, mighty, righteous, viracious, beautiful, well-formed, valorous, bow-carrying, (395) heroic Kshattriyas,
distinguished in battle, were born. In the Tretā all sovereigns were Kshattriyas. Heroic Kshattriyas were born in the Tretā, long-lived, great warriors, carrying bows in the fight, and living subject to authority. During the Dvāpara all castes are produced, energetic, valorous, striving for victory over one another. In the Tishya age are born men of little vigour, irascible, covetous, and mendacious. During that period, envy, pride, anger, delusion, ill-will, desire, and cupidity prevail among all beings. During this Dvāpara age there is some restriction."

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

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


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

275 It does not appear clearly whether we are to suppose them to have been produced in the Kṛita, or in the Tretā, as in the passage of the Rāmāyana, quoted in page 119.
prevails." [Then follows a description of the results of such good
government: righteousness alone is practised; prosperity reigns; the
seasons are pleasant and salubrious; longevity is universal; no widows
are seen; and the earth yields her increase without cultivation.]
"2682. When the king practises criminal justice only to the extent of
three parts, abandoning the fourth, then the Tretā prevails." [Then
evil is introduced to the extent of a fourth, and the earth has to be
tilled.] "2684. When the king administers justice with the omission
of a half, then the period called the Dvāpara prevails." [Then evil is
increased to a half, and the earth even when tilled yields only half her
produce.] "2686. When, relinquishing criminal law altogether, the
king actively oppresses his subjects, then the Kali age prevails."
[Then the state of things, which existed in the Krita age, is nearly
reversed.] "2693. The king is the creator of the Kṛita, Tretā, and
Dvāpara ages, and the cause also of the fourth yuga."

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

Śrūṇi-parvan, 3406. *Karma śūdrā kṛṣhir vaiśya daṇḍa-nītiḥ cha rājani |
brahmacharyaṁ tapo mantrāḥ satyaṁ chāpi dvijatīṣu  | teshāṁ yaḥ
kṣattriyaḥ veda vastraṇāṁ ievā sūdhanam 276 | śīla-doshāṁ vinirhatīṁ sa
pitā sa prajāpatiḥ  | kṛitāṁ tretā dvāparaṁ cha kaliś Bharatārahaḥ |
rāja-vṛttāṁ sarvāṁ rājāva yugam uchyate  | chāturvargāṁ tathā vedāṁ
chāturāśramyaṁ eva cha  | sarvam pramuhyaṁ ēva cha  | etad yadā rājā pra-
mādyati  |

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

276 This comparison is more fully expressed in a preceding verse (3404): Yo na
jānāti nirhatīṁ vastraṇāṁ rajako malam | raktānāṁ va sūdhatīṁ yathā nāsti
tathāva saḥ |
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In two of the preceding passages different colours are represented as characteristic either of particular castes (Sānti-p. verses 6934 ff.), or of particular yugas (Vana-p. verses 11241 ff.). Colours (though not ranked in the same order of goodness) are similarly connected with moral and physical conditions in verses 10058 ff. of the Sāntiparvan, of which I shall offer a few specimens:

Shad jīva-varṇāḥ paramam pramāṇam kṛishno dhūmro nīlam athāsya madhyam | raktam punaḥ sahyataraṁ sukham tu hāridra-varṇam susukhaṁ cha suklam | parantu suklam vimalaṁ viśokaṁ gata-klamaṁ siddhyati dānacauḍa | gatvā tu yoni-prabhavāṁ daitya sahasrāṁ siddhim upaiti jītaḥ | 10060. . . . Gatiḥ punar varṇa-kritā prayānāṁ varṇas tathā kāla-krito 'surendra | . . . . 10062. Krishnasya varnasya gatir nirkriṣṭa ca sajate narake pachyamānaḥ |

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

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


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

277 The printed text reads nāsaṁskṛtena; but na saṁskṛtena seems necessary.
Kshattriyas, with its numerous observances, illustrated as it was by sacrifices, and described as it has been by men skilled in the art of narration. Vaiśampāyana replied: 11810. I shall describe to you that age revered for its sacrifices and distinguished for its various works of liberality, as well as for its people. Those Munis of the size of a thumb had been absorbed by the sun’s rays. Following a rule of life leading to final emancipation, practising unobstructed ceremonies, both in action and in abstinence from action constantly intent upon Brahma, united to Brahma as the highest object,—Brāhmans glorious and sanctified in their conduct, leading a life of continence, disciplined by the knowledge of Brahma,—Brāhmans complete in their observances, perfect in knowledge, and contemplative,—when at the end of a thousand yugas, their majesty was full, these Munis became involved in the dissolution of the world. 11815. Then Viśṇu sprung from Brahma, removed beyond the sphere of sense, absorbed in contemplation, became the Prajāpati Daksha, and formed numerous creatures. The Brāhmans, beautiful (or, dear to Soma),\textsuperscript{278} were formed from an imperishable (akṣhara), the Kshattriyas from a perishable (kṣhara), element, the Vaiśyas from alteration; the Śūdras from a modification of smoke. While Viśṇu was thinking upon the castes (vargaṇa), Brāhmans were formed with white, red, yellow, and blue colours (varṇaiṣa).\textsuperscript{279} Hence in the world men have become divided into castes, being of four descriptions, Brāhmans, Kshattriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras, one in form, distinct in their duties, two-footed, very wonderful, full of energy(?), skilled in expediens in all their occupations. 11820. Rites are declared to be prescribed by the Vedas for the three (highest) castes. By that contemplation practised by the being sprung from Brahma (see v. 11815)—by that practised in his character as Viśṇu,—the Lord Prāchetasā (Daksha), \textit{i.e.} Viśṇu the great contemplator (yogin), passed through his wisdom and energy from that state of meditation into the sphere of works.\textsuperscript{280} Next the Śūdras, produced from extinction, are destitute

\textsuperscript{278} In verse 11802, we read \textit{abhishīkya tu Somaṁ cha yauvarājye Pitāmahah | brāhmaṇāṁ cha rājūnāṁ sāvataṁ rajan-charam | “Brahma also inaugurated Soma as the heir to the kingdom, as the king of the Brāhmans who walks eternally through the night.”

\textsuperscript{279} This play upon the two senses of the word varṇa will be noticed.

\textsuperscript{280} I do not profess to be certain that I have succeeded in discovering the proper meaning of this last sentence.
MYTHICAL ACCOUNTS OF THE CREATION OF MAN,

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

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

Harivamśa, 11355. Evam ekārṇave bhūto śete loke mahādyutih | prabhādyā salilaṁ sarvasā Harir Nārāyaṇaḥ prabhuh | mahato rajaso madhye mahārava-samasya vai | virajasko mahābāhur akṣharam brāhmaṇā viduḥ | ātma-rūpa-prakāśena tapasā saṁvītāḥ prabhuh | trikam āchādyya kālāṁ tu tataḥ suhṣaṇa sas tadā | purusho yajna ity evam yat param parikārtitam | yaḥ chānyat purushākhyam tu tat sarvasa purusottamaḥ | ye cha yajnaparā viprā ritvi jā iti sanjñitāḥ | ātma-dehāt purā bhūtā yajnavibhyah śrayatām tadā | 11360. Brahmānān paramānān vaktrād udgatāraṁ cha sāma-gāṁ | hotārāṁ atha chādhvargyum bāhubhyām aśrīyat prabhuh | brahmāno brahmāntarcha cha prastotaram cha sarvasaḥ | tam maitrā varṇaṁ spīśtvā pratishtātāram eva cha | udayt pratiharttāram poṭāraṁ chaiva Bhārata | achāhāvakam athorubhyām nesātāraṁ chaita Bhārata | pāmbhyām atohācbāṃdram brahmānaṁ chaiva yajniyam | grāvānaṁ atha bāhubhyām unnetāraṁ cha yajnikam | evam evaiśa bhaṅgan shoḍāsaitān jagatpatiḥ | pravaktin sarva-yajñānām ritvijoj sṛjād uttaman | tad esha vai yajnanayaḥ purusho vedā-saṁjñitaḥ | vedās cha tannayāḥ sarve sāngopaniḥdaḥ-kriyāḥ |

Vaisampāyana said: 1135. “Thus the glorious Lord Hari Nārāyaṇa, covering the entire waters, slept on (the world) which had become one sea, in the midst of the vast expanse of fluid 351 (rajas), resembling a mighty ocean, himself free from passion (virajaskah), with mighty arms.—Brāhmans know him as the undecaying. Involved through austere fervour with the light of his own form, and clothed with triple time (past, present, and future), the Lord then slept. Purushottama

351 Rajas is said in two places of the Nirukta, iv. 19, and x. 44, to have the sensory of “water.”
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(Vishnu) is whatever is declared to be the highest, Purusha the sacrifice, and everything else which is known by the name of Purusha. Hear how the Brahmans devoted to sacrifice, and called ritvijes, were formerly produced by him from his own body for offering sacrifices. 11360. The Lord created from his mouth the brahman, who is the chief, and the udgati, who chants the Sama; from his arms the hotri and the adhvaryu. He then . . . 232 created the prastotri, the maitravaruna, and the pratishtathtri; from his belly the pratiharttri and the potri, from his thighs the achhavaka and the neshtri, from his hands the agnidhra and the sacrificial brahmanya, from his arms the gravan and the sacrificial unnetri. Thus did the divine Lord of the world create these sixteen excellent ritvijes, the utterers of all sacrifices. Therefore this Purusha is formed of sacrifice and is called the Veda; and all the Vedas with the Vedangas, Upanishads, and ceremonies, are formed of his essence."

SECT. XII.—Extracts from the Bhagavata Purana on the same subject.

I will conclude my quotations from the Puranas on the subject of the origin of mankind and of castes with a few passages from the Bhagavata Purana. The first extract reproduces some of the ideas of the Purusha Sukta233 more closely than any of the Puranic accounts yet given.

ii. 5. 34. Varsha-puja-sahasrante tad anjam udake sayam | kula-karma-svabhava-stho jivo ’jivam ajivayat | 35. Sa eva Purushas tasmad anjam nirbheda nirgatah | sahasrov-anghri-bahv-aksha sahasranana-sirshavan | 36. Yasyavayavair lokan kalpayanti manishinah | kat-

232 I am unable to make a proper sense out of the words brahmano brahmanasteach cha, which, however, as I learn from Dr. FitzEdward Hall, are found (with only a difference of long and short vowels) in the best MSS. to which he has access, as well as in the Bombay edition. One of the sixteen priests, the Brahmanschharasiin, is not found in the enumeration, and his name may therefore have stood at the beginning of the line. Instead of the inept reading sarevatah, at the end, the author may perhaps have written sakshatah, “from his chest,” as, indeed, one MS. reads in the next line. The Bombay edition reads prishthuat, “from the back,” instead of srishvot.

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

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

ii. 1, 37. Brahmānanaṁ kṣattra-bhūjo mahātmā viḍ-ūrur anghri-srita-kṛṣṇa-varṇaṁ

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

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

iii. 22, 2. Brahmā śriyaj svā-mukhato yushmān ātma-parīpaṇāṁ | chhandomyas tapo-vidyā-yoga-yuktān algampatān | 3. Tat-trāṇāyāśrijach chāsmān doḥ-sahasrāt sahasra-pat | hridayaṁ tasya hi brahma kṣattram angam prachakshate

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

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

29. Mukhato varttata brahma Purushasya Kurūdavaḥ | yastān-mukhatvād varṇānām mukhyo 'bhūd brahmaṇo gurūḥ | 30. Bāhubhyo varttata kṣatraṁ kṣatatriyas tad-anuvrataḥ | yo jātas trāyate varṇān
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31. Viśo 'vartta na tasyorvor loka-vrītti-
karīr vihoḥ | vaiṣyas tad-uḍbhavo vṛttām nṛṇāṁ yaḥ samavartayat |
32. Padbhyaṁ bhagavato jajna svṛūṣāḥ dharmo-siddhyaye | tasyaṁ jātāḥ
purā śūdo yad-vṛittyaṁ tadhyaṁ Hariḥ | 33. Ete varṇāḥ svadharmaṁ
yajanti sva-guruṁ Hariṁ | śraddhayā "tma-vaśuddhyarthāṁ yaj jātāḥ
saka vrīttibhiḥ |

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

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

Viśro mukhād brahma cha yasya guhyāṁ rājanya āṣid bhujayor
balaṁ cha | ātvor viś ojo 'nghir aveda-śūdrau prasiddatām naṁ sa mahā-
vṛīhtāḥ |

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

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

iii. 20, 25. Arvāk-srotas tu navamaḥ kṣhattar eka-vido nṛṇāṁ | rajo
'dhikāḥ karma-parāḥ duḥkkhe cha sukha-māninaḥ |

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

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

\[\text{Aryamno Mātrakā pātī tayoḥ Charshaṇayaḥ sutāḥ | yatṛa vai mā-}nushā jātīr Brahmaṇaḥ chopakalpitā |\]

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

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

\[\text{ix. 14, 48. Eko eva purā vedah praṇavaḥ sarva-vāṁmayaḥ | devo} \]
\[\text{Nāraṇyaṇo nānya ēko 'gnir varṇa eva cha | Purūravasa evāsit trayā} \]
\[\text{tretā-mukhe nṛpya |} \]

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

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

235 The Sāṃkhya Kārikā, 53, says: \(\text{āshtā-vikalpo daivas tairagyonyas cha panchadā bhavati mānushyas chaika-vidhāh samānato bhautikāh sargāḥ;}\) which is thus translated by Mr. Colebrooke (in Wilson’s Sāṃkhya Kārikā, p. 164): "The divine kind is of eight sorts; the grovelling is five-fold; mankind is single in its class. This, briefly, is the world of living beings." The Commentator Gaudapūda shortly explains the words \(\text{mānushyas chaika-vidhāh by mānushhayonir ekaiva,} \) "the source of production of mankind is one only." Vijnāna Bhikāhu, the Commentator on the Sāṃkhya Pravachana, iii. 46, paraphrases the same words thus, \(\text{mānushya-sargāḥ chaika-prakāraḥ,} \) "the human creation is of one sort."
Sect. XIII.—Results of this Chapter.

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

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

Second: in various passages from the Brāhmanas, Epic poems, and Puranas, the creation of mankind is, as we have seen, described without the least allusion to any separate production of the progenitors of the four castes (pp. 23–27, and elsewhere). And whilst in the chapters where they relate the distinct formation of the castes, the Puranas, as has been observed, assign different natural dispositions to each class, they elsewhere represent all mankind as being at the creation uniformly distinguished by the quality of passion. In one of the texts I have quoted (p. 26 f.) men are said to be the offspring of Vivasvat; in another his son Manu is said to be their progenitor; whilst in a third they are said to be descended from a female of the same name. The passage which declares Manu to have been the father of the human race explicitly affirms that men of all the four castes were descended from him. In another remarkable text the Mahābhārata categorically asserts that originally there was no distinction of classes, the existing distribution having arisen out of differences of character and occupation. Similarly, the Bhāgavata Purāṇa in one place informs us that in the Kṛita age there was but one caste; and this view appears also to be taken in some passages which I have adduced from the Epic poems.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

i. 80, 16. Yām Atharvan Manush pītā Dadhyan dhiyam atnata | tas-
min brahmāni pūrvathā Indre utkha samagmata |

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

2 This verse is quoted in the Nirukta, xii. 34, where the words Manush pītā,
i. 114, 2. Yat saṁ cha yoś cha Manur āyejo pitā tañd āśyāma tavd Rudra praṇītishu |

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

ii. 33, 13. Yā vo bheshaṇā Marutāḥ āyaṇīni yā santamā vrishāno yā mayobhaḥ | yāni Manur avrīṇita pitā naḥ taṁ saṁ cha yoś cha Rudrasya vaṁśi |

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

viii. 52, 1 (Sāma-veda, i. 355). Sa pūryo mahānām venō kratubhir ānaje | yasya dvārā Manuḥ pitā devaśu dhiyāḥ ānaje |

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

“father Manu,” are explained as meaning Manuścha pitā mānavānām, “Manu the father of men.” Sāyaṇa, the Commentator on the Rig-veda, interprets them as meaning sarvōśaṁ prajānām pitṛibhūto Manuścha, “Manu the father of all creatures.” In R.V., x. 82, 3, the words “our father and generator” (yo naḥ pitā jāniṣṭaḥ), are applied to Viśvākarmāna, the creator of the universe. The word “father” in the R.V. is often applied to Dyaus, the Sky, and “mother” to the Earth, as in vi. 51 5. (Compare Journ. Roy. As. Soc. for 1864, pp. 55 ff.) But in these passages it is not necessary to suppose that the words are employed in any other than a figurative sense; although in a hymn to the Earth in the Atharva-veda, xii. 1, we find the following verse (the 15th): Tvañ-jñāta tuṣyā charaṇī martyīṣa tevām bhūhiṁ dvāpade tevām chatushaṇḍaḥ | tave me prāhīvi pancha-mānavāḥ yebhya jyotir amṛtaṁ martyebhyaḥ udyan sūryo rasīmbhir ñatotī | “Mortals born of thee live on thee: thou supportest both bipeds and quadrupeds. Thine, O Earth, are these five races of men, these mortals on whom the sun rising, sheds undying light with his rays;”—where it might almost appear as if the poet meant to represent mankind as actually generated by the earth. Brihaspati (iv. 50, 6; vi. 73, 1) and the other gods, as Indra, are called “father,” or compared to fathers (vii. 52, 3); as are Rudra, vi. 49, 10; and the Rishi, R.V., x. 81, 1; x. 82, 1, 3, 4. S‘. P. Br., i. 5, 3, 2, has Prajāpatau pitari; and Taitt. Br. iii. 9, 22, 1, Prajāpatim pitaram. In both the last places Prajāpati is referred to as the father of the gods.

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

4 I am indebted to Professor Aufrecht for the above translation of this, to me, obscure verse. Sāyaṇa explains it thus: Sa pūryo mukhya mahānām puruṣānām yajamāṇānām kratuḥṣīh karmādhīnaṁ nirvātīī samātavat tēḥāṁ hāvih kāma-yavānānāṁ ānajo āgachati | yasyaḥ rasiṁ saṁ kērāvanta prāṇiyāṁ niḥyāḥ karmanāy devaśe etehau madhye pitā sarvēsūṁ pāla con Manuḥ ānajō prāpa | ānajō prāpta-
The sense of the next text is less clear, but it appears at least to allude to the common designation of Manu as a father:

x. 100, 5. Yajno Manuḥ pramatir naḥ pitā hi kam

"Sacrifice is Manu, our protecting father."

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

viii. 30. 3. Te nas trādhvam te avata te u no adhi vochata | mā naḥ pathaḥ pitryād mānavād adhi dūram naiśṭa parācataḥ |

"Do ye (gods) deliver, protect, and intercede for us; do not lead us far away from the paternal path of Manu."

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

i. 68, 4. Hota nishatto Manor apatyae sa chil nu āśām patiḥ rayīnām |

"He (Agni) who abides among the offspring of Manu as the invoker (of the gods), is even the lord of these riches."

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

5 On this verse Sāvyana comments thus: Sarveshām Manuḥ pitā tataḥ ātataḥ | sarvētataḥ | pitāt Manuḥ dūram mārgam chakre | tasmāt patho mārgat no asmān mā naśita mā nayata | apanayatam mā kuruta ity arthaḥ | sarvād ātma bhārmanadhyātmi-karmāṇi yena mārgya bhavanti tam eva asmān nayata | kintu dūram ya etad-vyaktirikto viprakṛṣṭhaḥ māryo 'sti tasmād adhi adhitam ity arthaḥ asmān apanayatam | "'Of Manu' means, come from Manu who is the father of all. 'Distant:' Father Manu journeyed along a distant path. Do not lead us away from that path. Lead us along that path in which confinement, the agnihotra sacrifice, and other duties have always been practised. But lead us away from the distant path which is different from that."

6 The Commentator here explains "the offspring of Manu" as offspring or creatures in the form of worshippers (yajmāna-svarūpyaṁ praṣāyāṁ); and adds that according to a Brāhmaṇa "creatures are sprung from Manu" ("Mānavya hi praṣāḥ")
iii. 3, 6. Agnir deverbhir manushascha jantubhis tanvano yajnam puru-
pehasam dhiyā |

“Agni, together with the gods, and the children (jantubhih) of
Manush, celebrating a multifôrm sacrifice with hymns,” etc.

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

iv. 37, 1. Upa no Vajāḥ adhāram Ribhukshāḥ devāḥ yatā pathibhir
devayānaiḥ | yatāḥ yajnam manusho vikṣhu āsu dadhides raṇvāḥ sudine-
shu ahnām |

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

vi. 14, 2. Agnim hotāram īlāte yajneshu manusho viṣaḥ |

“The people of Manush praise in the sacrifices Agni the invoker.”

viii. 23, 13. Yadvai u viśpatih sitah suprīto manusho viśi | viśvā iḍ
Agnih prati rakṣāmsi śedhati |

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

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

7 Viśpati. Compare vi. 48, 8, where it is said: viśvāsūm grihapatir viśūm asī
tvam Agno mānushinam | “Agni, thou art the master of the house of all human
people (or, people sprung from Manush);” and x. 80, 6, Agnim viśaḥ īlāte mānushir
yāḥ Agnim Manuḥa Nāhuḥo vi jātāh | “Human people (or, people descended from
Manush) praise Agni: (people) sprung from Manush, from Nahush, (praise) Agni.”
Or if manushah be the nom. plur. the last clause will run thus: “men sprung from
Nahush (praise) Agni.”
Dadhyanch, as having celebrated religious rites in ancient times. The following further passages refer to him as a kindler of fire, and offerer of oblations:

i. 36, 19. *Ni tvām Agne Manur dadhe jyotir janāya śavate* |
   “Manu has placed (or ordained) thee, Agni, a light to all the people.”

i. 76, 5. *Yathā viprasya Manuho havirbhīr devān ayājah kavihiḥ kaviḥ san | eva hotaḥ satyatara tvam adya Agne mandrayā juhvā yajasva* |
   “As thou, thyself a sage, didst, with the sages, worship the gods with the oblations of the wise Manush, so to-day, Agni, most true invoker, worship them with a cheerful flame.”

v. 45, 6. *Ā ita dhiyam kriṇavāma sakḥāya . . . yayaḥ Manur Viśiśipram jīgāya . . . .
   “Come, friends, let us perform the prayer . . . whereby Manu conquered Viśiśipra . . . .

viii. 10. 2. *Yad vā yajñam Manave samimikshathur eva it Kāṃvasya bodhatam* |
   “Or if ye (Aśvins) sprinkled the sacrifice for Manu, think in like manner of the descendant of Kansa.”

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

x. 63, 7. *Yobhyo hotrām prathamāṃ āyeja Manuḥ samiddhāgnir ma- nasā sapta hotrihiḥ | tā Ādityā abhayam krama yachhata . . . .
   “O ye Ādityas, to whom Manu, when he had kindled fire, presented along with seven hotra priests the first oblation with a prayer, bestow on us secure protection.”

x. 69, 3. *“Yat te Manur yad anikam Sumitraḥ samiddhe Agne tad idam naviyah”* 8 |

8 The S'atapatha Brāhmaṇa (i. 4, 2, 5) thus explains the words *devedāho Manvīd- dāhah... Manvīddāhah iti | Manur hy etam agre aindyā | tasmād āha “Manvīddāhah” iti* |
   “The gods formerly kindled it (āre): hence it is called ‘god-kindled.’ Manu formerly kindled it: and hence it is called ‘kindled by Manu.’” The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (ii. 34), however, explains the word *Manv-īddāhah* from the fact that “men kindle it” *imam hi manushyā indāhate*. 
“That lustre of thine which Manu, which Sumitra, kindled is this same which is now renewed.”

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

i. 13, 4 (= S.V. ii. 700). Agno sukhatamA ratAh devAñ iliitañ ā vaha | asi hotā Manurhitañ |

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

i. 14, 11. Tvam hotā Manurhito ‘gne yajneshu sidasi | sah imam no adhvaram yaja |

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

vi. 16, 9. Tvam hotā Manurhitañ . . .

“Thou art the invoker placed by Manush . . . .”

viii. 19, 21. Īhe girā Manurhitam yam devā dātam aratim ni erie [ yajishṭham havya-vāhanam |

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

9 The compound word which I have here rendered “placed by Manush” is in the original Manur-hita. Professor Aufrecht would render it “given to man,” and quotes i. 36, 10, in support of this view. The sense I have given is supported by i. 36, 19, where the same root, dhā, from which hita (originally dhita) comes, is used, joined with the particle ni. The same participle hita is used in vi. 16, 1, where it is said: Tvam Agno yajnānām hotā sarveshām hitañ | devabhār māṃsāne jina |

“Thou, Agni, hast been placed, or ordained, among the race of Manush by the gods as the invoker at all sacrifices.” The fact that Agni is here said to have been placed by the gods among the race of Manush does not forbid us to suppose that there are other passages in which, either inconsistently, or from a different point of view, Agni may have been said to be placed by Manu. The compound manur-hita occurs also in the following texts, where, however, it has probably the sense of “good for man,” viz.: i. 106, 5. Brihaspati sadan iḍa naḥ sugaṅgh kridhi’śa’iḥ yor yat te manur-hitam tad īmahe | “Brihaspati, do us always good: we desire that blessing and protection of thine which is good for man.” (Sāyana says that here manur-hitam means either “placed in thee by Manu, i.e., Brahmä,” or, “favourable to man.” Benfey, in loco, renders “destined for man.”) vi. 70, 2. Rājāniś asya bhuvanasya rodasi asme retaṅ śinchataṅ yad manur-hitam | “Heaven and earth, ruling over this world, drop on us that seed which is good for man.” x. 20, 5. Rishīḥ sa yo manur-hitañ | “He (Pūṣāla) who is a rishi kind to man,” etc. Professor Roth s.v. gives only the latter sense.

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

There is also a class of passages in which the example of Manush may be referred to by the phrase manush-vat, "like Manush," or, "as in the case of Manush." Thus in i. 44, 11, it is said:

Ni tvā yajnasya sādhanam Agne hotām ritvijam manushvad deva dhīmahi . . . . |

"Divine Agni, we, like Manush, place thee, the accomplisher of the sacrifice, the invoker, the priest," etc.

v. 21, 1. Manushvat tvā ni dhīmahi Manushvat sam idhmahi | Agne Manushvad Angiro devān devayate yajā |

"Agni, we place thee like Manush, we kindle thee like Manush. Agni, Angiras, worship the gods like Manush, for him who adores them."

vii. 2, 3. Manushvad Agnim Manunā samiddham sam adhvarāya sadam in mahema |

"Let us, like Manush, continually invoke to the sacrifice Agni who was kindled by Manu."

viii. 27, 7. Suta-somāso Varuṇa havāmahe Manushvad iddhāgnyayaḥ |

"We invoke thee, Varuṇa, having poured out soma, and having kindled fire, like Manush."

viii. 43, 13. Uta tvā Bṛṣigwath śuče Manushvad Agne āhuta | Angirasvad havāmahe | . . . . 27. Yam tvā janāsa indhate Manushvad Angirasastama | Agne sa bodhi me vachāḥ |

"Like Bṛṣigu, like Manush, like Angiras, we invoke thee, bright Agni, who hast been invoked. . . . . 27. Agni, most like to Angiras, whom men kindle like Manush, attend to my words."

The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, i. 5, 1, 7, explains thus the word Manush-vat:—Manur hā vai agre yajnena īṣe | tad anukṛitya imaḥ prajāḥ ya-

---

11 I should observe that Prof. Aufrecht thinks the phrase—except perhaps with the single exception of viii. 43, 13—means "amongst men." Prof. Roth gives only the sense "like men," "as among, or for, men."

12 The same work in the same passage thus explains the phrase Bhārata-vat. "He bears (bhārati) the oblation to the gods; wherefore men say, Bharata (or 'the bearer') is Agni. Or, he is called Bharata (the 'sustainer') because, being breath, he sustains these creatures." This phrase may, however, refer to the example of King Bharata. See Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, xiii. 6, 4, 14.
jānte | tasmād āha “Manush-vad” iti | “Manor yajnaḥ” iti u vai
dhūḥ | tasmād vā tvā āhor “Manushvad” iti | “Manu formerly sacri-
ficed with a sacrifice. Imitating this, these creatures sacrifice. He
therefore says, Manushvat, ‘like Manu.’ Or, they say ‘like Manu,’
because men speak of the sacrifice as being Manu’s.”

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

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

vi. 16, 13. Inam tu tyam Atharva-vad Agnim mathanti vedaḥ stall
“The wise draw forth this Agni, as Atharvan did.”

vi. 16, 13 (= S.V. i. 9; Vāj. Sanh. xi. 32). Tvām Agne pūshkarād
adhy Atharvā nir amanthata... | 14. Tām u tvā Dadhyaṇi rishiḥ
putraḥ idha Atharvāṇaḥ

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

[In the Vājasaneyi Sanhitā, the first of these verses is immediately
preceded by the following words (xi. 32): Atharvā tvā prathamo nir
amanthad Agne | "Atharvan was the first who drew thee forth,
Agni.”]

Again it is said in the Rig-veda, x. 21, 5. Agnir jāto Atharvanā
vidad visvāni kavyā | bhuvad dūto Vivasvataḥ | “Agni, produced by
Atharvan, knows all wisdom, and has become the messenger of Vi-
vaswat.”

In i. 83, 5, Atharvan is mentioned as the earliest institute of sacri-
fice: Yajnair Atharvā prathamaḥ pathas tataḥ tataḥ sūryo vrataṇāḥ
venaḥ ajani | Atharvan was the first who by sacrifices opened up
paths; then the friendly Sun, the upholder of ordinances, was pro-
duced,” etc.: so too in x. 92, 10. Yajnair Atharvā prathamo vi dhārayād
devā dakshair Bhrigavāḥ sam chikitrire | “Atharvan, the first, estab-
lished (all things) with sacrifices. The divine Bhrigus co-operated with
their powers.”

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

i. 58, 6. Dadhus tvā Bhrigavo mānusheshvā rayim na chārum suhavam janebhyaḥ | hotāram Agne |

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

ii. 4, 2. Imam vidhanto apām sadasthe dvītā addadhur Bhrigavo vikshu Āyoḥ |

“Worshipping him (Agni) in the receptacle of waters, the Bhrigus placed him among the people of Āyu.”

x. 46, 2. Imam vidhanto apām sadasthe paśum na nāṣṭham padaiv anu gman | guhā chaṭantam uśīja namohir ichhanto dhīrā Bhrigavo avindan |

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

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

i. 36, 10. Yam tva devaśo manave dadhur iha yajīśhham havyavāhana | yam Kauḍo Medhyātīthīḥ dhanaspritam yam Vṛishā yam Upastutah |

“Thou, o bearer of oblations, whom the gods placed here as an object of adoration to man (or Manu); whom Kauḍa, whom Medhyātīthī, whom Vṛishā, whom Upastuta (have placed) a bringer of wealth,” etc. Compare vi. 16, 1, quoted above, p. 167, note 9.

iii. 5, 10. Yadi Bhrigubhyaḥ pari Mātariśvā guhā sāntāṁ havyavāham samīdhe |

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

x. 46, 9. Dīvāva yam Agnim prithivī janīśṭham āpas Tvashṭā Bhrigavo yam saḥobhiḥ | ūṇyam prathamam Mātariśvā devās tatakshur manave yajatram |

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

14 In the following passages also the Bhrigus are mentioned as connected with the worship of Agni: i. 71, 4; i. 127, 7; i. 143, 4; iii. 2, 4; iv. 7, 1; vi. 16, 2; viii. 3, 13; viii. 91, 4; x. 122, 5.
the waters, whom Tvashtri, whom the Bhrigus, have generated by
their powers."

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

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

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

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

i. 112, 16. Yabhir narā Śayave yabhir Atraye yabhīḥ purā Manave
gatun ishathuḥ | yabhīḥ sārīr ājatam Syūmarāsnaeye tabhir u shu ati-
bhir Aśvinā gatam | 18. ... Yabhir Manum śāram iṣā samāvatam |
"Come, Aświns, with those succours, whereby, o heroes, ye effected
deliverance for Śayu, for Atri, and formerly for Manu, whereby ye shot
arrows for Śyūmaraśmi. 18. . . . whereby ye preserved the hero
Manu with food."

viii. 15, 5. Yena jyotiṁshi Āyave Manave cha viveditha | mandāno
asya barhisho vi rājasī |
"Exulting in this (exhilaration), where-with thou didst make known
the luminaries to Āyu, and to Manu, thou art lord of the sacrificial
grass."

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

vii. 91, 1. Kuśid anga namsā ye vṛddhasah purā devā anavadyāsaḥ āsan | te Vāyave (Āyave?) Manave bādhitāya avāsayan Uṣhasam Sūryena |

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

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

i. 31, 4. Tvam Agne Manave dyām avāsayah Purūravasu sukīte su-
kṛttarāḥ |

"Thou, Agni, didst display the sky to Manu, to the beneficent Pu-
rūravas, (thyself) more beneficent."

If Manu be taken for a proper name in vii. 91, 1, it may reason-
ably be understood in the same way in vi. 49, 13, where the person referred is similarly spoken of as distressed:

vi. 49, 13. Yo rajāmīśi vimamo pārthivāni triś chid Vishnur Manave bādhitāya |

"Vishnū who thrice measured the terrestrial regions for Manu when distressed."

And in that case the word Manu may perhaps also be taken to denote a person in vii. 100, 4, Vīchakrame prithivim eva etām kṣetraya Vish-
nur Manave daśāsyān | "This Vishnū strode over this earth, bestowing it on Manu for an abode.". Although here the general sense of "man" would make an equally good sense.

I may introduce here another text in which, from its conjunction with other proper names, it must be held that the word Manu denotes a person.

i. 139, 9. Dādhyān āha me janusham pūrvo Angirāḥ Priyamedhāḥ Kaṇva Atrir Manur vidus te me pūrve Manur viduḥ |

"Dadhyanch, the ancient Angiras, Priyamedha, Kaṇva, Atri, Manu, know my (Paruchhepa's?) birth; they, my predecessors, Manu, know it."

There are, as we have seen, some passages in the hymns in which it is doubtful whether the words manu and manush denote an
individual, or stand for man in general; and there are also texts in which the latter sense is clearly the only one that can be assigned. Such are the following:

(1.) Manu in the singular:

1. 130, 5. . . . Dhenur iva manave visvadohaso janaya visvadohasah |
   “All-productive as a cow to man, all-productive to a person.”
   v. 2, 12. Barhishmate manave sarma yamsad havishmate manave sarma
   yamsat |
   “That he may bestow protection on the man who sacrifices, on the
   man who offers oblations.”

viii. 47, 4. Manor visvasya gha id ime Adityah rayar isate . . . |
   “These Adityas are lords of every man’s riches” . . . .

(2.) Manu in the plural:

viii. 18, 22. Ye chid hi mrityubandhavah Adityah manavah smasi |
   pra su naah ayur jivase tiratana |
   “O ye Adityas, prolong the days of us who are men who are of kin
   to death, that we may live.”

x. 91, 9. Yad devayanto dadhati prayamisi to havishmanto manavo
   vrikta-barhishah |
   “When these pious men sacrificing, and spreading the sacrificial
   grass, offer thee oblations.”

(3.) Manush in the singular:

i: 167, 7. Gah charanti manusho na yosha |
   “Like the wife of a man moving secretly.”

vii. 70, 2. . . . atapi gharmo manusho duroe |
   “Fire has been kindled in the man’s abode.”

The same phrase manusho durone occurs also in viii. 76, 2; x. 40,
13; x. 104, 4; x. 110, 1. In x. 99, 7, we find the words druva
manushe, “against the injurious man.”

(4.) Manush in the plural:

iv. 6, 11. Hotaram Agnim manusho nishedur namasyanta utijah sam-
   sam ayoh |
   “Men offering worship, and eager, attend upon Agni the invoker,
   the object of man’s (or Ayu’s) praises.”

In the following passages, if the word Manu is not to be understood
as denoting a person, the progenitor of men, it seems, at all events, to
designate his descendants, the favoured race to which the authors of
the hymns believed themselves to belong, and appears to be in some cases at least nearly synonymous with Ārya, the name by which they called men of their own stock and religion, in contradistinction to the Dasyus, a term by which we are either to understand hostile demons, or the rude aboriginal tribes:

i. 130, 8. *Indraḥ samatsu yajamanām āryam prāvad viśveshu satamātir ājishu . . . | manave sāsad avratān tvacham Krishnām arandhayat |*

"Indra who bestows a hundred succours in all conflicts . . . has preserved the Ārya in the fights. Chastising the lawless, he has subjected the black skin to the man (manave)."

Compare i. 117, 21, where instead of manu, or manusha, the word manusha is employed:

_Yavaṁ vṛikeṇa Āśvinā vapantā isham duhantā manushāya dasrā | abhi dasyum bākureṇa dharmantā uru jyotiṣ chakrathur ārāya |

"Sowing barley with the wolf, ye, o potent Āśvins, milking out food for man (manusha), blowing away the Dasyu with the thunderbolt(?), have made a broad light for the Ārya." 17

i. 175, 3. _Tvam hi śūrāḥ sanīta chodayo manusho ratham | sahāvān dasyum avratam oshaḥ pātram na śočishā |

"Thou, a hero, a benefactor, hast impelled the chariot of man: victorious, thou hast burnt up the rite-less Dasyu, as a vessel is consumed by a blaze."

ii. 20, 6. _Sa ha śruta Īndro nāma deva urdāhvo bhuvad manushe dasmatamaḥ | ava priyam arāsānasya sahāvān śiro dharaḍ dāsaaya avadhāvān | 7. Sa vṛitrarāḥ Īndraḥ krishṇayonīḥ purandaro dāsir avrāyad vi | ajanayad manave kshām apaścha satrā saṁsam yajamanāsyā tumot |

"The god renowned as Indra hath arisen most mighty for the sake of man. Violent, self-reliant, he has smitten down the dear head of the destructive Dāsa. 7. Indra, the slayer of Vṛitra, the destroyer of cities, has scattered the Dasyu (hosts) sprung from a black womb. He

15 A similar opposition between the word āyu, "man," and dasyu is to be noted in the following passage, vi. 14, 3: nānā hi Āgna avas epaṛāhante rāyo ayaḥ | tūr-vanto dasyam āyavo avratāḥ sikhānato avrata | "In various ways, o Agni, the riches of the enemy emulously hasten to the help (of thy worshippers). The men destroy the Dasyu, and seek by rites to overcome the riteless."

17 See Prof. Roth's explanation of this passage as given in a note to the article on Manu the progenitor of the Aryan Indians, Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. xx. p 418.
has produced for man the earth and the waters; he has perfectly fulfilled the aspiration of his worshipper."

vi. 21, 11. *Na me a vācham upa yāhi vidvān viśvebhīḥ sūno sahasa yajatraḥ | ye aṇijihvāḥ ētasāpaḥ ēsur ye manum chakrur uparam daśāya |

"Do thou, O wise god, son of strength, approach my hymn with all the adorable (deities), who were fire-tongued, rite-frequenting, and made man superior to the Dāsa."

viii. 87, 5. *Abhi hi satya somapāḥ ubhe babhātha rodaśi | Indrāsi suvato vṛiḍhaḥ patir divaḥ | 6. Tvam hi śaśvatīnām Indra darta pu-rām asi | hantā dasyor manor vṛiḍhaḥ patir divaḥ |

"5. For thou, O true soma-drinker, hast overcome both worlds. Indra, thou art the prosperer of him who makes libations, the lord of the sky. 6. Thou, Indra, art the destroyer of all the cities, the slayer of the Dasyu, the prosperer of man, the lord of the sky."

ix. 92, 5. *Tan nu satyam pavamānasya astu yatra viśve kāravaḥ saṁ-nasanta | jyotir yad abho akrinod u lokam prāvad manum daśyave kar abhikam |

"Let this be the true (abode) of the pure god (Soma) where all the sages have assembled; since he has made light and space for the day, has protected man, and repelled the Dasyu."

x. 49, 7. *Yad mā saśo manushaḥ āha nirmihe rīdhak krishe dāsaṁ kriś-vyam hathaiḥ |

"When the libation of man calls me to splendour, I tear in pieces (?) with blows the vigorous Dāsa."

x. 73, 7. *Tvam jaghantha Namuchim makhasyum dāsaṁ kriṣvānaḥ rāshaye vimāyan | tvam chakartha manave syonān patho devatrā anjasā iva yānān |

"Thou hast slain the lusty Namuchi, making the Dāsa bereft of magic against the rishi: thou made for man beautiful paths leading as it were straightway to the gods."

It is to be observed that in none of these passages is the Brahmanical, or any other, caste singled out as having been the special object of divine protection. Men, or Āryas, are the favourites of the gods. And

18 In iv. 26, 7, Indra says: "Aham bhumim adadām āryāya aham vrīṣṭhim dā-śunte mātyāya | "I gave the earth to the Ārya; I gave rain to the sacrificing mortal."
even in such hymns as R.V. i. 112; i. 116; i. 117; i. 119, etc., where the Aśvins are celebrated as having interposed for the deliverance of many of their worshippers, whose names are there specified, we are nowhere informed that any of these were Brāhmans, although reference is often made to their being rishis.19

There is one other text of considerable interest and importance, R.V. iii. 34, 9, which, although it is unconnected with Manu, may be here cited, as it connects the word ārya with the term varṇa, “colour,” which in later times came to signify “caste,” as applied to the Brāhmans and other classes. It is this:

Sasānātyām uto sūryān sasāna Indraḥ sasāna puruḥhojasāṁ gām
| hiranyayam uto bhogāṁ sasāna hātvī dasyāṁ pra āryāṁ varṇam āvat |

“Indra bestowed horses, he bestowed the sun, he bestowed the many-nourishing cow, he bestowed golden wealth: having slain the Dasyu, he protected the Āryan colour.”

It is to be observed that here the word varṇa is used in the singular. Thus all the persons coming under the designation of Ārya, are included under one class or colour, not several.20

We shall see in the next chapter that, irrespective of the verse of the Purusha Sūkta, there are in the Rig-veda Sanhitā a few texts in which the Brāhmans are mentioned alone of all the four castes, without any distinct reference being found anywhere to the second class as Rājanyas, or Kshattriyas, or to the third and fourth as Vaiśyas and Śūdras.

In the mean time I shall advert to some other phrases which are employed in the hymns, either to denote mankind in general, or to signify certain national or tribal divisions. The most important of these is there of the “five tribes,” who are frequently referred to under the appellations of pancha-kṛishṭayah, pancha-kṣhitayah, pancha-kṣhitayo manuṣhyayah (vii. 97, 1), pancha-charshanañayaḥ, pancha-janañ, pancha-janañyā viś (viii. 52, 7), pancha bhūma (vii. 69, 2), pancha jātā (vi. 61, 12).21

19 See Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1866, pp. 7 ff.
20 Sāyana, indeed, interprets the word āryam varṇam by uttamam varṇam traiyār-nīkam, “the most excellent class consisting of the three upper castes;” but he of course explains according to the ideas of his own age. In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, Kāya Sūkha (Adhvara Kāṇḍa, i. 6) it is stated that the upper three castes only were Āryas and fit to offer sacrifice (ārya eva brāhmaṇa vā kṣattriya vā vaiśya vā te hi yaḍnīgāh) see Journ. Roy. As. Soc. for 1866, p. 281.
21 In iii. 49, 1, mention is made not of the five tribes, but of all the tribes: S∧nśa
Some of these terms are occasionally used of the gods, as in x. 53, 4:

ṣūryā uṣa yajniyāsah panchajanaḥ mama hotraṁ jushadhvam | "Ye five tribes who eat (sacrificial) food, and are worthy of adoration, receive my oblation with favour."\(^{23}\)

On this verse Yāska remarks, Nirukta, iii. 8: "Gandharvāḥ pitaro devā asurā rakhāṇī " ity eke | "chatvāro varnā nishādāḥ panchamāḥ" ity Aupamanyavaḥ | "Some say the word denotes the Gandharvas, fathers, gods, asuras, and rakshases. Aupamanyava says it denotes the four castes and the Nishādās."\(^{23}\)

If Aupamayava was right, the Nishādās also were admissible to the worship of the gods in the Vedic age, as the "five classes" are represented in various texts as votaries of Agni. Such are the following:

vi. 11, 4. Āyuḥ na yaṁ namasā rātahavyāḥ anjanti suprayasam pancha janāḥ |

"Agni, whom, abounding in oblations, the five tribes, bringing offerings, honour with prostrations, as if he were a man."

Sāyaṇā here defines the five tribes as "priests and offerers of sacrifices" (rītvig-yajamāna-lakṣhanāḥ).

ix. 65, 22. Ye somāsah . . . sunvire . . . 23. Ye vā janeshu panchasu |

mahāṁ Indraṁ yasmin viśvā ā kṛishṇayāḥ somapāḥ kāmam avyaya | "Praise the great Indra, in whom all the tribes drinking soma have obtained their desire."

\(^{22}\) Compare x. 60, 4. "In whose worship Ikṣvāku prospers, wealthy and foe-destroying, like the five tribes in the sky (diveva pancha kṛishṇayāḥ). Sāyaṇā, however, renders "His five tribes (the four castes and the Nishādās) are as (happy as) if in heaven." Prof. Müller, Journ. Roy. As. Soc. for 1866, p. 462, renders, "as the five tribes in heaven."

\(^{23}\) In his note on this passage in his "Illustrations of the Nirukta," p. 28, Prof. Roth remarks: "The conception of the five races which originally comprehended all mankind . . . is here transferred to the totality of the divine beings. Hence also arises the diversity of understanding, when the number has to be indicated." Prof. Roth then quotes part of Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, iii. 31, which I give a little more fully from Dr. Haug's edition: Panchajanyāṁ vai etad ukthaṁ yad vaisvadevam | sarveshāṁ vai etat panchajānāṁ ukthaṁ deva-manushyaṁ gandharvāpsarasāṁ sarpaṇāṁ cha pitṛṇāṁ cha | eteshāṁ vai etat panchajānāṁ ukthaṁ | sarve enam panchajanaṁ viduḥ | ā enam panchirnī janatāyai havino gachhanti ya evaṁ vedā | "This Vaisvadeva uktha belongs to the five classes of beings. It belongs to all the five classes of gods, men, Gandharvas and Apsaras, serpents, and fathers. To these five classes belongs this uktha. All these five classes know him (who uses it). Those of this five-fold set of beings who are skilled in invocation come to the man who knows this." See Dr. Haug's Alt. Br. ii. 214, where it is said that Gandharvas and Apsaras are counted as one class.
“Or those soma-libations which have been poured out... (23) among the five tribes.”

x. 45, 6. Pitum chid adrim abhinat parayan janah yaa agnum aya-
jauta pancha |

“He (Agni), travelling afar, clove even the strong mountain, when
the five tribes worshipped Agni.”

vii. 15, 2. Yah pancha charshahir abhi nishasad a dame dame | kavir
grihapatir yuva |

“The wise and youthful master of the house (Agni) who has taken
up his abode among the five tribes in every house.”

In vi. 61, 12, Sarasvati is spoken of as “augmenting or prospering
the five tribes” (pancha jata varahayanti).

In viii. 52, 7, it is said: Yat panchajanyaya viha Indre ghoshah
asrikshata | “When shouts were uttered to Indra by the people of the
five tribes,” etc.

In R.V. i. 117, 3, Atri is styled rishim panchajanyam, “a rishi be-
longing to the five tribes.” In v. 32, 11, the epithet satpatih pancha-
janayah, “the good lord of the five tribes,” is applied to Indra. And in
ix. 66, 20, Agni is called the purified rishi, the priest of the five tribes
(panchajanyah purohitah).24

In other passages, however, it is far from clear that the “five races”
are intended to be identified with the Aryas, or people of honourable
race, to whom the authors of the hymns belonged. Such, perhaps, is
the case in the following verse: ii. 2, 10. Asmaka ayunnam adhi
pancha krishtishu uchchha svar na susuchita dushtaram | “May our glory
shine aloft among the five tribes, like the heaven unsurpassable.” See
also vi. 46, 7, to be quoted below.

On the same subject, Professor Roth remarks as follows in his Lexicon
under the word krishti: “The phrase five races is a designation of all
nations, not merely of the Aryyan tribes. It is an ancient enumera-
tion, of the origin of which we find no express explanation in the
Vedic texts. We may compare the fact that the cosmical space or
points of the compass are frequently enumerated as five, especially in

24 See Mahabharata, iii. 14160, as referred to by Roth under jana, where the birth
of a being of five colours, apparently a form of Agni, is described, who was generated
by five rishis, and who was known as the god of the five tribes (panchajanya) and the
producer of five races.
the following text of the A.V. iii. 24, 2: \textit{imā yāh pancha pradiśo mānavīh pancha kriśṭayaḥ} | ‘these five regions; the five tribes sprung from Manu’; among which (regions) we should have here to reckon as the fifth the one lying in the middle (\textit{dhruvā dīk}, A.V. iv. 14, 8; xviii. 3, 34), that is, to regard the Aryyas as the central point, and round about them the nations of the four regions of the world. . . . . According to the Vedic usage, five cannot be considered as designating an indefinite number.”

We cannot therefore regard the use of the term “five races” as affording any evidence of the existence of a rigidly defined caste-system at the period when it was in frequent use. The frequent reference to such a division, which fell into disuse in later times, rather proves the contrary. The caste-system was always a quadruple, not a quintuple, one; and although the Nishādas are added by Aupamanyava as a fifth division of the population, this class was esteemed too degraded to allow us to suppose that they could ever have formed part of a universally recognized five-fold division, of which all the parts appear to be regarded as standing on an equal, or nearly equal, footing.

It is supposed by Dr. Kuhn\textsuperscript{25} that the “five tribes” are to be identified with the clans whose names are mentioned in the following verse:

\begin{quote}
i. 108, 8. \textit{Yad Indrāgni Yadushu Turvaseshu yad Druhyushu Anushu Pūrushu sṭhaḥ | ataḥ pari vrishyaṇāv ā hi yātam athā somavya pibatam sutasya |}
\end{quote}

“If, o Indra and Agni, ye are abiding among the Yadus, Turvasas, Druhyus, Anus, Pūrus,—come hither, vigorous heroes, from all quarters, and drink the Soma which has been poured out.”

Although, however, these tribes are often mentioned separately in the Rig-veda, this is either the only, or almost the only, text in which they are all connected with one another. Their identity with the “five classes” is therefore doubtful.

There is another word employed in the Rig-veda to designate a race well known to the authors of the hymns, viz., \textit{nāhus}. We have already met with this term in a verse (x. 80, 6) I have quoted above, where it appears clearly to denote a tribe distinct from the descendants of Manush; and the adjective derived from it occurs in vi. 46, 7 (=

\textsuperscript{25} See Weber’s Indische Studien, i. 202, where Dr. Kuhn’s paper in the Hall. Allg. Lit. Z. for 1846, p. 1086, is referred to.
S.V. i. 262), where also the tribes of Nahush appear to be discriminated from the five tribes, whoever these may be supposed to be. The words are these: \textit{Yad Indra nāhushike ṛṣiyo nṛṣmain ca kriṣṭiṣhuh | yad vā pancha kśitiṇām dyunnam ā bhara satra vīśuṇī pauṁeya | “Indra, whatever force or vigour exists in the tribes of Nahush, or whatever glory belongs to the five races, bring it (for us); yea all manly energies together.”}

Professor Roth (see his Lexicon, s.v.) regards the people designated by the word \textit{nahush} as denoting men generally, but with the special sense of stranger, or neighbour, in opposition to members of the speaker’s own community; and he explains the words of x. 80, 6, twice referred to above, as signifying “the sons of our own people, and of those who surround us.”

These descendants of Nahush, whoever they may have been, are, however, distinctly spoken of in x. 80, 6 (the passage just adverted to), as worshippers of Agni, and can scarcely, therefore, have been regarded by the Aryas as altogether aliens from their race and worship.

Setting aside, as before, the Puruṣa Sūkta, there are few distinct references in the hymns of the Rig-veda to the creation of men, and none at all to the separate creation of castes. The following text ascribes the generation of mankind to Agni, R.V. i. 96, 2: \textit{Sa pūrvayā nividā kavyatā āyor imāḥ prajāḥ ajanayad manānām | vivasvatā chaśastā dyām apāḥ cha devā Agnim dhārayan dravinodām | “By the first nivid, by the wisdom of Āyu, he (Agni) created these children of men; by his gleaming light the earth and the waters: the gods sustained Agni the giver of riches.”26}

The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa introduces this verse by the following passage: \textit{Prājapatīr vai idam eka eva agre āsa | so kāmayata “prajāyeya bhūyān syām.” iti | sa tapo ’tapyata | sa vācham ayachhāt | sa saṃvatsarasaya parastād vyāharad dvādasa kṛitraḥ | dvādaśopadā vai eṣā nivīt | ētām vaca tām nividāṃ vyāharat | tāṃ sarvāṃ bhūtāṃ anvas-priyanta | taḥ etad rishiḥ pasyann abhyanuvachha “sa pūrvayā” ityādānā | “Prājapati alone was formerly this universe. He desired ‘may I be propagated, and multiplied.’ He practised austere fervour. He suppressed his voice. After a year he spoke twelve times. This nivid

26 See Dr. Haug’s translation in his \textit{Ait. Br. ii.} 143; and Benfey’s German version in his \textit{Orient und Occident, ii.} 512.
consists of twelve words. This nivid he uttered. After it all beings were created. Beholding this the rishi uttered this verse, 'by the first nivid,',' etc.

The generation of "creatures" (prajāh) is ascribed in various texts to different gods, in iii. 55, 1927 to Tvashtṛi Savitṛi; in ix. 86,28 to Soma; in viii. 85, 6 (ya imā jajāna viśva jātāmi) to Indra. In x. 54, 3 Indra is said to have "generated the father and mother (heaven and earth) from his own body" (yan mātaraṁ cha pitaraṁ cha sākam ajā-nayathās tanvaḥ svayāḥ); while Viśvakarman, who in x. 81, 2, 3 is said to have generated heaven and earth, is also in x. 82, 3 called "our father and generator" (yo naḥ pītā janītā). All these passages are, however, too vague to afford us any insight into the ideas of their authors regarding the creation of the human race.

sect. II.—Legends and Notices regarding Manu from the Satapatha, Aitareya, and Taittirīya Brāhmaṇas, the Taittirīya Saṅhitā, and the Chhūndogya Upaniṣhad.

The first passage which I adduce contains the very important legend of the deluge, which has already been quoted in the 2nd vol. of this work, pp. 324 ff., and which has also been rendered into English by Professor Max Müller (Anc. Sansk. Lit. pp. 425 ff.) and by Professor M. Williams (Ind. Epic Poetry, p. 34), as well as into German by its earliest translator, Professor Weber, in the vear 1849 (Ind. Studien, i. 163 f.).

Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, i. 8, 1, 1. Manave ha vai prātar avanegyam udakam ājahrur yathā idam pāṇībhyaṁ avanējanāya āharanti | evam tasya avanējanasya matsyaḥ pāṇī āpade | 2. Sa ha asmai vācham uvāda "bibhrihi mā pārayishyāmi tvā" iti | "kasmād mā pārayisyasi" iti | "aughaḥ imāḥ sarvaḥ prajāh nirvohdhā tatas tvā pārayītāmi" iti | "Katham te bhirit" iti | 3. Sa ha uvācha "yāvad vai kshullakaḥ bha-
vamo bahu vai nas tāvad nāśṭraḥ bhavaty uta matsya eva matsyaṃ gilati | kumbhyāṁ mā agro bibharasi | sa yaa tām ativarśa atha karṣaṁ khāva tasyāṁ mā bibharasi | sa yada tām ativarśa atha mā samudram abhyavaharasi | tarhi vai atināśtra bhavitāmi" iti | 4. S'aśvad29 ha

27 Perhaps, however, we are to understand Tvashtṛi's function of aiding in pro-
creation to be here referred to.
29 S'aśvat-śabdātra sūmarthyaḥ kṣipra-vachanah.—Comm.
jhasha 29 āsa sa hi jyesṭham 30 vardhate | "atha itithim samām tād aughāḥ āgantā tād mā nāvam upakalpya upāsāsai | sa auge utthite nāvam āpadyāsai tatas tevā pārayitāsmi" iti | 5. Tam evam bhrīvā samudram abhyavajāhāra | sa yatithim tat samām pariśiddesā tatithim samām nāvam upakalpya upāsānāhakro | sa auge utthite nāvam āpade | tam sa matsyaḥ upanyāpuplauve | tasya śringo nāvah pāsaṁ pratīmumoccha | tona ētām uttaram girim 31 atidūdrava 32 | 6. Sa ha uvācha "apīparam vai tevā vṛipyhe nāvam pratībadhīṃśaḥ | tāṁ tu tevā mā girau santam udakam antaschhaityādī yavad yavad udakām samavāyāt tāvāt tāvād anvavasarpaśi" iti | Sa ha tāvāt tāvād eva anvavasarpaśa | tad āpi ētād uttaraśya giriṁ "Manor avasārapaṇam" iti | auge ho ātah sarvakṣaḥ prajāḥ nirvāhā atah iha Manur eva ekaḥ pariśiśishe | 7. Saḥ archan śrāmyāṃs chāchāra prajākāmāḥ | tatra āpi pāka-yajnena īṣa | sa ghrītam dadhi mastvām āmikāhām āty apsu jhūvānchakāra | tataḥ saṁvatsare yoshit sambhāvā | sa ha pibdamanā 33 āva udeyāya | tasya hi sa maṃ ghrītāṃ pade santīṣṭhate | tayā Mitra-Varuṇāu sanjagmāte | 8. Tām ha uchatuh "kā asi" iti | "Manor dūhitā" iti | "āvayor brūshva" iti | "na" iti ha uvācha "yāḥ eva mām ājjanata tasya eva aḥam asmī" iti | tasyām apītvam 34 iṣhāte | tad vā jējnav tad vā na jējnav 35 ati tu eva iyāya | sa Manum ājaṣāma | 9. Tām ha Manur uvācha "kā asi" iti | "tava dūhitā" iti | "katham bhagavati mama dūhitā" iti | "yāḥ amūr apsu āhūtur āhavātur ghrītam dādhi mastvām āmikāhām tato iṁm ājjanathāh | sa āśir asmī tām mā yajne avakalpaya | yajne ched vā mā avakalpayishyasi bahuḥ prajāya pasubhir bha-vishyasi yām u mayā kāncia aśisah aśishyase sa te sarvā sarvarāhishyate" iti | tām ētād madhye yajnasye avākalpayat | madhyaṁ hi ētād yajnasya yad antarā prayājvanīyājan | 10. Tāya archan śrāmyāṃs chāchāra prajākāmāḥ | tayā iṁmā prajāṁ prajajne yā iyam Manoḥ prajātiḥ | yām u enayā kāncia aśisah aśāsta sa asmai sarvā sarvarāhishyata | sa ēshā niḍānena yad Iḍa | sa yo ha evam vidvān Iḍaya cha-rati etām ha eva prajātīm prajāya yām Manuḥ prajāyata | yām u enayā kāncia aśisah aśāste sa asmai sarvā samṛıdhyate

1. In the morning they brought to Manu water for washing, as

29 Jhasho maṁ-matsyaḥ.—Comm.
30 Jyesṭham vṛiddhatamam.—Comm.
31 Uttaram girim Himavantam.—Comm.
32 Some MSS. read adhīdūrava.
33 Pibdamanā . . . ghrīta-prabhavavatā ghrītam sraṃvantī susmīdhā udakād ut-
thītā.—Comm.
34 Apītvam bhūgaḥ | tam prāṛthītāvantau.—Comm.
35 Pratījnātavatī cha na cha pratījnātavatī.—Comm.
men are in the habit of bringing it to wash with the hands. As he was thus washing, a fish came into his hands, (2) (which spake to him) 'preserve me; I shall save thee.' (Manu enquired) ‘From what wilt thou save me?’ (The fish replied) ‘A flood shall sweep away all these creatures; from it I will rescue thee.’ (Manu asked) ‘How (shall) thy preservation (be effected)?’ 3. The fish said: ‘So long as we are small, we are in great peril, for fish devours fish; thou shalt preserve me first in a jar. When I grow too large for the jar, then thou shalt dig a trench, and preserve me in that. When I grow too large for the trench, then thou shalt carry me away to the ocean. I shall then be beyond the reach of danger.’ 4. Straightway he became a large fish; for he waxes to the utmost. (He said) ‘Now in such and such a year, then the flood will come; thou shalt, therefore, construct a ship, and resort to me; thou shalt embark in the ship when the flood rises, and I shall deliver thee from it.’ 5. Having thus preserved the fish, Manu carried him away to the sea. Then in the same year which the fish had enjoined, he constructed a ship and resorted to him. When the flood rose, Manu embarked in the ship. The fish swam towards him. He fastened the cable of the ship to the fish’s horn. By this means he passed over this northern mountain. 6. The fish said, ‘I have delivered thee; fasten the ship to a tree. But lest the water should cut thee off whilst thou art on the mountain, as much as the water subsides, so much shalt thou descend after it.’ He accordingly descended after it as much (as it subsided). Wherefore also this, viz., ‘Manu’s descent’ is (the name) of the northern mountain. Now the flood had swept away all these creatures; so Manu alone was left here. 7. Desirous of offspring, he lived worshipping and toiling in arduous religious rites. Among these he also sacrificed with the pāka offering. He cast clarified butter, thickened milk, whey and curds, as an oblation into the waters. Thence in a year a woman was produced. She rose

36 Bhaṅgūna-rthaśya siddhyarthai devatā eva matsya-rūpena ējaṅgūma | “To accomplish what was to follow, it was a deity which came in the form of a fish.”—Comm.
37 Aukha udaka-sanghātaḥ | sa imāḥ Bharatavarsa-nivāsīṁḥ prajāḥ niḥśeṣaṁ vodhā | deśāntarām prapatyaita | “The flood will entirely carry these creatures abiding in Bharatavarsa;—will convey them to another country.”—Comm.—I do not see why the verb niḥśeṣaṁ should have the sense here assigned to it: at all events we are afterwards told that Manu alone was left after the flood.
38 Or, if aḍhānudṛśaṁ be the true reading, “he hastened to.”
39 The Himaṃvat or Himālaya, according to the Commentator.
up as it were unctuous.\[^{40}\] Clarified butter adheres to her steps. Mitra and Varuṇa met her. They said to her, ‘Who art thou?’ ‘Manu’s daughter,’ (she replied). ‘Say (thou art) ours,’ (they rejoined). ‘No,’ she-said, ‘I am his who begot me.’ They desired a share in her. She promised that, or she did not promise that; but passed onward. She came to Manu. 9. Manu said to her, ‘Who art thou?’ ‘Thy daughter,’ she replied. ‘How, glorious one,’ asked Manu, ‘(art thou) my daughter?’ ‘Thou hast generated me,’ she said, ‘from those oblations, butter, thick milk, whey and curds, which thou didst cast into the waters. I am a benediction. Apply me in the sacrifice. If thou wilt employ me in the sacrifice, thou shalt abound in offspring and cattle. Whatever benediction thou wilt ask through me, shall accrue to thee.’ He (accordingly) introduced her (as) that (which comes in) the middle of the sacrifice; for that is the middle of the sacrifice which (comes) between the introductory and concluding forms. 10. With her he lived worshipping and toiling in arduous religious rites, desirous of offspring. With her he begot\[^{41}\] this offspring which is this offspring of Manu.\[^{42}\] Whatever benedictior he asked with her, was all vouchsafed to him. This is essentially that which is Iḍā. Whosoever, knowing this, lives with Iḍā, begets this offspring which Manu begot. Whatever benediction he asks with her, is all vouchsafed to him.\[^{43}\]

\[^{40}\] Such is the rendering of piddamūnā given by the Commentator, who is followed by Professors Weber and Müller. Professor Roth in his Lexicon, s. v., explains it by “firm,” i.e. “the woman arose solid out of the fluid mass.”

\[^{41}\] I should observe that the same verb (projaune) by which the generative act of Manu is here described, is in other passages of the same Brāhmaṇa (ii. 2, 4, 1; ii. 5, 1, 1; vi. 1, 1, 8; vi. 1, 3, 1; vii. 5, 2, 6; xi. 5, 8, 1) applied in another tense to the god Prajāpati, of whom it is said that he considered how he should beget progeny (sa aikṣhata katham mu praṣṭeṣya). (Compare xi. 1, 6, 1.) In other parts of the same work, however, it is said that Prajāpati created (asrijata) the waters (vi. 1, 1, 9), or creatures (praṣṭaḥ asrijata, vii. 4, 3, 5; x. 2, 2, 1); and the fact of the word “beget” being applied to Prajāpati, either in a figurative, or anthropomorphic sense, does not authorize us to suppose that the author of the S'atapatha Brāhmaṇa, in the passage before us (the legend of the deluge), intended to represent Manu as the creator of the human race, and not as their progenitor in the natural sense. (In R.V. ii. 33, 1; vi. 70, 3, we find the phrase praṣṭeyamahi praṣṭhiḥ p вас praṣṭhīhir vyaye | “let us beget children,” “he begets children.”)

\[^{42}\] Compare Taitt. Sanhitā, v. 1, 5, 6. “Śivo bhava prajāhīśnun ity āha prajāhīya eva enam śamāyoti | “mānushāḥbhyaḥ tvām angirah” ity āha mānāvya hi praṣṭaḥ” “He says, ‘be auspicious to the twin offspring;’ for he pacifies him from (injuring) the offspring. He says, ‘(We pacify) thee from (injuring) the human offspring, Angiras.’ For creatures are descended from Manu.”
From this interesting legend we learn that, according to its author's belief, Manu was not the creator of mankind, as some later accounts considered him to have been, but himself belonged to an earlier race of living beings, which was entirely destroyed by the deluge which is described. The legend regards him as a representative of his generation, who, for some reason, perhaps his superior wisdom, or sanctity, or position, was selected out of the crowd of ordinary mortals to be rescued from the impending destruction. That he was regarded as a mere man, and not as a being of a superior order, is shown by the fact of his requiring the aid of a higher power to preserve him. A supernatural fish, apparently some divine person, conceived as taking the form of a creature which would be perfectly secure and at home in the midst of the raging waters, undertook to deliver him, and guided the ship on which he was directed to embark, through all dangers to its destined haven. No one but Manu took refuge in the ship, for he alone, the story expressly records, was preserved, while all the other living beings were overwhelmed. Finding himself the sole survivor when the waters subsided he became desirous of progeny; and with intense devotion performed certain religious rites in the hope of realizing his wish through their efficacy. As a result of his oblations, a woman arose from the waters into which they had been cast. A male and a female now existed, the destined parents of a new race of men who sprang from their union,—a union the fruitfulness of which was assured by their assiduous practice of sacred ceremonies. From Manu and Idā, we are expressly told, the race known as that of Manu, i.e. the race of men, was produced. The legend says nothing whatever of this race being originally characterized by any distinction of castes, or about four sons, the ancestors of Brāhmans, Kshattriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras being born to Manu and Idā. We must therefore suppose that the author of the legend intends to represent the early race of mankind, or at least the first inhabitants of Bharata-varsha, as descended from one common progenitor without any original varieties of caste, however different the professions and social position of their descendants afterwards became. We are consequently entitled to regard this legend of the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa as at variance with the common fable regarding the separate origin of the Brāhmans, Kshattriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras.
The following are some other passages in which Manu and Iḍā are both referred to:

Taitt. S. ii. 6, 7, 1. Manuḥ prithivyāḥ yajniyam aichhat | sa ghṛtāṁ
nishkṛtam avindat | so 'bravīt "ko 'syāva yañe 'pi karttor" iti | tāv
abruṭām Mitra-Varunau "gor eva āvām īśvara karttoḥ evaḥ" iti | tau
tato gām samairayatam | sā yatra yatra nyakramat tato ghṛtam apīda-
yata | tasmād ghṛtapaḍī ucyate | tadd asyai janma | ... 3. Iḍā
upahavayate | paśavo vai Iḍā | paśūn eva upahavayate | chatur upahavayate |
chatushpādo hi paśavaḥ | "Mānavi" ity aha | Manur hy etām agrē
'paṣyat | "ghṛtapaḍī" ity aha | yad eva asyai padăd ghṛtam apīdyata
tasmād evam aha | "Maitrāvaruni" ity aha | Mitrāvarunau hy evāṁ
samairayatam |

"Manu sought whatever upon earth was fit for sacrifice. He found
butter poured out. He said, ‘Who has power to employ this in sacri-
fice also?’ Mitra and Varuṇa replied, ‘We two have power to employ
the cow.’ They then sent forth the cow. Wherever she went forth,
butter was pressed out. Hence she is called the ‘butter-footed.’ This
is her birth . . . 3. He calls upon Iḍā. Animals are Iḍā. He calls
upon animals. He calls upon them four times. For animals are four-
footed. He says ‘Mānavi.’ For Manu first saw her. He says ‘Butter-
footed.’ He says so, because butter was pressed from her foot. He
says ‘Maitrāvaruni.’ For Mitra and Varuṇa sent her forth.” (Comp.
Taitt. Br. iii. 7, 5, 6.)

Taitt. Br. i. 1, 4, 4. Iḍā vai Mānavi yajanukāśinyāḥ āśī tā 'kriṇoḥ
"Aṣura āgnim aṭṭhate" iti . . . | 6. Sā 'bravīd Iḍā Manum "tathā
vai āham tava āgnim ādāhyāmi yathā pra prajyā paśubhir mithunair
janishyate praty asmin loka sthāsyayi abhi swargam lokam jeshyah"
iti | gārhapatyam agrē aṭṭhāt | . . . gārhapatyena eva asmāi prajām
paśūn prājanayat |

“Īḍā, the daughter of Manu, was a revealer of sacrifice. She heard,
‘the Asuras are placing fire.’ . . . 6. Iḍā said to Manu, ‘I shall so
place thy fire that thou shalt increase in offspring, cattle, and twins;
 thou shalt be firmly established in this world, and shalt conquer the
heavenly world.’” She first placed the gārhapatyā fire. It was

42 Yajna-tattva-prakāśana-samarthā.—Comm.
44 Compare the Kaṭākha Br. viii. 4, quoted in Weber's Indische Studien, iii. 463,
where Iḍā is said to have promised to Manu: tathā te āgnim ādāhyāmi yathā ma-
through the gārhapatya that she produced for him offspring and cattle."

Tatt. S. i. 7, 1, 3. Sarvena vai yajnena devāḥ svargam lokam āyan | pākayajnena Manur aṣṭāmyat | sā Ida Manum upāvartata | tām deva- surāḥ vyahvayanta pratichim devaḥ parāchim Asurāḥ | sā devān upā- vartata |

"The gods arrived at the heavenly world by the whole sacrifice. Manu worshipped with the pākayajna. That Ida came to Manu. The gods and asuras called her away in different directions, the gods in front, the asuras behind. She came to the gods."

The following texts refer to Manu alone, as a celebrator of religious ceremonies:

Tatt. S. ii. 5, 9, 1. "Agni mahān asi" ity āha | mahān hy esha yad Agniḥ | "brāhmaṇa" ity āha | brāhmaṇo hy esha | "bhārata" ity āha | esha hi devebhyo havyam bharati | "devēdha" ity āha | devāḥ hy etam ainīdha | "Manviddha" ity āha | Manur hy etam uttaro devebhyāḥ ainīdha |

"He says, 'Agni, thou art great.' For this Agni is great. He says, 'o Brāhma.' For he is a Brāhmaṃ. He says, 'o Bhārata.' For he bears the oblation to the gods. He says, 'kindled by the gods.' For the gods kindled him. He says, 'kindled by Manu.' For Manu kindled him after the gods.'

Tatt. S. vi. 2, 5, 2 f. Trivrato vai Manur asiḥ dvivrata asura ekavrata devaḥ | prātār madhyandine sāyaṃ tad Manor vratam āsīt pākayajnasya rūpam pūshyai | prātaśca sāyaṃcha asurāṇāṃ nirmadhyaṃ kshudho rūpam | tatas te parabhavan | madhyandine madhyarāttre devānām tatas te 'bhavan svargam lokam āyaṃ |

"Manu performed three rites; the asuras two; the gods one. Manu’s rite was in the morning, at noon, and in the evening, the form of a pākayajna for nourishment. That of the asuras was in the morning and evening, without any midday rite, a form of hunger. Hence they perished. That of the gods was at midday and midnight. Hence they prospered, and arrived at the heavenly world."

Tatt. S. vii. 5, 15, 3. Etyā (i.e. abhijityā) vai Indram devaḥ ayājayaṃ | tasmād "Indrasavah" | etyā Manum manushyaḥ | tasmād "Manu-savah" | nushya devaṃ upaprajamāṇyante | "I will so place Agni for thee, than men shall be born among the gods."
yathā Indro devānām yathā Manur manushyānām eva bhavati yāḥ evam vidvān etayā iṣṭyā yajate |

"With this (abhhijīti) the gods sacrificed for Indra. Hence it is called 'Indra-sava.' Men sacrificed with it for Manu. Hence it is called 'Manu-sava.' As Indra is among gods, and Manu among men, so he becomes who thus knowing sacrifices with this oblation."

In Taitt. S. ii. 2, 10, 2, we find nearly the words which Kullūka quotes on Manu's Institutes, i. 1: Yad vai kincha Manur avadat tad bhesajam | "Whatever Manu said was a remedy."

In Satapatha Br. vi. 6, 1, 19, Manu is called a Prajāpati: "Prajā-patayo Manave svāhā" iti | Prajāpatir vai Manuḥ | sa hi idam sarvam amanuta | Prajāpatir vai etad agre karma akarot | "Svāhā to Manu the lord of creatures. Manu is a lord of creatures (prajā-pati) for he thought (amanuta) all this. The lord of creatures (prajā-pati) formerly did all this work."

The following story in its different versions also connects Manu with religious observances and represents him as very devout:

S. P. Br. i. 1, 4, 14 ff. Manor ha vai rishabhaḥ āsa | tasminn asura-gñiti sapatna-gñi vāk pravishṭā āsa | tasya ha sma ścasath ād āvac at ād asura-rākṣasānāṁ mrīdyamānāṁ yanti | te ha asurāṁ samudāre "pāpaṁ vata no 'yam rishabhaḥ sachate kathaṁ no imāṁ dahlknyāma" iti | "Kilatākuti" iti ha asura-brahmanā āsatuḥ | tau ha āchatuḥ "śradhā-devo vai Manuḥ | āvām nu vedāva" iti | tau ha āgatyā āchatur "Mano yājayāva tvā" iti | "kena" iti | "anena rishabhena" iti | "tatha" iti | tasya ālābdhasya sā vāg apachakraṁ | sā Manor eva jayam Mānuśvīṁ praviveśa | tasyai ha sma yatra vadaṁyai śrīvyanti tava ha sma eva asura-rākṣasāṁ mrīdyamānāṁ yanti | te ha asurāṁ samudāre "ito vai naḥ pāpiyaḥ sachate bhāyo hi manushāḥ vāg vadati" iti | Kilatākuti: ha eva āchatuḥ "śradhā-devo vai Manur āvām eva vedāva" iti | tau ha āgatyā āchatur "Mano yājayāva tvā" iti | "kena" iti | "enayā eva jayayā" iti | "tatha" iti | tasyai ālābdhāyai sā vāg apachakraṁ sā yajnam eva yajna-pattrāṁ praviveśa | tato ha evāṁ na ākārur nirhantum | sā evāṁ asura-gñi vāg ucedati | eva yasya ha evāṁ viduṣhāḥ etāṁ atra vāccham prayuṣvādayanti pāpiyāṁ so ha eva asya sapatnāḥ bhavanti |

"Manu had a bull. Into it an Asura-slaying, enemy-slaying voice had entered. In consequence of this (bull's) snorting and bellowing, Asuras and Rakshasas were continually destroyed. Then the Asuras
said: 'This bull, alas, does us mischief; how shall we overcome him?' Now there were two priests of the Asuras called Kilāta and Akuli. They said: 'Manu is a devout believer: let us make trial of him.' They went and said to him, 'let us sacrifice for thee.' 'With what (victim),'# he asked. 'With this bull,' they replied. 'Be it so,' he answered. When it had been slaughtered, the voice departed out of it, and entered into Manu's wife Manāvi. Wherever they hear her speaking, the Asuras and Rākshasas continue to be destroyed in consequence of her voice. The Asuras said: 'She does us yet more mischief; for the human voice speaks more.' Kilāta and Akuli said, 'Manu is a devout believer: let us make trial of him.' They came and said to him, 'Manu, let us sacrifice for thee.' 'With what (victim)?' he asked. 'With this (thy) wife,' they replied. 'Be it so,' he answered. When she had been slaughtered the voice departed out of her and entered into the sacrifice and the sacrificial vessels. Thence they were unable to expel it. This is the Asura-slaying voice which speaks out (when the two stones are struck with the samyā, as a part of the ceremonial). Wretched become the enemies of that man for whom, when he knows this, they cause this voice here to reverberate.'

Taitt. Br. iii. 2, 5, 9. Manoḥ śraddhā-devasya yajamānasya asura-gñī rāg yajñayudhesu pravishṭā āsit | te 'surāḥ yāvanto yajñayudhānām udvadatām upāśrinvans te parābhavan |

"An asura-slaying voice had entered into the sacrificial implements of the devout believer and sacrificer Manu. The Asuras, as many as heard the sacrificial implements sounding, were overcome."

Kāṭhaka Br. ii. 30, 1.⁴⁵ Manor vai kapālāny āsan | tair yāvato yāvato 'surān abhyupādadāhāt te parābhavan | atha tarhi Trishṭā-varūtri ⁴⁶ āstām asura-brahmau | tā asuraḥ abruvann "imāni shat kapālāni yache-thām" iti | tāv prataritvānā abhiprāpdayetām "Vāyave Agne Vāyave Indra" iti | "kiṁkāmau sthāḥ" ity abravit | "imāni nau kapālāni dehi" iti | tāny abhyāṁ adadāt | tāny aranyām parāhṛitya sama-piṁshām | tad Manor gavo 'bhivyatishtanta | tāni rishabhaḥ samaleś | tasya ruvato yāvanto 'surāḥ upāśrinvāṁs te parābhavan |

⁴⁵ Extracted from Weber's Indische Studien, iii. 461 f. A translation of this, as well as of the next passage, is given by Prof. Weber in the Journal of the German Oriental Society, vol. xviii. 284 ff.

⁴⁶ Rath in his Lexicon s. v. reads Trishñāvarūtri.
tau prātārītvāṁ abhiprāpadyetāṁ "Vāyave Agne Vāyave Indra" iti | "kīṁkāmau sthaḥ" ity abravīt | "anena tvā rishabhena yājayaṇa" iti | tat patāṁ yajur vajantim prayapadyate | tasyāḥ dyām vāg atishkhet | tasyāḥ vadaṁtyaḥ yāvanto 'surāḥ upāśrīṃvaṁte parābhavaḥ | tasmād naktaṁ strī chandratāram vadati | tau prātārītvāṁ abhiprāpadyetāṁ "Vāyave Agne Vāyave Indra" iti | "kīṁkāmau sthaḥ" ity abravīt | "anayā tvā patnyā yājayaṇa" iti | sā paryagnikritā āsīt | atha Indro 'chāyad "Manvam śraddhādevam Trishṭhāvārātrī asura-brahmau jāyayaṇa vyārīdhayatam" iti | sa āgachhat | so 'bravīd "abhyāṁ tvā yājayaṇī" iti | "na" ity abravīd "na vai aham anayor īṣe" iti | atithipatīr vāva atithē īṣe" ity abravīt | tā asmai prāyaśchhit | sa prātiveśo vediṁ kurvam āsta | tā aprīśchhhatam "ko'śī" iti | "brāhmaṇah" iti | "katamo brāhmaṇah" iti | "kim brāhmaṇasya pītaram kim u prikhvasi mātaram | śrutām ched asmin vedyam sa pītā sa pītāmaḥ" iti | tā avītam "Indro vai" iti | tau prāpataṁ | tayor yah prokṣhāya āpah āsāṁna tābhīr anuvisṛṣyya śirśe asthihānat | tā vṛishaḥ cha yavāshaḥ cha abhavatām | tasmā tāv tāv varśhesu śudhovatāḥ | ādhibhi hi hatau | tām paryagnikritām udāsrijat | tayā "rāhnot | tāḥ imāḥ Manavyaḥ prajāḥ | yat paryagni-kritam pātvavatam utsrijati yām eva Manur riddhim ārāhnot tām riddhoti | "Manu had platters. All the Asuras, against whom he laid out the sacrifice with these were destroyed. Now Trishṭha and Varūtri were at that time the priests of the Asuras. The Asuras said to them, 'ask for these six platters.' These two arrived as morning guests, repeating the formula, 'To Vāyu, o Agni, to Vāyu, o Indra.' 'What do you desire?' asked Manu. 'Give us these platters,' they replied. He gave them to them. Taking them they smashed them in the forest. Then Manu's cattle were standing round. The bull licked the platters. As many Asuras as heard him bellowing were destroyed. The two Asura priests came as morning guests, repeating the formula, 'To Vāyu, o Agni, to Vāyu, o Indra.' 'What do you desire?' enquired Manu. 'Let us sacrifice for thee with this bull,' they answered. He then came to his wife who was uttering a yajush. Her voice reached to the sky. As many Asuras as heard her speaking were destroyed. Hence a woman speaks more pleasantly by night. The two Asura priests arrived as morning guests, repeating the formula, 'To Vāyu, o Agni, to Vāyu, o Indra.' 'What do you desire?' asked Manu. 'Let us sacrifice for thee with
this thy wife (as the victim),' they replied. The fire was carried round her. Then Indra perceived, 'Tṛishṭha and Varūtri, the two Asura priests are depriving the devout believer Manu of his wife.' He came and said (to Manu), 'Let me sacrifice for thee with these two Asura priests (for victims).'</No,' answered Manu, 'I am not their master.' The host is master of the guest,' rejoined Indra. Manu then gave them to him. (Standing) near them he was making an altar. They asked 'Who art thou?' 'A Brāhman,' he replied. 'What (class of, Brāhman,' they enquired. He rejoined (with a verse), 'Why askest thou the father or the mother of a Brāhman? If Vedic tradition is to be discovered in him, that is his father, that his grandfather.' They knew, 'this is Indra.' They fled. He threw after them the water which was there for consecration, and therewith cut off their heads. They became, (the one) a vrīsha, (the other) a yavāsha plant. Hence these (two plants) wither in the rains, because they were killed with water. He released her (Manu's wife) after the fire had been carried round her. By her he prospered. These are the creatures sprung from Manu. Whenever a man releases the victim offered to Agni Pātnīvata, after fire has been carried round it, he prospers with the same prosperity with which Manu prospered.'

Compare with this a passage of the Taitt. Sanh. vi. 6, 6, 1. Indraḥ patniyā Manum ayājayat | tāṁ paryagnikrītām uḍasiyāt | tayā Manur ārdhnot | yat paryagnikrītam pātnīvatam uṣṭiṣati yām eva Manur riḍhīṁ ārdhnot tāṁ eva yajamāṇa riḍhnoti |

"Indra was sacrificing for Manu with his wife (as the victim). He released her after the fire had been carried round her. By her Manu prospered. Whenever the worshipper releases the victim offered to Agni Pātnīvata after fire has been carried round it, he prospers with the same prosperity with which Manu prospered."

I quote the following passages also from the interest which they possess as relating to a personage so ancient and venerable as Manu is reputed to be:

Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, v. 14. Nābhānediśthaṁ vai Mānavam brahma-\-charyyaiṁ vasantam bhrātaro nirabhajan | so 'bravīd etya "kim mahyam abhākta" iti | "etam eva nīshṭhāvam avavadītaram" ity abrwan | tas-mād ha api etarhi pitaram putrāḥ "nīshṭhāvo 'vavadītā" ity eva ācha-\-kṣate | sa pitaram etya abraviṁ "tvāṁ ha vāva maheyam tata abhākṣat"
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iti | tam pita 'bravād "mā putraka tad ādṛithāḥ | Angiraso vai ime svargāya lokāya satram āsata | te shashṭham shashṭham eva ahār āgatyā muhyanti | tān ete sukte shashṭhe 'hāni saṁsaya | teshām yat sahasrāṁ satra-pariveshaṁ tat te svar yanto dāsyanti" iti | "tathā" iti | tān upait "pratigrihyita Mānavam sumedhāsaḥ" iti | tam abruvan "kiṁ-kāmo vadasi" iti | "idām eva caḥ shashṭham ahaḥ prajñāpayāni" ity abravid "atha yad vai etat sahasrāṁ satra-pariveshaṁ tad me svar yanto datta" iti | "tathā" iti | tān ete sukte shashṭhe 'hany asāṁsayaat | tato vai te pra yajnam ajānaḥ pra svargaṁ lokam | tad yad ete sukte shashṭhe 'hari saṁsati yajnasya prajñāyai svargasya lokasya anukhyātai | tāṁ svar yanto 'bruvāṁ "stat te brāhmaṇa sahasram" iti | tad enāṁ samākurvaṇam purushāḥ krishṇa-vaśy uttarataḥ upothāya abravid "mama vai idām mama vai vāstuham" iti | so 'bravād "mahyāṁ vai idām ade" iti | tam abravit "tad vai nau tava eva pitāri prasnaḥ" iti | sa pitaram ait | tam pita 'bravād "nanaṁ te putraka ade" iti | "adur eva me" ity abravit "tad tu me purushaḥ krishṇa-vaśy uttarataḥ upodhathe 'mama vai idāṁ mama vai vāstuham' iti ādita" iti | tam pita 'bravād "tasya eva putraka | tat tubhyaṁ sa dāsyati" iti | sa āmavṛtya abravit "tava ha āva kila bhagavaḥ idam iti me pita āha" iti | so 'bravit "tad aham tubhyam eva dadāmī yaḥ eva satyam avādir" iti | tasmād evaṁ vidushaḥ satyam eva vādilavyam | sa eha sahasra-sanir mantrō yaḥ nābhānediśṭham | upa enam sahasrāṁ namati pra shashṭhena ahna svargaṁ lokam jānati yaḥ evaṁ veda] 47

"The brothers of Nābhānedīṣṭha disinherit him whilst he was living in the state of a Brahmacārīn. Coming (to them) he said: 'What share have you given to me?' They replied, '(we have given thee) this judge and divider (as thy share). In consequence sons even now speak of their father as the 'judge and divider.' He came to his father and said, 'Father, they have given thee to me as my share.' His father answered, 'Do not, my son, care about that. These Angirases are performing a sacrifice in order to (secure) the heavenly world; but as often as they come to the sixth day (of the ceremony) they become perplexed. Make them recite these two hymns (R. V. x. 61 and 62) on the sixth day; and when they are going to heaven, they will give

47 This passage has been already translated into German by Prof. R. Kotto, Journal of the German Oriental Society, vi. 244, and into English by Prof. Max Müller in his Anc. Sansk. Lit. p. 423 f., and by Dr. M. Haug in his Ait. Br. vol. ii. p. 341 f.
thee that provision of a thousand which has been made for the sacrifice.' He said, 'So be it.' He approached them, saying, 'Receive me, the son of Manu, ye sages.' They replied, 'With what object dost thou speak?' He said, 'Let me make known to you this sixth day; and then you shall give me this sacrificial provision of a thousand, when ye are going to heaven.' 'Let it be so,' they answered. He made them repeat these two hymns on the sixth day. They then knew the sacrifice, and the heavenly world. Hence when any one repeats these two hymns on the sixth day, it is with a view to a knowledge of the sacrifice, and to the revelation of the heavenly world. When they were going to the heavenly world, they said to him, 'This thousand, o Brähman, is thine.' As he was collecting (the thousand) a man in dark clothing rose up before him from the north, and said, 'This is mine; what remains on the spot is mine.' Nābhānedishṭha replied: 'But they have given it to me.' (The man) rejoined: 'It belongs to (one of) us; let thy father be asked.' He went to his father, who enquired: 'Have they not given thee (the thousand), my son?' 'They did give it to me,' he replied, 'but a man in dark clothes rose up before me from the north, and took it from me, saying, 'This is mine; what remains on the spot is mine.'" His father said: 'It is his; but he will give it to thee.' He returned, and said (to the man): 'This is thine, reverend sir, so my father says.' (The man) replied: 'I will give it to thee, who hast spoken the truth.' Wherefore one who has this knowledge should speak only truth. That is a hymn which bestows a thousand, that Nābhānedishṭha hymn. A thousand falls to his lot, he knows the heavenly world on the sixth day—the man who knows this.'

Taittirīya Sanhitā, iii. 1, 9, 4. Manuḥ putrebhyo dāyaṁ vyabhajat | sa Nābhānedishṭham brāhmacharryaṁ vasantaṁ nirabhajat | sa āgachhat | so 'bravīt "kathā ṃā nirabhāg" iti | "na tvā nirabhāksham" ity abravid "Angirasah ime satram āsate te suvargam lokam na prajā- nanti | teḥhyaḥ idam brāhmaṇam brāhi | te suvargam lokam yanto ye eshām paśavas tāṁs te dāsyanti" iti | tad ebhyo 'bravīt | te suvargam

48 See R.V. x. 62, 7.
49 The application of this title to Nābhānedishṭha is to be remarked, as his father Manu is recorded in the Puranic legends as ancestor of the solar race of kings. See the passage from the M. Bh. i. 3135 ff., quoted above, p. 126.
TRADITION OF THE DESCENT OF

lokam yanto ye eshum paśavaḥ āsāṁ tān asmai aḍaḍuḥ | tam paśubhiś charantam yajna-vāstau Rudraḥ āgachhat | so 'bravīt “mama vai ime paśavaḥ” iti | “adur vai mahyam imān” ity agravīt | “na vai tasya te iṣate” ity agravīt | “yaḍ yajnavāstau hīyate mama vai tād” iti | tasmād yājñavāstau na abhyavetyam | so ’bravīt | “yaṣe mā bhaja aṭha te paśuṇ na abhimāṃsye” iti | tasmāi etam manthīnāḥ saṁśrāvam ajyuḥot | tato vai tasya Rudro paśuṇ na abhyamanyata | yatra etam eva vidvān manthīnāḥ saṁśrāvam juhoti na tatra Rudraḥ paśuṇ abhimanyate |

“Manu divided his property among his sons. He disinherited his son Nābhānedihṭha who was living as a Brahmachārin. He came and said, ’How hast thou disinherited me?’ ‘I have not disinherited thee,’ replied (his father); ’these Angirases are celebrating a sacrifice; they do not know the heavenly world; declare to them this Brāhmaṇa; and when they are going to heaven, they will give thee the cattle they have.’ He declared the Brāhmaṇa to them, and when they were going to heaven they gave him the cattle they had. Rudra came to him as he was on the place of sacrifice employed with the cattle and said: ’These are my cattle.’ ’But,’ replied Nābhānedihṭha, ’they have given them to me.’ ’They have not power to do so; that which is left on the place of sacrifice is mine,’ answered Rudra. Hence the place of sacrifice must not be approached. (Rudra further) said: ’Give me a share in the sacrifice, and I shall not injure thy cattle.’ He offered him this libation of soma and flour. Then Rudra did not injure his cattle. Whenever any one knows this libation of soma and flour and offers it up, Rudra does not injure his cattle.”

A passage, quoted above, p. 26 f., from the Taittirīya Sanhitā, vi. 5,

50 The reader who knows German, and wishes to see an able discussion of the question, whether the legend of Nābhānedihṭha, as given in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, has any real connection with the two hymns of the Rig-veda (x. 61 and 62) which are referred to in it, and whether it contains any reminiscence, or symbolical representation, of ancient historical events, may consult Prof. Roth’s paper on the subject, in the 6th vol. of the Journal of the German Oriental Society, pp. 243 ff. The learned writer settles both questions in the negative, maintaining that the legend is manufactured out of certain misinterpreted allusions in the hymns, with the view of asserting the superiority of priestly knowledge to earthly power and worldly wealth, and that there never existed either a Nābhānedihṭha or a Manu. The object which I have in view in the collection of these texts does not require that I should express any opinion on these points. I only seek to ascertain what were the traditions received by the most ancient Indian writers themselves regarding the origin of their race, and not what was the historical value of those traditions.
6, 1 ff., may perhaps also be considered as affirming the descent of men from Manu when it declares them to be the offspring of Vivasvat; since the latter is regarded as the father of Manu.

In the Chhândogya Upanishad, iii. 11, 4 (p. 178 of Bibliotheca Indica, vol. iii.) the following reference to Manu occurs:

_Tad ha etad Brahmana Prajåpataye Prajåpatir Manave Manuh prayåbhyaḥ | tad ha etad Uddalakåya Āruṇaye putrāya jyeshthåya pitå brahma pravåcha |

"This (doctrine) Brahmana declared to Prajåpati, Prajåpati to Manu, Manu to (his) offspring. This sacred truth was declared to his eldest son Uddalaka Arûni by his father."

The first half of this passage is repeated in viii. 15, 1, of the same work (p. 625).

In his commentary on the former of the two passages, Sûkara Æchåryya gives this explanation:

_Brahma Hiranyagarbho Virajye Prajåpataye uvåcha | so 'pi Manave | Manur Ikshvåku-adibhyaḥ prayåbhyaḥ pravgåcha |

"Brahma Hiranyagarbha declared it to the Prajåpati Viraj; he to Manu; and Manu declared it to his descendants Ikshvåku and the rest."

In his note on the second passage, viii. 15, 1, he varies somewhat in his explanation of the personages by whom the doctrine was transmitted:

_Brahma Hiranyagarbhah Parameswaro vå tad-dvårena Prajåpataye Kaśyapåya uvåcha | asåv api Manave sva-pitråya | Manuh prayåbhyaḥ |

"Brahma Hiranyagarbha, or the supreme Lord (Parameswara) through his instrumentality, declared it to the Prajåpati Kaśyapa; he to his son Manu; Manu to his descendants."

In these two passages of the Chhândogya Upanishad Brahma is distinguished from Prajåpati, and Prajåpati from Manu, who again is said to have handed down the doctrine, not to any one person in particular, but "to the offspring," or "descendants" (prajåbhyaḥ), apparently his own descendants. This Upanishad therefore seems to coincide in the doctrine of the hymns, and of the Satapatha Bråhmaṇa, that Manu was the progenitor of mankind. The Commentator, it will have been noticed, in one place-delares that Prajåpati is identifiable with Viraj, and again that Kaśyapa is to be understood under that appellation. Viraj and Kaśyapa are not, however, generally regarded as the same.
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Nor is Kasyapa commonly considered to be Manu’s father. In the passages from the Rāmāyaṇa, ii. 110, and Mahābhārata, quoted above, pp. 115 and 126, Kasyapa is said to be the father of Vivasvat, and he again of Manu.

However this may be, as Manu is said to have handed down the sacred tradition to his descendants, we must suppose that those descendants included the whole of the progenitors of the Aryan Indians who were worthy of being made the depositaries of such a tradition; and must therefore conclude that the Chhāndogya Upanishad agrees with the passage quoted above, p. 126, from the Mahābhārata, in recognizing Manu as the progenitor of the Brāhmans, as well as the other castes.

SECT. III.—Extracts from the Mahābhārata regarding Manu.

I have already adduced in the preceding chapter, page 126, an important passage of the Mahābhārata, Ādiparvan verses 3128 ff., in which Manu Vaivasvata is expressly declared to have been the progenitor of mankind including the four castes. A legend of the deluge, corresponding to the one which has been adduced from the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, in the last section, is also to be found in the Vana-parvan of the Mahābhārata, and although it does not represent Manu as the parent from whom the human race was reproduced, but as the creator by whom the world was renewed, after the flood, I shall extract the entire text. Its style of narration is tedious, when compared with the quaint brevity of the Brāhmaṇa; but I shall condense it as much as possible in the translation. It begins thus, verse 12747:

Mārkaṇḍeya uvācha | Vivasvataḥ suto rājan maharshiḥ suprātāpavān | babhāva nara-sārdūla Prajāpati-sama-dyutiḥ | ojasā tejāsa lakshmyā tapasā cha viṣeshataḥ | atichakrāma pitaram Manuḥ svāṁ cha pitāmaham | ārddha-bāhur viṣārayām Badaryām sa narādhipāḥ | ekā-pāda-sthitas titram chācāra sumahat tapāḥ | 12750. Avāk-śūrā tathā chāpi netair animishair dṛiḍham | so 'tapyata tapo ghoraṁ varshaṅgam ayutaṁ tadā | taṁ kadāchit tapasvantam ārāchirāṁ jaṭa-dharam | Čhirīṇ-tīram āgamyai matsyo vachanam abravit | "bhagavan kshudra-matsyo 'smi bala-vaddhyo bhayam mama | matsyebhyo hi tato māṁ tvam trātum arhasi su-vrata | durbalaṁ balavanto hi matsyam matsyā viṣeshataḥ | āsvaṇti sadā vrittir vihitā naḥ sanātanī | tasmād bhayaughadh mahato majjantam māṁ viṣeshataḥ | trātum arhasi kartāṣmi krīte pratikṛitaṁ tava" | 12755.
Sa mātya-vachanāṁ śrutvā kṛipayā 'bhipariplutaḥ | Manur Vaiṣavavato 'griñṇat tam mātyaṁ pāṇinā svayam | udakāntam upāniya mātyaṁ Vaiṣavavato Manuḥ | alinjire prakshipat tam chandrāṁśu-sadṛśa-prabho | sa tatra vavrīdhe rājan mātyaḥ paraṁ-satkritaḥ | pravatav svikarot tasmai Manur bhāvam viśeshaṁ | atha kālēna mahatā sa mātyaḥ sumahān abhāt | alinjire yathā chaiva nāsau samabhavat kilā | atha mātyo Manuṁ śrīśirvā punar evābhyyabhaṁṣata | "bhagavan sādhu me 'dyānyat sthānaṁ sampratipādaya" | 12760. Uddhryaṁalinjirat tasmāt tataḥ sa bhagavān Manuḥ | tam mātyaṁ anakñd vāpī mahaṁ sa Manus tadā | tatra tam prakshipaḥ chāpi Manuḥ para-puranjaya | athāvārdhāhata mātyaṁ sa punar varsha-ghan bern | dvi-yojanayat vāpī vistritā chāpi yojanam | tasyāṁ nāsau samabhavat mātyo rājāva-lochanah | visheśṭhaṁ cha Kaunteya mātyo vāpyāṁ viśāmpate | Manuṁ mātyaṁ tato śrīśirvā punar evābhyyabhaṁṣata | "naya mām bhagavan sādho samudra-mahishīṁ priyām | Gangāṁ tatra nivatsyāmi yathā vā tata māṇyaś | 12765. Nīdeśe hi mayā tudhyāṁ sthātavān anaṁyayā | vṛiddhir hi paramā prāptā tvat-kṛito hi mayā 'nagha" | evam ukto Manur mātyaṁ anaknaḥ bhagavān vaśi | naṁ Gangaṁ tatra chainam svayam prakshipaḥ achyutaḥ | sa tatra vavrīdhe mātyaḥ kanchit kālam arindama | tataḥ punar Manuṁ d-śivāva mātya vachanam abraviit | "Gangāyaṁ na hi śaknomicīriyatevām cheshtīm prabhō | samudraṁ naya mām āsū pradīpa bhagavan" iti | uddhrya Ganga-salilāḥ tato mātyaṁ Manuḥ svayam | samudram anayat pṛthva tatra chainaṁ avāśrijat | 12770. Sumahān api mātyaṁ tu sa Manuṁ navatra tadā | āśid yathāśaṁ-kāryayaścha sparśa-gandha-sukhaścha vai | yadā samudre prakshipaḥ sa mātyo Manuṁ tadā | tata enam idāṁ vākyaṁ smayamāna ivābraviit | "bhagavan hi kritā rakṣāṁ tvayā sarvā viśeshaṁ | prāpta-kālaṁ tu yat kāryayaṁ tvayā tach chhṛyaṭām mama | achirād bhagavan bhaumam idāṁ sthāvaramangaman | sarvaṁ eva mahābhṛga pralayaṁ vai gamishyati | sampanskhaḷaṁ-kālo 'yāṁ lokānāṁ samupasthitāḥ | tasmāt tvām bodhayāmy adya yat te hitam anusatam | trasānāṁ sthāvaramāṁ cha yach chengāṁ yach ca nangati | tasya sarvasya samprāptaṁ kālaṁ paraṁ-dāruṇaḥ | nauś ca kāraṇitayā te dṛṣṭāṁ yuktā-satāraṇaḥ | tatra saptarśiḥbhiś sārdhāṁ āruheṣṭha mahāmuns | evaṁ chaiva sarvāṁ yathoktāṁ dviṣajā puraḥ | tasyāṁ ārēhāyār nāvī susanguptāṁ bhāgaḥ | nau-sthaṁ cha māṁ pratiśhethāṁ tato muni-jana-prīya | āgamishyāmy ahaṁ śringi vijne-
TRADITION OF THE DESCENT OF

yas tena tāpasa | evam etat tvāyā kāryam āpirishṭo 'si vrajaṃyā ahām |
tā na śakya mahaṭyo vai āpas tartum mayā vinā | 12780. Nābhī-
skṛtyam idāṁ cāhī prachanam me tvāyā vibho" | "evam karisya" | iti tāṁ sa matsyam pratyabhāṣhata | jagamatu ca yathākāmam annu-
∫nāpya parasparam | tato Manur mahaṛuja yathōktaṁ matsyakena ha |
vijāṇy ādāya sarvāṁ sāgaram purulvā tadā | naukāyanā subhāya vira |
mahāṁśam arindama | chintayāmāsas ca Manus tam matsyam prī-
thīvate | sa ca tach-chintitaṁ jñātvā matsyāḥ parapuranjaya | śringā |
tātrajagāmāsau tadā Bharata-sattama | tāṁ drīṣṭvā manuṣya-vyāghra |
Manuś matsyaṁ jalarnave | 12785. Śringināṁ tāṁ yathōktena rūpeṇa-
drīṁ tvechchhitam | vaṭārakamayam pāsam atha matsyasya mūrdhāni |
Manuś manuṣya-sārdūla tasmin śringe nyavesaya | saṁśyaśa tena pāse-
śa matsyāḥ para-purānajaya | vegeṇa mahātā nāvam prākharṣh lavoṇām- |
bhāsi | sa ca tāṁ tārayan nāva samudram manuṣeṣvara | nityamāṇam |
ivormibhir garjāmānam ivāmbhāsā | keśobhyāmāṇā mahāvātāiś sā naus|
tasmin mahodādhau | gūṛgate chapolva stū maṭṭa para-purānajaya |
naivā bhūmir na ca dīṣāḥ pradīṣo vā chakāśirop | 12790. Sarvām ām-
bhasam evāsit khaṁ dyauḥ cha naraṃpuṇa | evambhāte tadā loke sanku|
le Bharatarahabhā | adriśyanta saptarṣhahyā Manuś matsyae tathāvūca cha |
evam bahūn varsha-gaṇān tāṁ nāvam so'tha matsyakau | chakarṣhātandrito |
rājaṁ tasmin salīla-sanchoye | tato Himavatāḥ śringaṁ yat param Bharatar-
rahabhā | tatrākarṣh tato nāvam sa matsyāḥ Kurunandana | athābravita |
tādā matsyas tāṁ rīśhīn prahasan bānaiḥ | "asmin Himavatāḥ śringe nāvam |
badhita maṃchiram" | sa baddhā tatra tais tārnam rīśhhibhir Bharata-
rahabhā | 12795. Naur matsyasya vacaḥ śrutvā śringe Himavatas tadā | tach |
cha Naubāḥanaṁ nāma śringam Himavatāḥ param | khyātām adyāpi |
Kauntyā tad vidhā Bharatarahabhā | athābravīd anismihās tāṁ rīśhīn |
sa hitas tadā | "ahām Prajāpatir Brahmā yat-param nādhiṁyate |
masyea-rūpeṇa yāyaṁ cha mayā 'smād mokshita bhayāt | Manunā ca |
praḥar saṛvāḥ sa-devaśura-manuṣhāḥ | sraṣṭaevyāḥ saṛva-lokaś ca yach |
chēgam yach ca nengati | tapaśa cāhī tiroṇaḥ prabhā 'syā bhavise|
yati | mat-prasaḍat prajā-sargo na ca mohaṁ gamishyat" | 12800. Ity |
ukteva vacanam matsyaḥ kahāṇenādārānaṁ gataḥ | sraṣṭṣu-kāmaḥ prajās |
cāhī Manuḥ Vaivasvataḥ svayam | pramūdho 'bhūt prajā-sargo tapas tepe |
mahat tataḥ | tapasā mahatā yuktaḥ so 'tha sraṣṭṭum prachakrame | sar-
vaḥ prajā Manuḥ sākshād yathāvād Bharatarahabhā | ity etāḥ mātṣyakam |
nāma purāṇam pariśrītānaṁ |
"12747. Mārkaṇḍeya said: There was a great rishi Manu, son of Vivasvāt, majestic, in lustre equal to Prajāpati. In energy, fiery vigour, prosperity, and austere fervour he surpassed both his father and his grandfather. Standing with uplifted arm, on one foot, on the spacious Badari, he practised intense austere fervour. 12750. This direful exercise he performed, with his head downwards, and with unwinking eyes, for 10,000 years. Once, when, clad in dripping rags, with matted hair, he was so engaged, a fish came to him on the banks of the Chirin, and spake: 'Lord, I am a small fish; I dread the stronger ones, and from them you must save me. For the stronger fish devour the weaker; this has been immemorially ordained as our means of subsistence. Deliver me from this flood of apprehension in which I am sinking, and I will requite the deed.' 12755. Hearing this, Manu, filled with compassion, took the fish in his hand, and bringing him to the water threw him into a jar bright as a moonbeam. In it the fish, being excellently tended, grew; for Manu treated him like a son. After a long time he became very large, and could not be contained in the jar. Then, seeing Manu, he said again: 'In order that I may thrive, remove me elsewhere.' 12760. Manu then took him out of the jar, brought him to a large pond, and threw him in. There he continued to grow for very many years. Although the pond was two yejunās long, and one yejana broad, the lotus-eyed fish found in it no room to move; and again said to Manu: 'Take me to Gangā, the dear queen of the ocean-monarch; in her I shall dwell; or do as thou thinkest best, (12765) for I must contentedly submit to thy authority, as through thee I have exceedingly increased.' Manu accordingly took the fish and threw him into the river Gangā. There he waxed for some time, when he again said to Manu: 'From my great bulk I cannot move in the Gangā; be gracious and remove me quickly to the ocean.' Manu took him out of the Gangā; and cast him into the sea. 12770. Although so huge, the fish was easily borne, and pleasant to touch and smell, as Manu carried him. When he had been thrown into the ocean he said to Manu: 'Great lord, thou hast in every way preserved me: now hear from me what thou must do when the

81 He could not have stood on one foot and with his head downwards (if this means standing on his head) at one and the same time. The text may mean that these attitudes were successively adopted.
time arrives. Soon shall all these terrestrial objects, both fixed and moving, be dissolved. The time for the purification of the worlds has now arrived. I therefore inform thee what is for thy greatest good. 12775. The period dreadful for the universe, moving and fixed, has come. Make for thyself a strong ship, with a cable attached; embark in it with the seven rishis, and stow in it, carefully preserved and assorted, all the seeds which have been described of old by Brāhmans.55 When embarked in the ship, look out for me: I shall come recognizable by my horn. So shalt thou do; I greet thee and depart. These great waters cannot be crossed oвер without me. 12780. Distrust not my word.’ Manu replied, ‘I shall do as thou hast said.’ After taking mutual leave they departed each on his own way. Manu then, as enjoined, taking with him the seeds, floated on the billowy-ocean in the beautiful ship. He then thought on the fish, which, knowing his desire, arrived with all speed, distinguished by a horn. When Manu saw the horned leviathan, lofty as a mountain, he fastened the ship’s cable to the horn. Being thus attached, the fish dragged the ship with great rapidity, transporting it across the briny ocean which seemed to dance with its waves and thunder with its waters: Tossed by the tempests, the ship whirled like a reeling and intoxicated woman. Neither the earth, nor the quarters of the world appeared; (12790) there was nothing but water, air, and sky. In the world thus confounded, the seven rishis, Manu, and the fish were beheld. So, for very many years, the fish, unwearied, drew the ship over the waters; and brought it at length to the highest peak of Himavat. He then, smiling gently, said to the rishis, ‘Bind the ship without delay to this peak.’ They did so accordingly. 12795. And that highest peak of Himavat is still known by the name of Naubandhana (‘the Binding of the Ship’). The friendly fish (or god, anusimesha) then said to the rishis, ‘I am the Prajāpati Brahma, than whom nothing higher can be reached. In the form of a fish I have delivered you from this great danger. Manu shall create all living beings, gods, asuras, men, with all worlds, and all things moving and fixed. By my favour and through severe austere fervour, he shall attain perfect insight into his creative work, and shall not be-

55 The S'atapatha Brāhmaṇa is silent as to these seeds, as well as to the seven rishis; but it is possible that the reference here made to them may have been borrowed from some other ancient source.
come bewildered.' 12800. Having thus spoken, the fish in an instant disappeared. Manu, desirous to call creatures into existence and bewildered in his work, performed a great act of austere fervour; and then began visibly to create all living beings. This which I have narrated is known as the Mātasyaka Purāṇa (or 'Legend of the Fish')."

It will be observed that towards the close of this narrative it is stated that Manu (not Brahmā himself) was the creator of Men, as well of gods and asuras; and that no reference is made to the formation of separate castes.

The commentators seem disinclined to take this legend in its literal sense. We shall see below what reason the scholiast-on the Bhāgavata Purāṇa assigns for this procedure. The following are some of the remarks of the Commentator Nīlakanṭha on the above passage of the Mahābhārata:

"
Manuḥ" manute ity abhimānātmako 'hankāro Manuḥ | viśeṣeṇa vaste ačhādāyati ohit-prakāśam iti viveka-jñānam tad-vān vīvasvān māyāśi teśaraḥ "māyinaṁ tu maheśvaram" iti śrutē | tasya Viśvavatasya charitam sancharayaṃ | "avidyā-nāśe saty avidyako 'hankāraḥ kathāṃ sancharati | nahi tantu-dāhe puṭas tīśṭhati" ity ākshepaḥ | . . . atra para-brahmaṇa eva rūpāntaram matsyākhyo jīvaḥ | so 'hankāreṇa Manuṇa uttarottara-srēṣṭhesu alinjirādi-rūpesv sthāla-dehesu tapo-bahū ni-pāyyate | sa ca samudrākhye vairāje dehe nipātītaḥ ca kalpānte avidyā-nāśa-rūpe saty api dādha-(dagāha?) -puṭa-nīyayena anvarthamānam ahankāraṁ saptaṇhp-saṃjñakaiḥ prāṇādibhiḥ vīja-saṃjñaiḥ prārabdhakarmabhiḥ cha samitaṁ charama-śeṇa-nāvy āruḍham vāsanā-varatraya jīva-matsyaṇa pralaya-kāle 'py uhyāmanam meru-śringa same 'chale bhavato (Hima-va?)-rūpe sadvāsanayā labdhāsupadaṃ viśṇam anulakṣyā jīva-matsyō 'dārṣanam praṃptaḥ | ati-vilīne hy ahankāre jīvatvaṃ naśgati | sa punar nirasta-jīva-bhāvo 'hankāro brahma-rūpatăm āpanno yathā purvaṁ vāsanayā jagat tīrieti | nashto 'py avidyākhyo kāraṇe samsāra-bhāna-lakṣhaṇaṁ kāryam chakra-bhramam iva kanchit kūlam anvartata ity adhyāya-tātparyam | akṣharārthaḥ tv ityādi | 

"'Manu,' that which imagines, denotes the consciousness of self (ahankāra), consisting in the idea that objects refer to one's self (abhimāna). 53 'Vivasvat' is he who possesses the discriminating knowledge that (such and such a thing) obscures the light of the mind, i.e.

he is the Illuder, Īśvara, for the Veda speaks of 'Maheśvara the Illuder.' It is the 'history,' the action, of this son of Vivasvat, that is related. It is objected, 'how can Ahankāra, which arises from ignorance, operate when ignorance is destroyed?' for when the threads are burnt the cloth no longer remains. Here the embodied soul, called in this passage a 'Fish,' is only another form of the supreme Brahma. This 'Fish' is thrown by 'Manu,' who is Ahankāra, through the power of austere fervour, into gross bodies, here represented by 'a jar,' 'a pond,' etc., which gradually rise in excellence. Being at last cast into the body of Virāj, called 'the ocean,' although 'the close of the Kalpa' means the destruction of ignorance, still the embodied soul denoted by the 'Fish,' contemplating Ahankāra still remaining like the ashes of burnt cloth, then entering, along with the breath and other vital airs named 'the seven rishis,' and the works of a former birth designated as 'seeds,' into the ship which signifies its last body, and then borne along even in the period of dissolution by the embodied soul itself symbolized as a 'Fish,' by means of the 'rope' of the remaining consciousness of past perceptions (vāsanā), obtaining at length through a consciousness of former perceptions, which were pure (sād-vāsanā), a resting-place on a mountain like the peak of Meru, represented by the Himavat (?), and finally dissolved;—the embodied soul under the figure of a 'Fish' having contemplated all this,—vanishes. For when Ahankāra has become entirely dissolved, the state of the embodied soul ceases. Then Ahankāra, after the state of the embodied soul has been dispelled, obtains the condition of Brahma; but by its consciousness of past perceptions creates the world as before. Even when the cause called ignorance has been destroyed, the effect in the shape of the semblance of the world continues for some time, like the revolution of a wheel. Such is signification of the section."

According to this allegorical interpretation "Vivasvat," father of Manu, represents Īśvara, the Illuder. "Manu" is Ahankāra, or self-consciousness. The "Fish" is the embodied soul, which fancies itself to be, but is not, distinct from the Supreme spirit. Ahankāra, denoted by 'Manu,' places the embodied soul, symbolized by the "Fish," in a variety of bodies gradually increasing in excellence, which are signified

54 The words are taken from one of the Upanishads, to which, at the time of correcting this sheet, I am unable to give the necessary reference.
by the "jar," "pond," "Gangā," and "ocean." Although the end of the Kalpa means the removal of ignorance, still Ahankāra continues for a time; and along with the "seven rishis," who stand for the vital airs, and the "seeds," which are former works, embarks on the "ship," which is its last body, and is drawn over the ocean by the embodied soul by means of a "rope," which signifies the consciousness of former perceptions. Ahankāra at length finds a resting-place, denoted by Mount Himavat; and when it has been destroyed, the embodied soul vanishes. Ahankāra, however, passes into the form of Brahma, and, through the operation of the cause explained by the Commentator, creates the world anew.

It is scarcely necessary to remark that the narrator of the legend himself appears to have had no idea of making it the vehicle of any Vedantic allegory such as is here propounded.

The following is another version of the same legend from the Matsya Purāṇa:


---

55 This passage is extracted in Professor Aufrecht's Catalogue of the Bodleian Sanskrit MSS. p. 347.
56 The Taylor MS. reads ṣabhūsa, instead of vachanam.
TRADITION OF THE DESCENT OF


57 Instead of anarthāt the Taylor MS. reads anūthān. 
58 The Taylor MS. reads here evam kṛita-yugasayādau. 
59 Kūrm-sannībhā | Taylor MS. 
60 The Taylor and Gaikowar MSS. have chaṇḍra.

"12. Formerly a heroic king called Manu, the patient son of the Sun, endowed with all good qualities, indifferent to pain and pleasure, after investing his son with the royal authority, practised intense austerities to the extent of half a year, (13) in a certain region of Malaya (Malabar), and attained to transcendent union with the Deity (yoga). 14. When a million years had elapsed, Brahmag became pleased and disposed to bestow a boon, which he desired Manu to choose. 15. Bowing before the father of the world the monarch said, ‘I desire of thee this one incomparable boon, that when the dissolution of the universe arrives I may have power to preserve all existing things, whether moving or stationary.’ 17. ‘So be it,’ said the Soul of all things, and vanished on the spot; when a great shower of flowers, thrown down by the gods, fell from the sky. 18. Once as, in his hermitage, Manu offered the oblation to the Manes, there fell, upon his hands, along with some water, a Saphari fish (a carp), (19) which the kind-hearted king perceiving, strove to preserve in his water-jar. 20. In one day and night the fish grew to the size of sixteen fingers, and cried, ‘preserve me, preserve me.’ 21. Manu then took and threw him into a large pitcher, where in one night he

61 The Taylor MS. reads veda-nāvam, "the ship of the Vedas."
increased three cubits, (22) and again cried, with the voice of one distressed, to the son of Vivasvat, ‘preserve me, preserve me, I have sought refuge with thee.’ 23. Manu next put him into a well, and when he could not be contained even in that; (24) he was thrown into a lake, where he attained to the size of a yojana; but still cried in humble tones, ‘preserve me, preserve me.’ 25. When, after being flung into the Gangā he increased there also, the king threw him into the ocean. 26. When he filled the entire ocean, Manu said, in terror, ‘Thou art some god, (27) or thou art Vāsudeva; how can any one else be like this? Whose body could equal 200,000 yojanas? 28. Thou art recognised under this form of a fish, and thou tormentest me, Keśava; reverence be to thee, Hrīśīkeśa, lord of the world, abode of the universe!’ 29. Thus addressed, the divine Janārdana, in the form of a fish, replied: ‘Thou hast well spoken, and hast rightly known me. 30. In a short time the earth with its mountains, groves, and forests, shall be submerged in the waters. 31. This ship has been constructed by the company of all the gods for the preservation of the vast host of living creatures. 32. Embarking in it all living creatures, both those engendered from moisture and from eggs, as well as the viviparous, and plants, preserve them from calamity. 33. When driven by the blast, at the end of the yuga, the ship shall be swept along, thou shalt bind it to this horn of mine. 34. Then at the close of the dissolution thou shalt be the Prajāpati (lord of creatures) of this world, fixed and moving. 35. When this shall have been done, thou, the omniscient, patient rishi, and lord of the Manvantara, shalt be an object of worship to the gods.”

2nd Adhyāya: “1. Sūta said: Being thus addressed, Manu asked the slayer of the Asura, ‘In how many years shall the (existing) Manvantara come to an end? 2. And how shall I preserve the living creatures? or how shall I meet again with thee?’ The fish answered: ‘From this day forward a drought shall visit the earth for a hundred years and more, with a tormenting famine. 4. Then the seven direful rays of the sun, of little power, destructive, shall rain burning charcoal. 5. At the close of the yuga the submarine fire shall burst forth,

22 The reading of the Taylor MS. here is partially erased; but it may have been sava-vedānīm, “of all the Vedas.” Compare the various reading in verse 11 of the next adhyāya.

23 According to the reading of the Taylor MS. we should have to substitute the words, “Thus at the beginning of the Krita age, thou” etc.
while the poisonous flame issuing from the mouth of Sankarshaṇa (shall blaze) from Pātāla, and the fire from Mahādeva's third eye shall issue from his forehead. Thus kindled the world shall become confounded. 7. When, consumed in this manner, the earth shall become like ashes, the æther too shall be scorched with heat. 8. Then the world, together with the gods and planets, shall be destroyed. The seven clouds of the period of dissolution, called Saṃvartta, Bhīmanāda, Droṇa, Chaṇḍa, Balāhaka, (9) Vidyutpatāka, and Soṇāmbu, produced from the steam of the fire, shall inundate the earth. 10. The seas agitated, and joined together, shall reduce these entire three worlds to one ocean. 11. Taking this celestial ship, embarking on it all the seeds, and through contemplation fixed on me fastening it by a rope (12) to my horn, thou alone shall remain, protected by my power, when even the gods are burnt up. 13. The sun and moon, I Brahmā with the four worlds, the holy river Narmadā,64 the great rishi Mārkaṇḍeya, (14) Mahādeva, the Vedas, the Purāṇa with the sciences,—these shall remain with thee at the close of the Manvantara. 15. The world having thus become one ocean at the end of the Chākshusha manvantara, I shall give currency to the Vedas at the commencement of thy creation. 16. Sūta continued: Having thus spoken, the divine Being vanished on the spot; while Manu fell into a state of contemplation (yoga) induced by the favour of Vāsudeva. 17. When the time announced by Vāsudeva had arrived, the predicted deluge took place in that very manner. Then Janārdana appeared in the form of a horned fish; (the serpent) Ananta came to Manu in the shape of a rope. 19. Then he who was skilled in duty (i.e. Manu) drew towards himself all creatures by contemplation (yoga) and stowed them in the ship, which he then attached to the fish's horn by the serpent-rope, (20) as he stood upon the ship, and after he had made obeisance to Janārdana. 21. I shall now declare the Purāṇa which, in answer to an enquiry from Manu, was uttered by the deity in the form of the fish, as he lay in a sleep of contemplation till the end of the universal inundation: Listen." The Matsya Purāṇa gives us no further information here about the progress and results of the deluge; and this narrative does not appear to be ever afterwards resumed.

64 In the opinion of this writer, therefore, the Narmadā (Nerbudda) must have been a holier stream than the Gangā: otherwise we should have expected him to select the latter as the river to be preserved at the dissolution.
The Bhāgavata P. viii. 24, 7, gives the same story with variations as follows:

yāharad Hariḥ | 58. Sa tu Satyavrato rājā jñāna-vijnāna-saṁyutaḥ | 
Vishnuḥ prasādāt kalpe 'emin asid Vaivasvato Manuḥ |

"7. At the close of the past Kalpa there occurred an occasional dissolution of the universe arising from Brahmā's nocturnal repose; in which the Bhūrloka and other worlds were submerged in the ocean.

8. When the creator, desirous of rest, had under the influence of time been overcome by sleep, the strong Hayagrīva coming near, carried off the Vedas which had issued from his mouth. 9. Discovering this deed of the prince of the Dānavas, the divine Hari, the Lord, took the form of a Sapharī fish. 10. At that time a certain great royal rishi, called Satyavrata, who was devoted to Nārāyaṇa, practised austere fervour, subsisting on water. 11. He was the same who in the present great Kalpa is the son of Visvasvat, called Srāddhadeva, and was appointed by Hari to the office of Manu. 12. Once, as in the river Kṛtamāla he was offering the oblation of water to the Pitrīs, a Sapharī fish came into the water in the hollow of his hands. 13. The lord of Draviḍa, Satyavrata, cast the fish in his hands with the water into the river. 14. The fish very piteously cried to the merciful king, 'Why dost thou abandon me poor and terrified to the monsters who destroy their kindred in this river?' [Satyavrata then took the fish from the river, placed it in his waterpot, and as it grew larger and larger, threw it successively into a larger vessel, a pond, various lakes, and at length into the sea. The fish objects to be left there on the plea that it would be devoured; but Manu replies that it can be no real fish, but Vishṇu himself; and with various expressions of devotion enquires why he had assumed this disguise, verses 15–31.1] The god replies: 32. "On the seventh day after this the three worlds Bhūrloka, etc., shall sink beneath the ocean of the dissolution. 33. When the universe is dissolved in that ocean, a large ship, sent by me, shall come to thee. 34. Taking with thee the plants and various seeds, surrounded by the seven rishis, and attended by all existences, (35) thou shalt embark on the great ship, and shalt without alarm move over the one dark ocean, by the sole light of the rishis. When the ship shall be vehemently shaken by

65 Naimittika. See above p. 45.
66 Manu is called Srāddhadeva in the Mahābhārata also, Śunting. 4507. In the Brāhmaṇas, however, he receives the appellation, or epithet, not of Srāddhādeva, but of Srāddhādeva. See above, p. 188 ff.
the tempestuous wind, fasten it by the great serpent to my horn—for I shall come near. 37. So long as the night of Brahmā lasts, I shall draw thee with the rishis and the ship over the ocean.” [The god then disappears after promising that Satyavrata shall practically know his greatness and experience his kindness, and Satyavrata awaits the predicted events, verses 38–40.] 41. “Then the sea, augmenting as the great clouds poured down their waters, was seen overflowing its shores and everywhere inundating the earth. 42. Meditating on the injunctions of the deity, Satyavrata beheld the arrival of the ship, on which he embarked with the Brāhmans, taking along with him the various kinds of plants. 43. Delighted, the Munis said to him, ‘meditate on Keśava; he will deliver us from this danger, and grant us prosperity.’ 44. Accordingly when the king had meditated on him, there appeared on the ocean a golden fish, with one horn, a million yojanas long. 45. Binding the ship to his horn with the serpent for a rope, as he had been before commanded by Hari, Satyavrata lauded Madhusūdana.” [Verses 46–53 contain the hymn.] 54. When the king had thus spoken, the divine primeval Male, in the form of a fish, moving on the vast ocean declared to him the truth; (55) the celestial collection of Puranas, with the Sānkhya, Yoga, the ceremonial, and the mystery of the soul. 56. Seated on the ship with the rishis, Satyavrata heard the true doctrine of the soul, of the eternal Brahmā, declared by the god. 57. When Brahmā arose at the end of the past dissolution, Hari restored to him the Vedas, after slaying Hayagrīva. 58. And King Satyavrata, master of all knowledge, sacred and profane, became, by the favour of Vishṇu, the son of Vivasvat, the Manu in this Kalpa.”

Before adducing the remarks of the commentator Śrīdharā Svāmin on the passage last cited from the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, I shall quote one more version of the same legend from the Agni Purāṇa. It is not of any great consequence, as, though more condensed, it coincides in purport with that in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa: which of the two has bor-

---

67 This has been copied by Professor Aufrecht from a MS. of the Agni Purāṇa, belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society of London. I am informed by Prof. Aufrecht that the East India Office Library has two MSS. of the Vahni Purāṇa, which (although Vahni is, in later Sanskrit, synonymous with Agni) differ entirely in their contents from the Agni Purāṇa.
rowed from the other, or whether both are derived from a common source, I am unable to say.


"Vasishṭha said: 1. Declare to me Vishṇu, the cause of the creation, in the form of a Fish and his other incarnations; and the Puranic revelation of Agni, as it was originally heard from Vishṇu. Agni replied: 2. Hear, o Vasishṭha, I shall relate to thee the Fish-incarnation of Vishṇu, and his acts when so incarnate for the destruction of

Professor Aufrecht’s transcript has this reading Manur-ukto; which I have re- | tained, although I was not aware that Manu was commonly used for Manu, except in the Vedic period.
the wicked, and protection of the good. 3. At the close of the past
Kalpa there occurred an occasional dissolution of the universe caused
by Bṛhma's sleep, when the Bhūrolka and other worlds were inun-
dated by the ocean. 4. Manu, the son of Vivasvat, practised austere
fervour for the sake of worldly enjoyment as well as final liberation.
Once, when he was offering the libation of water to the Pitrīs in the
river Kṛitamālā, (5) a small fish came into the water in the hollow of
his hands, and said to him when he sought to cast it into the stream,
'Do not throw me in, (6) for I am afraid of alligators and other
monsters which are here.' On hearing this Manu threw it into a jar.
Again, when grown, the Fish said to him, 'Provide me a large place.'
7. Manu then cast it into a larger vessel (?). When it increased there,
it said to the king, 'Give me a wide space.' 8. When, after being
thrown into a pond, it became as large as its receptacle, and cried out
for greater room, he flung it into the sea. 9. In a moment it became
a hundred thousand yojanas in bulk. Beholding the wonderful Fish,
Manu said in astonishment: (10) 'Who art thou? Art thou Vīshṇu?
Adoration be paid to thee, o Nārāyaṇa. Why, o Janārdana, dost thou
bewilder me by thy illusion?' 11. The Fish, which had become in-
carnate for the welfare of this world and the destruction of the wicked,
when so addressed, replied to Manu, who had been intent upon its pre-
servation: (12) 'Seven days after this the ocean shall inundate the
world. A ship shall come to thee, in which thou shalt place the seeds,
(13) and accompanied by the rishis shalt sail during the night of Brahma.
Bind it with the great serpent to my horn, when I arrive. 14.
Having thus spoken the Fish vanished. Manu awaited the promised
period, and embarked on the ship when the sea overflowed its shores.
15. (There appeared) a golden Fish, a million yojanas long, with one
horn, to which Manu attached the ship, (16) and heard from the Fish
the Matsya Purāṇa, which takes away sin, together with the Veda.
Keśava then slew the Dānava Hayagrīva who had snatched away the
Vedas, and preserved its mantras and other portions.'

The following is Śrīdhara's comment, before referred to, on the
legend of the deluge, as told in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa. These remarks
have been well translated and explained in the preface to the 3rd volume
of his edition of this Purāṇa (pp. xxxviii ff.) by M. Burnouf, whose
elaborate discussion of the legend extends from p. xxiii to p. liv.
Atra idāṁ chintyāṁ “kim ayam mahāpralayo dainandino vā” iti |
tatra tāvād “brāhma layāḥ” (v. 7) iti “yo ’svaś asmin mahā-kalpe”
(v. 11) iti cha utker “mahāpralayaḥ” iti prāptaṁ “na” iti brūmah |
mahāpralaye prithivyādīnām avasēśhāsamhavād “yāvād brūmī niśā”
(v. 37) ity-ādy-uktī- virodhāḥ cha | ato “dainandana” iti yuktaṁ | na |
cha etad api sangachhate | samvartakair antevrishty-adibhir vinā akasmād |
eva “saptame ’hāṁ trailokyāṁ nimankṣhyati” (v. 32) iti matsyokter |
anupapatteḥ | yathoktam prathama-skandho “rūpaṁ” (i. 3, 15) ity ādi |
tad api tadā durghaṭam | na hi pralaya-dvaye ’pi “mahimayovā nāvy” |
ārohaḥ samhavati na cha Chākshusha-manvantare pralayo ’sti | tathā |
cha sati saptam Manur Vaivasvataḥ ity api durghaṭam syāt | “tvam |
tāvād oshadhiḥ sarvaḥ” (viii. 24, 34) ity-ādi-nirdeśo ’pi na sangachhate |
na hi tadā oshadhi-adīnāṁ sattvēṇāṁ cha avasēśhā samhavati | tasmād |
anyathā varnyate | navīvāṁ vāstavaḥ ko ’pi pralayaḥ | kintu Satyavrata-
tasya jñānopadesaya āvibhāto bhagavān vaiśvāyārdham akasmāt pralaya-
iva darśayāmasya yathā ’smīn eva Vaivasvata-manvantare Mārkaṇ-
ḍeyāya darśitaṁ | tad-apēkshayā eva cha “mahā-kalpe ’smīn” iti |
viśeṣhāvaṁ sangachhate | tathā cha “tataḥ samudraḥ udvelaḥ sarvataḥ |
samadṛśyata” (v. 41) iti tasyaiwā yathā darśanam uktaṁ ity esā dīk |

“Here we have to consider whether this was a great dissolution of |
the universe, or one of those which occur at the close of each day of |
Brahmā. If it be supposed from the expressions ‘a dissolution pro-
ceeding from Brahmā’ (v. 7), and ‘he is the same who in this Mahā-
kalpa’ (v. 11), that it was a great dissolution, we reply,—no; because |
in a great dissolution the earth and other worlds cannot possibly remain |
in existence, and because this would be opposed to the words ‘so long |
as the night of Brahmā lasts’ (v. 37). Hence it might appear that it |
must be one of the disolution which occur at the end of a day of |
Brahmā. But this also is impossible, because it would be at variance |
with the Fish’s words that ‘the three worlds should be submerged on |
the seventh day,’ (v. 32) suddenly, without the drought and other cala-
mities which precede a dissolution. What is stated in the first book |
(iii. 15), ‘at the deluge, in the Chākshusha Manvantara, he took the |
form of a Fish, and preserved Manu Vaivasvata, whom he placed in a |
ship formed of the earth,’ would also in that case be inconceivable; for

69 Bhāgavata Purāṇa, i. 3. 15. Ṛupaṁ sa jyotire nātyaṁ Chākshushodadhi-samp-
plave | nāvy ūropya mahīmayyām opād Vaivasvatam Manum | On this passage also
(1.) in neither of the two dissolutions could any one be placed ‘in a ship in the form of the earth’ (as the earth is submerged in the one case and altogether destroyed in the other); (2.) there is no dissolution of the world in the Chākshusha Manvantara; (3.) in the case supposed the existence of a seventh Manu, the son of Vivasvat would be impossible (for the fourteen Manus succeed each other in one Kalpa without the intervention of any dissolution). And in that case, the command to take ‘all the plants into the ship’ (viii. 24, 34), would be inconceivable, since no plants or other such substances are left at such a period. Such being the fact, the narrative must be otherwise explained. It was in fact no real dissolution which is here related. But the deity, who appeared to teach Satyavrata knowledge, shewed him suddenly the semblance of a dissolution to instil into him dispassion, just as in the Vaivasvata Manvantara he shewed to Mārkaṇḍeya. And if referred to this, the words ‘in this Māhakalpa’ will be conceivable. And consequently the words ‘Then the sea was beheld overflowing its shores on every side’ are spoken with reference to what Satyavrata saw (in the vision). Such is an indication of the purport of the Section.”

Śrīdhara Śvāmin here reasons only upon the data supplied by the particular version of the story which he found before him in the Bhāgavata, and does not seem to have extended his researches so far as to ascertain whether the legend might not exhibit some variations as narrated in other Puranas. If he had turned to the Matsya Purāṇa he would have found that one of his objections, viz., that drawn from the absence of any reference to the calamities supposed to precede a dissolution, did not apply to the account there given; since that narrative expressly asserts that these premonitory signs were manifested. Others of his objections apply no doubt to the other narratives as well as to that in the Bhāgavata. According to the ordinary Puranic theory (see above, pp. 43 ff.) fourteen Manus exist in each Kalpa, and one succeeds another without the intervention of any pralaya or dissolution. It is obviously inconsistent with this theory to represent such a dissolution

Śrīdhara remarks: Yadyapi manvantarōcasāne pralaya nāsti tathāpi kmaṣhit kau-tukena Satyavrataśya niyā pradarśītā yathā “akāṅgaḥ Mārkaṇḍeyaḥ” iti drashtāṇam | “Although there is no dissolution at the end of a Manvantara, yet, through a certain sport an illusion was shown to Satyavrata, as in the other passage where it is said ‘Suddenly to Mārkaṇḍeya,’ etc.”
as taking place either during the life of any of the Manus, or after his disappearance. It is even doubtful, or more than doubtful (Wilson’s Vish. P. i. p. 50 f. and p. 44, above) whether one Manu can exist contemporaneously with another, and yet, according to the Matsya and Agni Purānas (see above, pp. 205 ff., 211 f.) Manu Vaivasvata is said to have lived during his predecessor’s period, although the Bhāgavata āvoids this difficulty by making Satyavrata the hero of the story and by representing him as being born again as Manu Vaivasvata at the beginning of the next Manvantara. (M. Burnouf’s Preface above referred to may be consulted for further remarks on this subject.) The authors of the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas do not, however, appear to have been so sensitively alive to inconsistencies of this description as Śrīdhara. Perhaps the system of Kalpas and Manvantaras may not have been so clearly defined, or so generally current, when the older parts, at least of the Mahābhārata, were composed, as at a later period.70 And even the Puranic writers may not have cared very much to preserve a strict congruity in all that they wrote. In fact they may have had no great faith in the authority of speculations so arbitrary and artificial as those relating to the great mundane periods to which I refer,—speculations which were derived from no higher source than previous writers of their own class. The case, however, was different with the Commentators, who lived at a later period, and who seem to have regarded the established doctrine regarding Kalpas and Manvantaras as an article of faith.

There is, however, no doubt that, for the reasons above assigned, this legend of a Flood, such as is described in the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas, does not fit into the system of Kalpas and Manvantaras. But what is the inference which we ought to draw from this circumstance? M. Burnouf believes (1.) that the theory of great mundane periods and periodical dissolutions of the universe was received in India from very early times (Bhāg. P. iii. Pref. p. xliii.) and (2) that it was older than the legend of a deluge, as, although the latter may have been derived from ancient tradition, the style in which it is related in the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas has nothing of the archaic colouring of the Ṛg- Ṛg- hāyasas contained in the Brāhmaṇas, and it had not, so far as h w,

70 The Svāyambhuva Manvantara is mentioned in the Sāntip. verse 12658; but no details are given (kṛte yuge mahārāja pura Svāyambhuva 'ntare).
been found in any work of the class last named (p. xxvii.), and was not, he anticipated, likely to be discovered there (lili.). The conclusion which he deduces from these premises, and from the absence of any tradition of any great local inundation (pp. xlviii. and li.), is that, although, as related in the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas, the legend of the deluge has received in some respects an Indian character (xxxi. ff.; xlv. ff.), it is not in its origin Indian, (li.), but was most probably imported into Hindustan from a Semitic source, whether Hebrew or Assyrian (lili.–liv.). The first of M. Burnouf’s premises, regarding the great antiquity of the system of Kalpas, Manvantaras, and mundane dissolutions, is not borne out by the Vedic hymns, or anything that has yet been found in the Brāhmaṇas (see above, pp. 45 ff.). And his anticipation that no reference to a deluge would be discovered in any of the older Indian records has proved incorrect, as is shown by the legend of Manu quoted above (p. 181 ff.) from the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa.

Professor Weber, by whom attention was first drawn (in his Indische Studien, i. 160 ff.) to this passage, shows how materially it interferes with Burnouf’s results. If there is no proof of the great antiquity of the cosmical theory which that great scholar supposes to be inconsistent with the early existence in India of any tradition of a deluge, whilst on the other hand there is distinct evidence that that tradition was actually current there at a much earlier period than he imagined, it is clear that his supposition of its having been introduced into that country from an exclusively Semitic source loses much of its probability.

The explanation by which Śrīdhara endeavours to maintain the consistency of the Puranic narratives and theories seems to be altogether unfounded. There is no appearance of the authors either of the Bhāgavata, or Matsya, or Agni Purāṇas having intended to represent the deluge as a mere vision. They evidently meant this narrative to be taken literally, just as much as anything else that they describe.

I shall now compare the versions of the legend given in the Mahābhārata and Purāṇas with each other, and with that quoted above from the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa.

I. The following are the peculiarities of the narrative in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa:

1. It makes no reference to any great mundane periods, such as Kalpas or Manvantaras.
(2.) It does not speak of a dissolution of the world (pralaya), but of a flood (augha) which swept away all living creatures except Manu.

(3.) It does not fix the number of days or years after which the flood should come

(4.) It speaks of Manu simply, without assigning to him any patronymic, such as Vaivasvata.11

(5.) It contains no allusion to the locality in which he was when the fish came to him.

(6.) It makes no mention of the fish being thrown into any river.

(7.) It is silent as to Manu being accompanied by any rishis when he embarked on the ship, and as to his taking any seeds along with him.

(8.) It speaks of the ship as having rested on the “Northern mountain,” and of a place called “Manu’s Descent.”

(9.) It does not say anything of any deity being incarnate in the fish.

(10.) It represents Iḍā as produced from Manu’s oblation, and as the mother of his offspring, begotten apparently in the natural way.

It is manifest from this abstract, when compared with what follows, that the flood described in the Brāhmaṇa is distinguishable in various respects from the dissolution, or pralaya, of the later works.

II. The legend as told in the Mahābhārata agrees with that of the S. P. Br. in some, and differs from it in other particulars:

(1.) It does not specify any Kalpa or Munvantara.

(2.) It speaks of a dissolution of the universe (pralaya), and of the time of its purification by water (samprakshālana-kālāḥ) having arrived.

(3.) It makes the fish declare that this event should take place speedily (achirāt), and alludes to no antecedent calamities.

11 Manu Vaivasvata is however mentioned in S. P. Br. xiii. 4, 3, 3. “Manu Vaivasvato rājā” ity-āha | tasya manushyā viśāḥ | “He says Manu Vaivasvata king. ‘Men are his subjects.’” Further on, xiii. 4, 3, 6, Yama Vaivasvata is spoken of as King of the Pitris. Compare R.V. x. 14, 1; 17, 1. In the Valakhilya hymn attached to the R.V. iv. 1, Indra is mentioned as drinking Soma in the house of Manu Vivasvata (not Vaivasvata). In the Atharva-veda, viii. 10, 24, Manu Vaivasvata is spoken of as the calf of the cow Virū (tasya Manu Vaivasvato vatsāḥ). Yama is similarly spoken of in the preceding verse. In Valakhilya, iii. 1, Indra is said to have drunk Soma in Manu Śāṃvarāgi’s house: The connection of the words Śivṛṣya and Śeṣṛṣya with the word manu, “man,” in R.V. x. 68, 8 ff. and 11, no doubt gave rise to the idea of a Manu Śāṃvarī. See Wilson’s Vishnu P. sto. ed. pp. 266 ff., and Roth’s remark in Journal Germ. Or. Soc. vi. 245 f., and R.V. x. 17, 2.
TRADITION OF THE DESCENT OF

(4.) It assigns to Manu the patronymic of Vaivasvata, but mentions no other Manu.

(5.) It represents the fish as coming to him when on the banks of the Chirni river.

(6.) It describes the fish as thrown into the Ganges before it was taken to the sea.

(7.) It speaks of Manu as embarking on the ship with the seven rishis, and as taking with him all the seeds described by the Brahmans.

(8.) It declares that the ship rested on the highest peak of the Himalaya, which was thence called Naubandhana.

(9.) It makes the fish reveal himself as Brahmā Prajāpati.

(10.) It describes Manu not as begetting offspring but as creating all sorts of living beings including men.

III. The Matsya Purāṇa agrees in some points, and differs in others from the above details.

(1.) It states that Manu, whom it styles the son of the Sun (Sahasrakiranātmaja, and Ravi-nandana), i.e. Manu Vaivasvata, practised austerity after making over his kingdom to his son (v. 12). One might have supposed that he could only have done this in his own Manvantara; but it is said further on (v. 34 f.) that he was informed by the fish that when the dissolution should come to an end, he should become a Prajāpati and lord of the Manvantara; and he receives a promise that he should be preserved during the dissolution (ii. 12), which, as appears from v. 15, was to take place at the end of the Chākhusha Manvantara. After this he was to create the world anew. We must therefore suppose the writer to have regarded Manu Vaivasvata as existing during the period of his predecessor, but as then occupying the inferior position of a king. This difficulty is, as I have already remarked, avoided in the Bhāgavata, which makes King Satyavrata the hero of the story.

(2.) This Purāṇa speaks of a dissolution (pralaya) and yet (i. 15 ff.) represents Manu as asking and receiving from Brahmā as a boon that when that dissolution should arrive, he should be the preserver of all things stationary and moving.

(3.) It states that a hundred years and more would elapse before the dissolution, which was to be preceded by famine and various terrific phenomena.

(4.) It represents Manu as the son of the Sun. See under head (1.).
THE INDIAN RACE FROM MANU.

(5.) It mentions Malaya (Malabar) as the scene of Manu's austerity, and of the apparition of the fish.

(6.) It agrees with the Mahabharata in describing the fish as thrown into the Ganges, though at so great a distance from Malabar.

(7.) It is silent as to the seven rishis embarking on the ship, but speaks of Manu taking with him all sorts of creatures (living apparently) as well as seeds (chap. ii. v. 11).

(8.) It does not bring the narrative to a conclusion (see above, p. 207), and thus has no opportunity of saying anything of the place where the ship rested.

(9.) It speaks of Janardana (Vishnu) as the god who was manifested in the Fish.

(10.) It refers to Manu as about to effect a creation (ii. 15), but also as preserving the existing animals and plants (ch. i. 15 ff., 31 f.; ii. 2, 19).

IV. According to the Bhagavata Purana:

(1.) The event described was an "occasional dissolution" (naimitthiko layah, see above, p. 45) at the end of a Kalpa (viii. 24, 7); and yet in contradiction with this it had previously been alluded to (i. 3, 15) as occurring at the close of the Chakhusha Manvantara.

(2.) See head (1.).

(3.) The dissolution was to take place after seven days (viii. 24, 32); and no premonitory calamities are referred to.

(4.) The hero of the story is Satyavrata, king of Dravida, who was born again in the present mahakalpa as the son of Vivasvat (vv. 10, 11, 58).

(5.) The scene of the incidents, with which the narrative begins, was the river Krtaal, in the country of Dravida.

(6.) The fish is not thrown into any river after it had been once taken out of the Krtaal, and had grown large.

(7.) Satyavrata is commanded to take with him into the ship the seven rishis, as well as plants, seeds, and all beings (sarva-sattvoparishhitah).

(8.) Nothing is said of the place where the ship rested.

(9.) Vishnu is the deity who took the form of a fish with the view of recovering the Vedas carried away by the Davana Hayagriva (vv. 9, 57).

(10.) No mention is made in this chapter of any creation effected by Manu; but in ix. i. an account is given of his descendants.
V. The narrative in the Agni Purāṇa agrees with that in the Bhāgavata, except in its much greater conciseness, and in making Manu Vaivasvata, and not Satyavrata, the hero of the story.

Sect. IV.—Legendary Accounts of the Origin of Castes among the Descendants of Manu and Atri, according to the Purāṇas.

We have already seen that it is distinctly affirmed in a passage quoted above (p. 126) from the Ādiparvan of the Mahābhārata, verses 3138 ff., that men of all classes, Brāhmans, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas, and Śūdras were descended from Manu, a statement which is clearly at variance with the notion of their having been separately created from different members of Brahma. This tallies with the account of the origin of castes which is found in those parts of the Purāṇas which profess to record the history of the two royal races, the solar and the lunar, which are said to have sprung from Manu Vaivasvata and Atri.

The Vishnu Purāṇa (which is here written in prose) makes the following statement regarding Manu’s descendants:


“Before the mundane egg existed the divine Brahma Hiranyagarbha, the eternal originator of all worlds, who was the form and essence of Brahma, who consists of the divine Vishnu, who again is identical with
the Rik, Yajush, Sāman and Atharva-Vedas. From Brahmā’s right thumb72 was born the Prajāpati Daksha; Daksha had a daughter Aditi; from her was born Vivasvat; and from him sprang Manu. Manu had sons called Ikshvāku, Nṛiga, Dhṛiṣṭa, Saryāti, Narishyanta, Prāṃśu, Nābhāganedīṣṭa, Karūsha, and Prishadhra.73 Desirous of a son, Manu sacrificed to Mitra and Varuṇa; but in consequence of a wrong invocation through an irregularity of the hotrī-priest, a daughter called Ilā was born. Then through the favour of Mitra and Varuṇa she became to Manu a son called Sudyumna. But being again changed into a female through the wrath of Īśvara (Mahādeva) she wandered near the hermitage of Budha the son of Soma (the Moon); who becoming enamoured of her had by her a son called Purūravas. After his birth, the god who is formed of sacrifice, of the Rik, Yajush, Sāman, and Atharva Vedas, of all things, of mind, of nothing,74 he who is in the form of the sacrificial Male, was worshipped by the rishis of infinite splendour who desired that Sudyumna should recover his manhood. Through the favour of this god Ilā became again Sudyumna.”

Regarding the different sons of Manu the Purāṇas supply the following particulars:

(1.) Prishadhra.—The Vishṇu Purāṇa says:

Prishadhras tu guru-go-badhāḥ cḥhūdratvam āgamat |
“Prishadhra became a Sūdra in consequence of his having killed his religious preceptor’s cow.”

On the same subject the Harivaṃśa tells us, verse 659:

Prishahdra hiṁsayītvā tu guror gāṁ Janamejaya | sāpāč cḥhūdratvam āpannah |
“Prishadhra having killed his Guru’s cow, became a Sūdra in consequence of his curse.”

This story is variously amplified in the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, section cxii., and in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa ix. 2, 3–14. See Professor Wilson’s note, Vishṇu Purāṇa, 4to. edit. p. 351, where the author remarks that

72 See above, p. 72 ff.
73 Compare with this the list of Manu’s sons given in the passage from the M. Bh. Ādip. quoted above, p. 126. Nābhānedīṣṭa (not Nābhāganedīṣṭa) is mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, and Taittiriya Sanhitā (see above, p. 191), and S’aryāta in the S’. P. Br. iv. 1, 6, 1. See Journ. Roy. As. Soc. for 1866, p. 11 ff. The Mārk. P. cxii. 3 ff., and the Bhāg. P. ix. 1, 11 ff. treat also of Manu’s sons and of the birth of Ilā. See Wilson’s Vishṇu P. 4to. ed. pp. 348–58, and Burnouf’s Bhāg. P. vol. iii. pref. lxx. ff.
74 Akincinmimayah, “not consisting of anything.”
"the obvious purport of this legend, and of some that follow, is to account for the origin of the different castes from one common ancestor."

(2.) Karūsha.—The Vishṇu Purāṇa says, iv. 1, 13:

Karūshāt Kārūshā mahābālaḥ Kṣattriyaḥ bahūvuh |

"From Kārūsha the Kārūshas, Kṣattriyas of great power, were descended."

The Bhāgavata Purāṇa, ix. 2, says:

Kārūshād Mānavād āsan Kārūshāh Kṣattrā-jātayāḥ | uttarā-patha-
goptāro brahmānāḥ dharma-vatsalāḥ |

"From Karūsha, son of Manu, came the Kārūshas of the Kṣattriya caste, protectors of the northern region, devout, and lovers of duty."

(3.) Nābhāga.—The Vishṇu Purāṇa says:

Nābhāgo Nedita-putras tu vaiśyatām agamat |

"Nābhāga, the son of Nedisha, became a Vaiśya."

The Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa says he was the son of Dīsgā, and relates how he became a Vaiśya, by marrying the daughter of a man of that class (section exiii. and Wilson, p. 352, note). The Bhāgavata Purāṇa, ix. 2, 23, says he became a Vaiśya in consequence of his works (Nābhāgo Dīsga-putra 'nyah karmabhīr vaiśyatām gataḥ). And yet a long list of his descendants is given, and among them occurs Marutta who was a Chakravartin, or universal monarch (Vishṇu P. iv. 1. 15–17; Bhāg. P. ix. 2, 23–28; Mārk. P. cxxviii.–cxxxii.). He had a grandson called Dama, of whom the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa relates that at a Svayamvara he was chosen by the daughter of the King of Dāśārṇa for her husband (cxxxiv. 8), and that when the bride had been seized by three of his rejected rivals (verse 16) she was rescued by him after he had slain one of them and vanquished another (verse 53); that subsequently that same vanquished rival in revenge killed Dama’s father, who had retired into the wilderness as an ascetic (cxxxv. 18). The Purāṇa in one of its recensions ends with the following curious particulars:

Tataś chakāra tātasya raktenaivodaka-kriyām | anṛṣyam prāpya sa

pituh punah prayāt sva-mandiram | Vapushmatas cha māmsena pinda-
dānaṁ chakāra ha | brahmanan bhogayamāsa rakṣaḥ-kula-samudbhavān |

evamvidhā hi rājano bahūvuh sūrya-vamaśa-jāh | anyo 'pi sudhiyāh sūrā

yājvānaḥ śastra-kovidāḥ | vedantam pāthamānāṁśe tān na sankhyātum

ihotsaha |

"Dama then (after tearing out the heart of Vapushmat) performed
with blood the rites to the manes of his father; and having thus discharged his debt to his parent, he returned home. With the flesh of Vapushmat he formed the oblation which he offered, and fed the Brāhmans who were of Rākṣasa descent. Of such character were the kings of the Solar race. There were also others who were wise, brave, priests, and skilled in the scriptures. I am unable here to enumerate those of them who studied the Vedānta."

The Harivaṃśa (section xi. verse 658) tells us that "two sons of Nābhāgārīṣṭha, who were Vaiśyas, became Brāhmans" (Nābhāgārīṣṭha-putraub dvau vaiśyau brāhmanatām gatau).

(4.) Dhṛishṭa.—Of him the Viṣṇu Purāṇa relates, iv. 2, 2:
Dhṛishtasyāpi Dhārṣṭakam Khaṭtraṁ samabhavat
"From Dhṛishṭa sprang the Dhārṣṭaka Khaṭtriyas."

The Bhāgavata Purāṇa says, ix. 2, 17:
Dhṛishtād Dhārṣṭam abhūt Kṣatram brahma-bhūyam gataṃ kṣitau
"From Dhṛishṭa were descended the Dhārṣṭa Kṣattriyas, who obtained Brāhmaṇhood on earth."

(5.) The last-named Purāṇa enumerates in verses 19 ff. of the same section the descendants of Narishyanta, among whom was Agniveśya, verse 21:
Tato 'gniveśya bhaṅgavān Agniḥ svayam abhūt sutaḥ | Kāṁśa iti viṣhyāto Jāṭukarṇya mahān rishiḥ | tato brahma-kulaṁ jātam Āgniṣṭoṣyānaṁ nripa | Narishyantānvayaḥ proktah |
"From him (Devadatta) sprang a son Agniveśya, who was the lord Agni himself, and who was also called Kāṁśa and Jāṭukarṇya the great rishi. From him was descended the Agniveśyāya race of Brāhmans."

75 This quotation, which will be partly found in Prof. Wilson’s note 22, p. 353, is taken from the section given separately by Prof. Banerjea at the end of his edition of this Purāṇa from a Maithila MS. which differs from that followed in his text (see his Preface, p. 30). In verses 6 ff. of section cxxvi. however, of Prof. Banerjea’s text, Dama threatens to do something of the same sort as in the other recension he is described to have actually done: 6. Yad aham tasya raktena dehittheṇa Vapushmaṭah | na karomi guros triśtiṁ tat pravekṣhayo hutaśaṁnam | 7. Tuchchhoṣitenodaka-karma tasya tatasya sankhya vinipīṭitasya | māṁsaṃ samyag dvija-bhojanam cha na ehe pravekṣhayāni hutaśaṁnam tat | 6. If I do not satiate my father with the blood from Vapushmat’s body, then I shall enter the fire. 7. If I do not celebrate with his blood the obsequial rites of my father prostrated in the fray, and feed the Brāhmans with (his) flesh, I shall enter the fire."

76 The Commentator explains brahma-bhūyam by brāhmanatvam, “the state of Brāhmans.”
Brāhmans. The offspring of Narishyanta has been declared.” That of Dīṣṭa is next taken up.

Some of the names of Manu’s sons are repeated in the subsequent narrative. Thus we find a second Prāṇṣu named among the descendants of Nābḥāga (Wilson, 352). And in the Vishṇu Purāṇa, iv. 2, 2, a second Nābḥāga is mentioned as follows:

Nābḥāgasyātmajo Nābḥāgas tasya Ambarīshaḥ | Ambarīshasyāpi
Vīrūpo’dhavat Vīrūpāt Prishadaśvo jajne tataḥ cha Rathītaraḥ | tatrāyaṁ ślokaḥ

“ete kshattrā-prasūtā vai punas cāṅgirasaḥ smṛitāḥ | Rathītaraṁ pravarāḥ kshattropetā devijātayah”

“The son of Nābḥāga was Nābḥāga; his son was Ambarīsha. From him sprang Vīrūpa; from him Prishadaśva; and from him Rathītara; regarding whom this verse is current: ‘These persons sprung from a Kshattriya, and afterwards called Angirases, were the chief of the Rathītaras, twice-born men (Brāhmans) of Kshattriya race.”

The Bhāgavata thus explains the circumstance, ix. 6, 2:

Rathītarasyāprajasya bhāryāyūṁ tantavo ’ṛthitaḥ | Angirā janayaṁ
māsa brahmavarchasinaḥ sutān | eto kṣetre prasūtā vai punas tu Angi-

“Angiras being solicited for progeny, begot sons possessing Brahmanical glory on the wife of Rathītara who was childless. These persons being born of a (Kshattriya’s) wife, but afterwards called descendants of Angiras, were the chief of the Rathītaras, twice-born men (Brāhmans) of Kshattriya lineage.”

It will be observed that in this last verse the Bhāgavata reads kṣetre prasūtāḥ “born of the wife (of a Kshattriya),” instead of kṣattrā-prasūtāḥ, “sprung from a Kshattriya,” and thus brings this verse into a closer conformity with the one preceding it. Professor Wilson (p. 359, note) considers that the form given to the legend in the Bhāgavata “is an afterthought, not warranted by the memorial verse cited in our text.” It is difficult to determine whether or not this may be the case without knowing which of the two readings in that verse is the original one.

(6.) The Vishṇu Purāṇa next proceeds to enumerate the descendants of Ikshvāku son of Manu. The representative of his line in the twenty-first generation was Harita, of whom it is said, iv. 3, 5:

77 See Prof. Wilson’s note in p. 359 on this passage.
Ambarishasya Māṇḍhātus tanayasya Yuvanāśvah putro 'bhūt | tasmād
Harito yato 'ngiraso Hāritāḥ |

"The son of Ambarisha ¹⁸ son of Māṇḍhātri was Yuvanāśva. From
him sprang Harita, from whom the Hārita Angirases were descended."

These words are thus paraphrased by the Commentator: "from him
sprang the Hārita Angirases, Brāhmans, chief of the family of Hārita"
(tasmād Hāritā Angiraso dvijāḥ Harita-gotra-pravarāḥ).

The Linga Purāṇa, quoted by Prof. Wilson, states the same thing:

Harito Yuvanāśvasya Hāritā yata ātmajāḥ | ete hy Angirasaḥ pakshe
kṣattropetā dvijātayaḥ |

"The son of Yuvanāśva was Harita, of whom the Hāritas were sons.
They were on the side of Angiras, twice-born men (Brāhmans) of
Kshatriya lineage."

And the Vāyu Purāṇa tells us with some variation:

Harito Yuvanāśvasya Hāritā bhūrayah smrītāḥ | ete hy Angirasaḥ
putrāḥ kṣattropetā dvijātayaḥ |

"Harita was the son of Yuvanāśva: (after whom) many persons were
called Hāritas. These were the sons of Angiras, twice-born men (Brāhm-
ans) of Kshatriya race."

This may mean that they were begotten by Angiras, as is said by
the Bhāgavata (see above) to have been the case with Rathītara's sons.
In that case, however, as Nābhāga and Ikshvāku were brothers and Ra-
thītara was only the fifth in descent from Nābhāga, whilst Harita was
the twenty-first after Ikshvāku,—Angiras (if we suppose one and the
same person be meant in both cases) must have lived for sixteen gene-
nerations!

Such are the remarkable notices given in the Purāṇas of the rise of
different castes among the descendants of some of the sons of Manu
Vaivasvata the legendary head of the solar line of kings. I shall now
add some similar particulars connected with the lunar dynasty.

According to the Vishṇu Purāṇa (iv. 6, 2 ff.) Atri was the son of
Brahmā, and the father of Soma (the moon), whom Brahmā installed
as the sovereign of plants, Brāhmans and stars ¹⁹ (aseshauṣhadhi-dvija-
naksatrāgam ādhipatye 'bhayasechayat). After celebrating the rājasūya
sacrifice, Soma became intoxicated with pride, and carried off Tārā

¹⁸ We have already had a person of this name the son of Nābhāga. See above.
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(Star), the wife of Bṛhaspati the preceptor of the gods, whom, although admonished and entreated by Brahmā, the gods, and rishis, he refused to restore. Soma's part was taken by Uśanas; and Rudra, who had studied under Angiras, aided Bṛhaspati (Angirasaśeṣa sakāśopalabṛha-vidya bhagavān Rudro Bṛihaspateḥ sāhāyyam akarot). A fierce conflict ensued between the two sides, supported respectively by the gods and the Daityas, etc. Brahmā interposed, and compelled Soma to restore Tāra to her husband. She had, however, in the mean time become pregnant, and bore a son Budha (the planet Mercury), of whom, when strongly urged, she acknowledged Soma to be the father. Purūravas, as has been already mentioned, was the son of this Budha by Ilā, the daughter of Manu. The loves of Purūravas and the Apsaras Urvāśī are related in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, xi. 5, 1, 1; in the Vishnu Purāṇa, iv. 6, 19 ff.; in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, ix. 14; and in the Harivaṃśa, section 26. The Mahābhārata, Ādi. sect. 75, alludes to Purūravas as having been engaged in a contest with the Brāhmans. This passage will be quoted hereafter. According to the Vishnu Purāṇa, iv. 7, 1, Purūravas had six sons, of whom the eldest was Āyus. Āyus had five sons: Nahusha, Kshattrayiddha, Rambha, Rapi, and Anenas. The narrative proceeds (iv. 8, 1):

Kṣattrayiddhāt Sunahotraḥ 63 putro 'bhatat | Kāśa-Leśa-Gṛitama-dās trayo 'syābhavan | Gṛitamadasya Saunakaś chāturvarṇya-pravarttayitā 'bhat | Kāśasya Kāśirājas tato Dirghatamāḥ putro 'bhavat | Dhanvantaris Dirghatamaso 'bhat |

"Kṣattrayiddha had a son Sunahotra, who had three sons, Kāśa, Leśa, and Gṛitamada. From the last sprang Saunaka, who originated the system of four castes. Kāśa had a son Kāśirāja, of whom again Dirghatamas was the son, as Dhanvantari was of Dirghatamas."

60 This is the only mention I have ever happened to encounter of the great Mahādeva having been at school!

61 This passage is translated by Professor Müller in the Oxford Essays for 1856, pp. 62 f.; and the legend has been formed on the basis of the obscure hymn in the R.V. x. 95, in which the two names of Purūravas and Urvāśī occur as those of the interlocutors in a dialogue.

62 A short quotation has been already made from this narrative. See above, p. 158.

63 Both my MSS. read Sunahotra. Professor Wilson has Suhotra.

64 The Commentator explains the words chāturvarṇya-pravarttayitā by saying that the four castes were produced among his descendants (tad-vāṁde chaturāro varṇā abhaṣan). This explanation agrees with the statement of the Vāyu Purāṇa given in the text.
The Vayu Purāṇa, as quoted by Professor Wilson (V. P. 4to. ed. p. 406), expresses the matter differently, thus:

"Putro Gṛtisamadasya cha Sunako yasya Saunakaḥ | brāhmaṇāḥ kṣat- triyāḥ chaiva vaisyāḥ śūdrās tathaiva cha | etasya vaṁśe samudbhūtā vichitraḥ karmabhīr dvijāḥ |

"The son of Gṛtisamada was Sunaka, from whom sprang Saunaka. In his family were born Brāhmans, Kṣattriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras, twice-born men with various functions." 85

In like manner the Harivāmśa states in section 29, verse 1520:

"Putro Gṛtisamadasyāpi Sunako yasya Saunakāḥ | brāhmaṇāḥ kṣat- triyāḥ chaiva vaisyāḥ śūdrās tathaiva cha |

"The son of Gṛtisamada was Sunaka, from whom sprang the Saunakas, Brāhmans, Kṣattriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras."

Something similar is said of Gṛtisamati (who was the son of a Suhotra, although not the grandson of Kṣattravṛiddha) in a following section, the 32nd of the same work, verse 1732:

"Sa chāpi Vitathāḥ putrān janayāmāsa pancha vai | Suhotrāḥ cha Suho- tāram Gayaṁ Gargaṁ tathaiva cha | Kapilāṁ cha mahātmānam Suho- trasya suta-ādayam | Kāśakaḥ cha mahāsattvas tathā Gṛtisamatir niṁpaḥ | tathā Gṛtisamateḥ putrā brāhmaṇāḥ kṣattriyāḥ viśaḥ |

"Vitathā was the father of five sons, Suhotra, Suhotri, Gaya, Garga, and the great Kapila. Suhotra had two sons, the exalted Kāśaka, and King Gṛtisamati. The sons of the latter were Brāhmans, Kṣattriyas, and Vaiśyas."

The Bhagavata Purāṇa, ix. 17, 2 ff, has the following notice of Kṣattravṛiddha’s descendants:

"Kṣattravṛiddha-sutasyaśaṁ Suhotrasyāmajāś trayaḥ | Kāśyaḥ Kuśo Gṛtisamadeḥ iti Gṛtisamadāḥ abhūt | Sunako Saunako yasya baheri- chaḥ pravaro muniḥ |

"Suhotra, son of Kṣattravṛiddha, had three sons, Kāśya, Kuśa, and Gṛtisamada. From the last sprang Sunaka, and from him Saunaka, the eminent Muni, versed in the Rig-veda.”

85 On this Professor Wilson remarks, note, p. 406: “The existence of but one caste in the age of purity, however incompatible with the legend which ascribes the origin of the four tribes to Brahma, is everywhere admitted. Their separation is assigned to different individuals, whether accurately to any one may be doubted; but the notion indicates that the distinction was of a social or political character.”
It is to be observed that this Gṛtsamada, who is here described as belonging to the regal lineage of Purūravas, is the reputed rishi of many hymns in the second Maṇḍala of the Rig-veda. Regarding him the Commentator Sāyaṇa has the following remarks in his introduction to that Maṇḍala:

Maṇḍala-āraśṭā Gṛtsamadāḥ rishiḥ | sa cha pūrvam Āngirasa-kule Sunahotrasya putraḥ san yajna-kāle 'suraṁ grihītaḥ Indreṇa mochitaḥ | paśchāt tad-vachaneiva Bhṛgu-kule Sunaka-putro Gṛtsamada-nāma 'bhūt | tathā chānukranaṇikā “Yāḥ Āngirasaḥ Sunahotro bhūte Bhārgavaḥ Saunako ’bhavat sa Gṛtsamado devityam maṇḍalam apāṣyaḥ” iti | tathā tasyaiva Saunakasya vachanam rishy-anukramaṇa “tvam Ṛgne” iti | “Gṛtsamadāḥ Saunako Bhṛgutāṁ gataḥ | Saunahotro prakṛtya tu yaḥ Āngirasa uchyaḥ” iti | tasmād maṇḍala-āraśṭā Saunako Gṛtsamadāḥ rishiḥ |

“The seer (i.e. he who received the revelation) of this Maṇḍala was the rishi Gṛtsamada. He, being formerly the son of Sunahotra in the family of the Āngirasas, was seized by the Asuras at the time of sacrifice and rescued by Indra. Afterwards, by the command of that god, he became the person named Gṛtsamada, son of Sunaka, in the family of Bhṛgu. Thus the Anukramaṇikā (Index to the Rig-veda) says of him: ‘That Gṛtsamāda, who, having been an Āngirasa, and son of Sunahotra, became a Bhārgava and son of Sunaka, saw the second Maṇḍala.’ So, too, the same Saunaka says in his Rishi-anukramaṇa regarding the Maṇḍala beginning with ‘Thou, o Agni’—‘Gṛtsamada son of Sunaka who is declared to have been naturally an Āngirasa, and the son of Sunahotra, became a Bhṛgu.’ Hence the seer of the Maṇḍala is the rishi Gṛtsamada son of Sunaka.”

It will be noticed that (unless we are to suppose a different Gṛtsamada to be intended in each case) there is a discrepancy between the Puraṇas on the one hand, and Sāyaṇa and the Anukramaṇikā on the other; as the Puraṇas make Gṛtsamada the son of Sunahotra or Sunhotra, and the father of Sunaka; whilst the Anukramaṇikā, followed by Sāyaṇa, represents the same personage as having been, indeed, originally the son of Sunahotra of the race of Āngiras, but as having afterwards become, by what process does not appear, the son of Sunaka of the race of Bhṛgu.

In his translation of the Rig-veda (ii. 207 f.) Professor Wilson refers
to a legend about King Vitahavya in the Anuśāsana-parvan of the Mahābhārata (verses 1944–2006) which gives a different account of Griṭsamada’s parentage. It begins: Śriṇu rājān yathā rājā Vitahavyo mahāyāsaḥ | rājarṣhir durlabham prāpto brāhmaṇyaṁ loka-satkṛitam | “Hear, o king, how the renowned Vitahavya, the royal rishi, attained the condition of Brāhmaṇthood venerated by mankind, and so difficult to be acquired.” It happened that Divodāsa, King of Kāśi (Benares) was attacked by the sons of Vitahavya, and all his family slain by them in battle. The afflicted monarch thereupon resorted to the sage Bhārādvāja, who performed for him a sacrifice in consequence of which a son named Pratardana was born to him. Pratardana, becoming an accomplished warrior, was sent by his father to take vengeance on the Vitahavyas. They rained upon him showers of arrows and other missiles, “as clouds pour down upon the Himālaya” 86 (abhya-varṣhānta rājānam himavantam ivāmbudāḥ); but he destroyed them all, and “they lay with their bodies besmeared with blood, like kinsuka-trees 87 cut down” (apatan rudhirādrāṅgā. nikritā iwa kinsukāḥ). Vitahavya himself had now to fly to another sage, Bhṛgū, who promised him protection. The avenger Pratardana, however, followed and demanded that the refugee should be delivered up:

Āsyādānim badhād adya bhavishtyāmy anriṇāḥ putuḥ | tam uścha kri-pāvishto Bhṛgur dharma-bhrītāṁ varaḥ | “nehāsti kāhātriyaṁ kaśchit sarve hiṁ devi-jātayaḥ” | etat tu vacchānaṁ śrutvā Bhṛgus tathyaṁ Pratardanāḥ | pādāv upaspṛśya śanaiḥ prahrīṣhto vākyaṁ abraṣṭ | evam apy asmi bhagvan kṛitakṛityo na saṁsayaḥ | . . . . . tyājito hi mayā jātim esha rājā Bhṛgūdvāha | tatas tenāhiyanaumnāto yayau rājā Pratardanāḥ | yathā-gatam mahārāja muktaḥ visham īvoraṇaḥ | Bhṛgur vachana-mātreṇa sa cha brahma-rshitaṁ gataḥ | Vītahavyo mahārāja brahma-vādītvam eva cha | tasya Griśamādaḥ putruḥ rūpeṇendra ivāparaḥ | “Sakras tvam” iti yo dātayār nigrīhitaṁ kilābhavat | rigvede varūtae chāgryā śrutir yasya mahātmanaḥ | yatra Griśamāda “brahma” bhṛmaṇaiḥ sa mahīye | sa brahmachārī viprārṣḥ śrīman Griśamādo 'bhaṭat |

“Pratardana says: ‘By the slaughter of this (Vitahavya) I shall

86 This simile seems to indicate a familiarity with the manner in which the clouds collect, and discharge their contents on the outer range of the Himālaya.

87 The Kinsuka is a tree bearing a red blossom (Butea frondosa).
now, to-day, be acquitted of my debt to my father.’ Bhṛigu, the most eminent of religious men, filled with compassion, answered: ‘There is no Kshattriya here: all these are Brāhmans.’ Hearing this true assertion of Bhṛigu, Pratardana was glad, and gently touching the sage’s feet, rejoined: ‘Even thus, o glorious saint, I have gained my object . . . for I have compelled this King (i.e. Rājanya) to relinquish his caste.’ King Pratardana then, after receiving the sage’s salutations, departed, as he came, like a serpent which has discharged its poison: while Vitahavya by the mere word of Bhṛigu became a Brāhman-rishi, and an utterer of the Veda. Gṛitsamada, in form like a second Indra, was his son; he was seized by the Daityas, who said to him, ‘Thou art Śakra’ (Indra). In the Rig-veda the text’s (śruti) of this great rishi stand first. There Gṛitsamada is honoured by the Brāhmans (with the title of) ‘Brāhmān.’ This illustrious personage was a Brah- machārīn, and a Brāhman-rishi.’

According to the enumeration of Gṛitsamada’s family, which follows here, Sunaka was his descendant in the twelfth generation, and Saunaka in the thirteenth. The story concludes with these words:

Evaṁ vipratvam ajamad Vitahavyo narādhipaḥ | Bhṛigoḥ prasadād rājendra kshattriyoḥ kshattriyarshaḥbhā |

‘Thus did King Vitahavya, a Kshattriya, enter into the condition of Brāhmanhood by the favour of Bhṛigu.’

In the next chapter we shall again notice Vitahavya among the Kshattriyas who are declared by tradition to have been the authors of Vedic hymns.

King Divodāsa was the sixth in descent from Kāśa brother of Gṛitsamada. Of him the Harivamśa states, section 32, verse 789 f.:

Divodāsasya dāyado brahmashir Mitrāyur nripaḥ | Maitrāyaṇaś tataḥ Somo Maitreyas tu tataḥ sṛṣṭiḥ | etc vai samsrītaḥ pakhśam kshattropetās tu Bhārgavaḥ |

‘The son of Divodāsa was the King Mitrāyu a Brāhman-rishi. From him sprang Soma Maitreyana, from whom the Maitreyas received their name. They, being of Kshattriya line ge, adhered as Bhārgavas to the side (of the latter).’

If I have correctly interpreted this verse, and if by “first” we are to understand first in order, it corresponds not accurately represent the state of the case: as the hymns of Gṛitsamada only appear in the second Maṇḍala.
The twentieth in descent from the same Kāśa, brother of Grītsamada, was Bhārgabhūmi, of whom the Vīshṇu Purāṇa says, iv. 8, 9:

*Bhārgasya Bhārgabhūmiḥ | tataś cha tāvān ya-pravṛttiḥ | ity eto Kāśayo bhūpatayaḥ kathitaḥ |

"The son of Bhārga was Bhārgabhūmi, from whom the four castes originated. Thus have the kings called Kāśis been declared."

In two passages of the Harivaṃśa, names identical, or nearly so, are found, but with a different progenitor in each case, in reference to which a similar statement is made. The first is in section 29, verse 1593:

Venūhotra-sutaḥ chāpi Bhargo nāma prajēvarah | Vatsasya Vatasa-

bhūmis tu Bhṛgubhūmis tu Bhārgavāt | ete hy Angirasaḥ putrā jātā vaṁśe 'tha Bhārgavo | brāhmanāḥ kshattriyā vaisyāḥ trayaḥ putrāḥ||

"The son of Venūhotra was King Bharga. From Vatsa sprang Vatsabhūmi, and Bhṛgubhūmi from Bhārgava. These descendants of Angiras were then born in the family of Bhṛgu, Brāhmans, Kshattriyas, and Vaiśyas three (classes of) descendants in thousands."

The second passage is in the 32nd section, verse 1752:

Sukumārasya putras tu Satyaketur mahārathah | suto 'bhavad mahā-
tejā rājā parama-dhārmikah | Vatsasya Vatsabhūmis tu Bhārgabhūmis

tu Bhārgavāt | ete hy Angirasah putrā jātā vaṁśe 'tha Bhārgavo | brāh-

nanāḥ kshattriyā vaisyāḥ śudrāḥ cha Bharatarashabha |

"The warrior Satyaketu was the son of Sukumāra, and a prince of great lustre and virtue. From Vatsa sprang Vatsabhūmi, and Bhār
gabhūmi from Bhārgava. These descendants of Angiras were then born in the family of Bhṛgu, Brāhmans, Kshattriyas, Vaiśyas and Sudras."

The parallel passage in the Vāyu Purāṇa, as quoted by Professor Wilson, p. 409, has names which are mostly different:

Venūhotra-sutaḥ chāpi Gārgyo vai nāma viśrūtaḥ | Gārgyasya Gārg-
gabhūmis tu Vatso Vatsasya dhīmataḥ | brāhmanāḥ kshattriyās chaiva
tayōḥ putrāḥ sudhārmikāḥ |

"The son of Venūhotra was the renowned Gārgya. Gargabhūmi was the son of Gārgya; and Vatsa of the wise Vatsa. Brāhmans and Kshattriyas were the virtuous sons of these two." 80

80 Professor Wilson, p. 410, note, gives tejoyuktāh, "glorious," instead of trayaḥ putrāḥ, as the reading either of the Brahma Purāṇa, or of the Harivaṃśa, or both.

80 In regard to these passages the reader may consult the remarks of Professor
Another son of Áyus (son of Pururavas) was Rambha, of whom the Bhágavata Puráña says, ix. 17, 10:

Rambhasya Rabhasaḥ putro Gabhíraś chákriyas tataḥ | tasya kshettre bhrahma jajne śrínu vairśam Anenasah |

“The son of Rambha was Rabhasa, from whom sprang Gabhíra and Akriya. From his wife Bráhmans were born: here now the race of Anenas” (another son of Áyus).

Of the same Rambha the Vishńu Puráña says (iv. 9, 8), Rambhas tv anapatyo 'bhavat | “Rambha was childless.”

Another son of Áyus, as we have seen, Vishńu Puráña, iv. 8, 1, was Nahusha. He had six sons (V. P. iv. 10, 1), of whom one was Yayáti. The sons of the latter were Yadu, Turvasu, Druhyu, Anu, and Páru (Ibid. iv. 10, 2). One of these five, Anu, had, as we are told, in the twelfth generation a son of Bali, of whom the Vishńu Puráña, iv. 18, 1, relates:

Hemát Sutapás tasmād Balir yasya kshettre Dirghatamasā Anga-
Banga-Kalinga-Suhma-Pândrākhyaṃ Báleyañh ksatram ajanyata |

“From Hema sprang Sutapas; and from him Bali, on whose wife Báleya Kshattriyas (i.e. Kshattriyas of the race of Bali), called Anga, Banga, Kalinga, Suhma, and Pundra were begotten by Dirghatamas.”

Professor Wilson (p. 445, note 12) quotes from the Váyu Puráña a statement regarding the same person that he had “sons who founded the four castes” (putrān cháturvarṣya-karāṇ); and refers to a passage in the Matsya Puráña, in which Bali is said to have obtained from

Wilson, p. 409, note 16, where a commentator (on the Bráhma Puráña, or the Hari-
vánsá) is quoted, who says that in the passage from these works “another son of Vatsa the father of Alarka is specified, viz., Vatsabhúmi; while Bhárgava is the brother of Vatsa; and that (the persons referred to were) Angirases because Gálava belonged to that family, and (were born in the family) of Bhrigu, because Visvámitra belonged to it” (Vatsasya Alarka-pituh putrañtaram āha “Vatsabhúnim” iti | “Bhárgavād” Vatsa-bhrútuḥ | “Angirasa” Gálavasya Angirasatvāt | “Bhárgave” Visvámitrasya Bhárgavatvāt). The Vishńu Puráña, iv. 8, 6, says that Vatsa was one of the names of Pratardana, son of Divodása, a descendant of Kúśa, and a remote ancestor of Bhárgabhuámi. See however Professor Wilson’s note 13, p. 408. It is possible that the resemblance of the word Bhárga to Bhárgava may have occasioned the descendants of the former to be connected with the family of Bhrigu.

These five names occur together in the plural in a verse of the Rig-veda, i. 109, quoted above, p. 179.

Kshettre bháryāyām jñatañcud Báleyañh | “They were called descendants of Bali because they were born of his wife.”
Brahmā the boon that he should "establish the four fixed castes" (cha-turo niyatān varṇāṁs tvam sthāpayeti).

The Harivaṃśa gives the following account of Bali, in the course of which the same thing is stated; section 31, verses 1682 ff.:

Phenāt tu Sutapā jajne sutah Sutapaso Baliḥ | jāto mānusha-yonau tu sa rājā kāņcaneśhuddhiḥ | mahāyogī sa tu Balīr babhūva nripatiḥ purā | putrān utpādayāmāsa pancha vaṁśa-karān bhūvi | Angah prathamato jajne Vangaḥ Suhmaḥ tathaiva cha | Pundraḥ Kalinagaḥ cha tathā Bāleyāḥ शत्रुः क्षत्रियम् uchyate | Bāleyā brāhmaṇaś chaiva tasya vaṁśakarā bhūvi | Bales tu Brahmaṇaḥ datto caraḥ prītena Bhārataḥ | mahāyogītvam āyuṣ cha kalpasya parimāṇataḥ | śaṅgrāme chaṭpy ajeyatvaṁ dharma chaiva pradhānataḥ | trailokya-dārsanaṁ chāpi prādhānyam prasavo tathā | bale chāpratimatvaṁ vai dharma-tattvārtti-dārsanaṁ | chaturo niyatān varṇāṁs tvam cha sthāpayiteti cha | ity ukto vibhūna rājā Balīḥ tāntim parāṁ yayau | tasyaite tanayaḥ sarve kshetrajā muni-punganāḥ | sambhātā Dirghatapasaḥ Sudeshnāyām mahājauśaḥ | 

"From Phena sprang Sutapas; and the son of Sutapas was Bali. He was born of a human mother, this prince with the golden quiver; but King Bali was of old a great yogin. He begot five sons, who were the heads of races upon the earth. Anga was first born, then Vanga, Suhma, Pundra and Kalinga; such are the names of the Kshattriyas descended from Bali (Bāleyāḥ). There were also Bāleya Brāhmans, founders of his race upon the earth. By Brahmā, who was pleased, the boon was granted to Bali that he should be a great yogin, should live the entire length of a Kalpa, should be invincible in battle, should have pre-eminence in virtue, should have the power of beholding the whole three worlds, should have a superiority in begetting progeny, should be unequalled in strength, and should comprehend the essential principles of duty. And being thus addressed by the Lord in these words, 'Thou shalt establish the four regulated castes,' King Bali attained supreme tranquillity. All these sons, the offspring of his wife, were begotten on Sudeshnā by the glorious muni Dirghatapas." ⁹³

⁹³ M. Langlois must have found in his MS. a different reading of the last line, as he renders it otherwise. Professor Wilson remarks (V.P. pp. 444, note 12): "The Matsya calls Bali the son of Virochana, and āyu-kalpa-pramāṇikāḥ, "existing for a whole Kalpa;" identifying him, therefore, only in a different period and form, with the Bali of the Vāmana Avatāra" (Dwarf-incarnation). (See Wilson's Vishṇu P. p. 265, note, and the Bhāgavata P. ix. sects. 15–23, and other works quoted in the 4th vol. of this work, pp. 116 ff.
Apratiratha is recorded as being a descendant of Pūru (another of Yayāti’s sons), in the thirteenth generation (Wilson, p. 448). Of him it is related, Vishnu Purāṇa, iv. 19, 2:

RITEYOH RANTINĀRĀH PUTRA ’BHĀT | TAMSUM APRATIRATHAṆ DHRAVAMA ḌHARHAN ČA RANTINĀRĀH PUTRĀN ĀVĀPA | APRATIRATHĀṬ KANVAṆ | TASYĀPI MEDHĀTITHIṆ | YATAḥ KANVĀṆAṆA DEVĪṆ BAHUṆHAKH | TAMSOR ANILAS TATO DUSHYANTAṆḌAYAŚ ČHATVĀRAṆ PUTRA BAHUṆVAḤ | DUSHYANTAṆ ČHAKRAVARTIĪ BHARATOA ’BHAVAT |

“RITEYUH AṆ SARANĪRĀṆA, WHO HAD TANSU, APRATIRATHA AND DHRAVĀ FOR HIS SONS. FROM APRATIRATHA SPRANG KAṆṆA. HIS SON WAS MEDHĀTITHI; FROM WHOM THE KĀṆṆAṆAṆA BRAHMANS WERE DESCENDED. FROM TANSA SPRANG ANILA, WHO HAD FOUR SONS, DUSHYANTA, AND OTHERS. FROM DUSHYANTA SPRANG THE EMPEROR BHARATA.”

With some variations the Bhāgavata Purāṇa says, ix. 20, 1:

PĀṆI DRAVAMA PRAVAKHŠYAMI YATRA JĀTO ’SI BHARATA | YATRA RĀJARŚAYO VAṆIṢṆ YO BRAHMA-VĀṆIṢṋ YO CHA JAYIṆE | . . . 6. RITEYOH RANTIBHĀRO ’BHĀṬ TRAYAS TASYAṬMAṆAṆA NIPRA | SUMATIR DHRUVAṆ PRATIRATHAṆ KANVAṆ PRATIRATHEMAṆAṆA | TASYA MEDHĀTITHIṆ TASNĀṬ PRASKAṆṆYĀṆA DEVĪṬAYAṆ | PUTRO ’BHĀṬ SUMATIRRAIḤYO DUSHYANTAṆ TAT-SUTO MATAṆ |

“I shall declare the race of Pūru from which thou hast sprung, O Bhārata; and in which there have been born royal rishis, and men of Brahmanical family . . . 6. From Riteyu sprang Rantibhāra; who had three sons, Sumati, Dhrusa, and Apratiratha. Kanva was the son of the last; and the son of Kanva was Medhātithi, from whom the Prakṣaṇas and other Brahmans were descended.”

A little further on, in the chapter of the Vishnu Purāṇa just quoted (iv. 19, 10), Kanva and Medhātithi are mentioned as having had a different parentage from that before assigned, viz., as being the son and grandson of Ajamiḍha, who was a descendant in the ninth generation of Tansu, the brother of Apratiratha:

AJAMIḌHAṆA ṇAṆAṆA | KAṆṆAṆA MEDHĀTITHIṆ YATAḥ KANVĀṆAṆA DEVĪṆ | AJAMIḌHAṆASYAṆAYAṆA PUTRO BRIHADISHUṆA |

“From Ajamiḍha sprang Kanva: from Kanva Medhātithi, from whom were descended the Kāṇvayana Brahmans. Ajamiḍha had another son Brihadishu.”

64 On this the Commentator remarks: AJAMIḌHAṆA KAṆṆAṆA EKO VAṆIṆO BRIHADISAṆE-OṬĪṆAR AṆAR VAṆIṆO NṬIḌAR AṆAR AṆAR ṈRUKṢHAṆIṆA CHĀṆARĀṆA | “AJAMIḌHAṆA HAD ONE SET OF DESCENDANTS, CONSISTING OF KAṆṆA, ETC., A SECOND CONSISTING OF BRIHADISHU, ETC.,
On this last passage Professor Wilson observes, p. 452, note: "The copies agree in this reading, yet it can scarcely be correct. Kaṇva has already been noticed as the son of Apratiratha." But the compiler of the Purāṇa may here be merely repeating the discordant accounts which he found in the older authorities which he had before him.

Regarding Ajamiḍha the Bhāgavata says, ix. 21, 21:

Ajamiḍhasya vaṁśyaḥ syuḥ Priyamedhādayo dvijāḥ | Ajamiḍhad Bhrihadishuḥ |

"Priyamedha and other Brāhmans were descendants of Ajamiḍha. From Ajamiḍha sprang Brīhadishu."

The Vishṇu Purāṇa (iv. 19, 16) gives the following account of Mudgala, a descendant of Ajamiḍha in the seventh generation:

Mudgalāḥ cha Maudgalyaḥ kṣattropetā dvijatayo babhūvaḥ | Mudgalāḥ Bahvaśvo Bahvaśved Divodāso 'halyaḥ cha mithunam abhūt | Saradvato 'halyāyām Sṛṭānanda 'bhaṁvat |

"From Mudgala were descended the Maudgalya Brāhmans of Kṣatтриya stock. From Mudgala sprang Bahvaśva; from him again twins, Divodāsa and Ahalyā. Sṛṭānanda was born to Saradvat²⁵ by Ahalyā."

Similarly the Bhāgavata Purāṇa says, iv. 21, 33 f.:

Mudgalāḥ brahma nirṛṣṭaṁ gotram Maudgalya-saṅjñitam | mithunam Mudgalāḥ Bhārmyāḍ Divodāsaḥ pumān abhūt | Ahalyā kanyākā yasyāṁ Sṛṭānanda tu Gautoṁat |

"From Mudgala sprang Brāhmans, the family called Maudgalyas. To the same father, who was son of Bharmyaśva, were born twins, Divodāsa, a male, and Ahalyā, a female child, who bore Sṛṭānanda to Gautama."

The words of the Matsya Purāṇa on the same subject, as quoted by Professor Wilson, p. 454, note 50, are:

Mudgalasyaśī Maudgalyaḥ kṣattropetā dvijatāyaḥ | etc hy Angirasaḥ pakshe saṁsthitāḥ Kaṇva-Mudgalāḥ |

"From Mudgala sprang the Maudgalyas, Brāhmans of Kṣatтриya stock. These Kaṇva and Mudgalas stood on the side of Angiras."

a third consisting of Nila, etc., and a fourth consisting of Rikša, etc." The last two sons of Ajamiḍha are mentioned further on, Nila in v. 15, and Rikša in v. 18, of the same chapter of the V. P.

²⁵ The Commentator says this is a name of Gautama. Regarding Ahalyā and Gautama see the story extracted above, p. 121, from the Rāmāyaṇa.
The Harivamsa, section 32, verse 1781, thus notices the same family:

Mudgalasya tu dayado Maudgalayah sumahayasah | ete sarve mahat-
mano kshattropet dvijataya | ete hy Angirasah pashah samkritah
Kanya-Mudgalah | Maudgalasya suto jyeshtho brahmaishah suma-
hayasah |

“The renowned Maudgalya was the son of Maudgala. All these
great personages were Brāhmans of Kshattriya descent. These Kānyas
and Maudgalas adhered to the side of Angiras. Maudgalya’s eldest son
was a celebrated Brahman-rishi.”

Regarding Kshemaka, a future descendent of Ajamidha in the 31st
 generation, the Vishnu Purāṇa says, iv. 21, 4:

Tato Niramitas tasmach cha Kshemakah | tatrāyaṁ slokah | “brahma-kshhatrasya yo yonir”
vaṁso rājarshi-satkritah | Kshemakam praṇya
rājanāṁ sa saṁsthām praṇyate kalau |

“From him (Khaṇḍapāṇi) shall spring Niramitra; and from him
Kshemaka; regarding whom this verse (is current): ‘The race, con-
secrated by royal rishis, which gave birth to Brāhmans and Kshattriyas,
shall terminate in the Kali age, after reaching King Kshemaka.’”

The corresponding verse quoted by Professor Wilson (p. 462, note 24)
from the Matsya and Vāyu Purāṇas substitutes devaṁhi, “divine rishi,”
or “gods and rishi,” for the rājarshi, “royal rishi,” of the Vishnu Pur-
āṇa. The verse in question is there described as anuvainśa-sloko’yaṁ gīto
vīpraitḥ puratanaṁ, “a genealogical verse sung by ancient Brāhmans.”

According to the details given from the Purāṇas in this section
several persons, Gṛitsamadha, Kaṇva, Medhātithi, and Priyamedha, to
whom hymns of the Rig-veda are ascribed by Indian tradition as their
rishis, were of Kshatriya descent.

In the line of the same Tansu, brother of Apratiratha, we find in
the sixth generation a person named Garga, of whom the Vishnu Pur-
āṇa relates, iv. 19, 9:

Gargat Siniḥ | tato Gaṅgyah Sainyah kshattropetā dvijatayo babhuvah |

“From Garga sprang Sini; from them were descended the Gārgyas
and Sainyas, Brāhmans of Kshattriya race.” 97

96 On this words the Commentator has this note: Brahmayah brahmanayah Kshat-
trasya kshattriyasya cha youḥ kiraṇam purवaiṁ yathoktataṭ | ‘Brahma’ and
‘Kshattrya’ stand for Brāhma and Kshattriya. This race is the ‘source,’ cause (of
these), as has been declared above.”

97 On this the Commentator only remarks: Tatas tūbhyaṁ Gaṅgyah Sainyah cha
Similarly the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, ix. 21, 19, says:

Gargāt S'inis tato Gāryaḥ kshatrād brahmaḥ hy avarttataḥ |

"From Garga sprang Sini, from them Gārya, who from a Kshatriya became a Brāhman." 88

The Vishnup Purāṇa records a similar circumstance regarding the family of Mahāvīryya, the brother of Garga (iv. 19, 10):

Mahāvīryyād Urukshayō nāma putro 'bhūt | tasya Trayyarunā-Pushkarināv Kapiś cha putra-trayam abhūt | tath cha tritayam api pāschād vipratām upajagāma |

"Mahāvīryya had a son named Urukshaya; who again had three sons, Trayyarunā, Pushkarin, and Kapi; and these three afterwards entered into the state of Brāhmans (i.e. became such)."

The Bhāgavata states, ix. 21, 19 f.:

Duritakshayo Mahāvīryyat tasya Trayyaruniḥ Kaviḥ | Pushkararunir ity atra ye brāhmaṇa-gatīm gataḥ |

"From Mahāvīryya sprang Duritakshaya. From him were descended Trayyaruṇi, Kavi, and Pushkararunī, who attained to the destination of Brāhmans." 100

According to the Matsya Purāṇa also, as quoted by Professor Wilson (451, note 22), "all these sons of Uruksha (sic) attained the state of Brāhmans" (Urukshataḥ sūtā hy ete sarve brāhmaṇatām gataḥ); and in another verse of the same Purāṇa, cited in the same note, it is added: Kāvyānāṁ tu varā hy ete trayāḥ prakta maharshayaḥ | Gargāḥ Sankriti-tayaḥ Kāvyā kshattropetā deijatayaḥ | "These three classes of great rishis, viz. the Gargas, Sankritis, and Kāvyas, Brāhmans of Kshatriya race, are declared to be the most eminent of the Kāvyas, or descendants of Kavi." The original Garga was, as we have seen, the brother of Mahāvīryya, the father of Kavi, or Kapi; while, according to the

Garga-vaiśvyateṭāḥ Ś'ini-vaiśvyateṭāḥ cha samākhyaṭāḥ | kshatriyā eva kenaḥhit kūraṇena brāhmaṇasyā cha bāhuvah | "They were called Gāryas and S'ainyas because they were of the race of Garga and Ś'ini. Being indeed Kshatriyas they became Brāhmans from some cause or other."

88 The Commentator does not say how this happened.

99 Unless Professor Wilson’s MSS. had a different reading from mine, it must have been by an oversight that he has translated here, "The last of whom became a Brāhman."

100 On this the Commentator annotates: Ye atra kshatra-vaiśvy eka brāhmaṇa-gatim brāhmaṇa-ṛipatām gataḥ te | "Who in this Kshatriya race attained the destination of Brāhmans,—the form of Brāhmana."
Vishnu Purana (iv. 19, 9), and Bhagavata Purana (ix. 21, 1), Sankriti was the son of Nara, another brother of Mahaviryya.

The series of passages just quoted is amply sufficient to prove that according to the traditions received by the compilers of the ancient legendary history of India (traditions so general and undisputed as to prevail over even their strong hierarchical prepossessions), Brāhmans, Kshattriyas, and even Vaiśyas and Sūdras, were, at least in many cases, originally descended from one and the same stock. The European critic can have no difficulty in receiving these obscure accounts as true in their literal sense; though the absence of precise historical data may leave him without any other guide than speculation to assist him in determining the process by which a community originally composed for the most part of one uniform element, was broken up into different classes and professions, separated from each other by impassable barriers. On the other hand, the possibility of this common origin of the different castes, though firmly based on tradition, appeared in later times so incredible, or so unpalatable, to some of the compilers of the Puranas, that we find them occasionally attempting to explain away the facts which they record, by statements such as we have encountered in the case of the Kings Rathitara and Bāli, that their progeny was begotten upon their wives by the sages Angiras and Dīrghatamas, or Dīrghatapas; or by the introduction of a miraculous element into the story, as we have already seen in one of the legends regarding Gṛtamsada, and as we shall have occasion to notice in a future chapter in the account of Viśvāmitra.
CHAPTER III.

ON THE MUTUAL RELATIONS OF THE DIFFERENT CLASSES OF INDIAN SOCIETY ACCORDING TO THE HYMNS OF THE RIG-AND ATHARVA-VEDAS.

In the last chapter I have attempted to shew that in general the authors of the hymns of the Rig-veda regarded the whole of the Aryan people, embracing not only the priests and chiefs, but the middle classes also of the population, as descended from one common father, or ancestor, whom they designate by the name of Manu. This reference to a common progenitor excludes, of course, the supposition that the writers by whom it is made could have had any belief in the myth which became afterwards current among their countrymen, that their nation consisted of four castes, differing naturally in dignity, and separately created by Brahmā.

In that chapter I proposed to leave for further consideration any specific notices which the Rig-veda might contain regarding the different classes of which the society contemporary with its composition was made up. On this consideration I now enter. As that great collection of hymns embodies numerous references, both to the authors themselves and to the other agents in the celebration of divine worship, it may be expected to supply, incidentally or indirectly, at least, some information respecting the opinion which these ministers of religion entertained of themselves, and of the ecclesiastical and civil relations in which they stood to the other sections of the community. I shall now endeavour to shew how far this expectation is justified by an examination of the Rig-veda.

It will be understood, from what I have already (pp. 7 and 11 ff.) written on the subject of that one hymn of the Rig-veda in which the
four castes are distinctly specified, i.e. the Purusha Sûkta, that in the enquiry, which I am now about to undertake, I confine myself in the first instance to those hymns which for any reason (see p. 4, above) appear to be the most ancient, leaving out of account until afterwards, all those compositions which, like the one just mentioned, are presumably of a later age.

It will, I think, be found on investigation that not only the older hymns, but the great bulk of the hymns, supply no distinct evidence of the existence of a well defined and developed caste-system at the time when they were composed.

SECT. I.—On the signification of the words brâhmân, brâhmaña, etc., in the Rig-veda.

As the Rig-veda Sanhitâ is made up almost entirely of hymns in praise of the gods, it was not to be anticipated that it should furnish any systematic or detailed explanations on the points which form the object of our enquiry. But as was natural in compositions of the early and simple age to which these hymns belong, they do not always confine themselves to matters strictly connected with their principal subject, but indulge in occasional references to the names, families, personal merits, qualifications, relations, circumstances, and fortunes of the poets by whom they were produced, or of their patrons or other contemporaries, or of their predecessors.

I have, in another volume of this work, enquired into the views which the authors of the hymns appear to have held on the subject of their own authorship. The conclusion at which I arrived was, that they did not in general look upon their compositions as divinely inspired, since they frequently speak of them as the productions of their own minds (vol. iii. pp. 128-140). But although this is most commonly the case (and especially, as we may conjecture, in regard to the older hymns), there is no doubt that they also attached a high value to these productions, which they describe as being acceptable to the gods (R.V. v. 45, 4; v. 85, 1; vii. 26, 1, 2; x. 23, 6; x. 54, 6; x. 105.
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8), whose activity they stimulated (iii. 34, 1; vii. 19, 11), and whose blessing they drew down. In some of the hymns a supernatural character or insight is claimed for the rishis (i. 179, 2; vii. 76, 4; iii. 53, 9; vii. 33, 11 ff.; vii. 87, 4; vii. 88, 3 ff.; x. 14, 15; x. 62, 4, 5), and a mysterious efficacy is ascribed to their compositions (vol. iii. pp. 173 f.) The rishis called their hymns by various names, as arka, uktha, riḥ, gir, dhī, nītha, nīvid, mantra, maṭi, sūkta, stoma, vāch, vachas, etc. etc.; and the also applied to them the appellation of brahma in numerous passages. 2 That in the passages in question brahma has generally the sense of hymn or prayer is clear from the context of some of them (as in i. 37, 4; viii. 32, 27, where the word is joined with the verb gāyata, "sing," and in vi. 69, 7, where the gods are supplicated to hear the brahma), as well as from the fact that the poets are said (in i. 62, 13; v. 73, 10; vii. 22, 9; vii. 31, 11; x. 80, 7) to have fashioned or generated the prayer, in the same way as they are said to have fashioned or generated hymns in other texts (as i. 109, 1; v. 2, 11; vii. 15, 4; viii. 77, 4; x. 23, 6; x. 39, 14), where the sense is indisputable; while in other places (iv. 16, 21; v. 29, 15; vi. 17, 13; vi. 50, 6; vii. 61, 6; x. 89, 3) new productions of the poets are spoken of under the appellation of brahma.

That brahma has the sense of hymn or prayer is also shown by the two following passages. In vii. 26, 1, it is said: Na somaḥ Indram asuto mamāda na abrahmaṇaḥ maghavānāṁ sutāsāḥ | tasmāi ukthāṁ janaye yaj yujoshad nyvad navishyaḥ śriṇavad yathā naḥ H 2. Uktthe ukthoe somaḥ Indram mamāda nīthe nīthe maghavānāṁ sutāsāḥ | yad iṁ sabādhaḥ pitarāṁ na putraḥ samāna-dakshāḥ avase havante H 7 14 "Soma unless poured out does not exhilarate Indra; nor do libations without hymns (abrahmaṇaḥ). I generate for him a hymn (uktha) which he will love, so that like a man he may hear our new (production). 2. At each hymn (uktha) the soma exhilarates Indra, at each psalm (nītha) the libations (exhilarate) Maghavat, when the worshippers united, with one effort, invoke him for help, as sons do a father." 3 Again in x. 105, 8, it is

2 For a list of these texts and other details which are here omitted, I refer to my article "On the relations of the priests to the other classes of Indian Society in the Vedic age," in the Journal of the Royal. As. Soc. for 1866 (from which this section is mostly borrowed).

3 It is clear from the context of this passage that abrahmaṇaḥ means "unattended by hymns," and not "without a priest." After saying that soma-libations without
said: *Ava no vri-jina śītī rīchā vanema anrīchāḥ | na abrahmā yajnah rīthag joshati tve |* "Drive away our calamities. With a hymn (rīchā) we may slay the men who are hymnless (anrīchāḥ). A sacrifice without prayer (abrahmā) does not please thee well."

I have said that great virtue is occasionally attributed by the poets to their hymns and prayers; and this is true of those sacred texts when called by the name of *brahma*, as well as when they receive other appellations, such as *mantra*. Thus it is said, iii. 53, 12, *Viśvāmitrasya rakshati brahma idam Bhārataṁ yanam | "This prayer (brahma) of Viśvāmitra protects the tribe of Bharata;" v. 40, 6, *Gulham sûryaṁ tanasā aparatena turiyena brahmaṇā avindad Atriḥ | "Atri with the fourth prayer (brahmaṇā) discovered the sun concealed by unholy darkness;" vi. 75, 19, *Brahma varma mama antaram | "Prayer (brahma) is my protecting armour;" vii. 33, 3, *Eva id nu kam dāsarājne Sudāsam prāvad Indro brahmaṇā vo Vasishṭhāḥ | "Indra preserved Sudās in the battle of the ten kings through your prayer, o Vasishṭhas." In ii. 23, 1, Brahmaṇaspati is said to be the "great king of prayers" (*jyeṣṭha-rajaṁ brahmaṇām*) (compare viii. 97, 3), and in verse 2, to be the "generator of prayers" (*janitā brahmaṇām*); whilst in x. 61, 7, prayer is declared to have been generated by the gods (*svādhyo ajanayan brahma devaḥ*). Compare vii. 35, 7.

*Brāhmaṇā* in the masculine is no doubt derived from the same root as *brāhmaṇā* neuter, and though differing from it in accent as well as gender, must be presumed to be closely connected with it in signification, just as the English "prayer" in the sense of a petition would be with "prayer," a petitioner, if the word were used in the latter sense. As, then, *brāhmaṇā* in the neuter means a hymn or prayer, *brāhmaṇā* in the masculine must naturally be taken to denote the person who composes or repeats a hymn or prayer. We do not, however, find that the composers of the hymns are in general designated by the word.*

hymns are unacceptable to Indra, the poet does not add that he is himself a *priest*, or that he is attended by one, but that he generates a hymn; and the same sense is required by what follows in the second verse. Accordingly we find that Śāyaṇa explains *abrahmāṇaḥ* by *stotra-hīnāḥ," destitute of hymns." The same sense is equally appropriate in the next passage cited, x. 105, 8. On iv. 16, 9, where *abrahmā* is an epithet of *dasyu* "demon," Śāyaṇa understands it to mean "without a priest," but it may mean equally well or better, "without devotion, or prayer."*4* In *brāhmaṇā* neuter the accent is on the first syllable; in *brāhmaṇā* masculine on the last.
brāhmāṇ, the name most commonly applied to them being rishi, though they are also called vipra, vedhas, kavi, etc. (see vol. iii. of this work, pp. 116 ff.). There are, however, a few texts, such as i. 80, 1; i. 164, 35; ii. 12, 6; ii. 39, 1; v. 31, 4; v. 40, 8; ix. 113, 6, etc., in which the brāhmāṇ may or must be understood as referred to in the capacity of author of the hymn he utters. So, too, in ii. 20, 4, and vi. 21, 8, a new composer of hymns seems to be spoken of under the appellation of nutānasya brāhmāṇyataḥ; and in ii. 19, 8, the Gṛtsamadās are referred to both as the fabricators of a new hymn (mauma navīyaḥ) and as (brāhmāṇyāntaḥ) performing devotion. In three passages, vii. 28, 2; vii. 70, 5, and x. 89, 16, the brāhmā and brāhmāṇi, “prayer” and “prayers,” or “hymn,” and “hymns,” of the rishis are spoken of; and in vii. 22, 9, it is said, “that both the ancient and the recent rishis have generated prayers” (ye cha pūrve rishayo ye cha nūtnāḥ Indra brahmāṇi janayanta viprāḥ). In i. 177, 5, we find brahmāṇi kāroḥ, “the prayers of the poet.” The fact that in various hymns the authors speak of themselves as having received valuable gifts from the princes their patrons, and that they do not there allude to any class of officiating priests as separate from themselves, would also seem to indicate an identity of the poet and priest at that early period.

The term brahman must therefore, as we may conclude, have been originally applied (1) to the same persons who are spoken of elsewhere in the hymns as rishi, kavi, etc., and have denoted devout worshippers and contemplative sages who composed prayers and hymns which they themselves recited in praise of the gods. Afterwards when the ceremonial gradually became more complicated, and a division of sacred functions took place, the word was more ordinarily employed (2) for a minister of public worship, and at length came to signify (3) one particular kind of priest with special duties. I subjoin a translation of the different passages in which the word occurs in the Rig-veda, and I have attempted to classify them according as it seems to bear, in each case, the first, second, or third of the senses just indicated. This, however, is not always an easy task, as in many of these texts there is nothing to fix the meaning of the term with precision, and one signi-

6 In another place (x. 96, 5) Indra is said to have been lauded by former worshippers, pūrvedhīr gājadhānīḥ, a term usually confined (as brāhmāṇ was frequently applied) in after times to the offerers of sacrifice.
fication easily runs into another, and the same person may be at once the
author and the reciter of the hymn.

I. Passages in which brāhmān may signify “contemplator, sage, or
poet.”

(In all these texts I shall leave the word untranslated.)

i. 80, 1. Ītā hi some id made brāhmaṇa cakāra vardāhanam ।

“Thus in his exhilaration from soma juice the brāhmaṇa has made
(or uttered) a magnifying (hymn).”

i. 164, 34. Priyāhām tvā param antam prithivyāḥ prīchāhām yatra
bhuvanasya nābhīḥ | prīchāhām tvā vrīshno avasya retaḥ prīchāhām
vācāhāḥ pūramaṇaḥ vyoma । 35. Iyāṁ vedih paro antaḥ prithivyāḥ ayaṁ
yajno bhuvanasya nābhīḥ ayaṁ somo vrīshno avasya reta brahmann ayaṁ
vācāhāḥ paramaṁ vyoma ।

“I ask thee (what is) the remotest end of the earth; I ask where is
the central point of the world; I ask thee (what is) the seed of the
vigorous horse; I ask (what is) the highest heaven of speech. 35.
This altar is the remotest end of the earth; this sacrifice is the central
point of the world; this soma is the seed of the vigorous horse; this
brāhmaṇa is the highest heaven of speech.”

ii. 12, 6. Yo vadhrasya chodita yaḥ kṛīsasya yo brahmaṇo nādhamā-
nasya kīrth ।

“He (Indra) who is the quickener of the sluggish, of the emaciated,
of the suppliant brāhmaṇa who praises him,” etc.

vi. 45, 7. Brahmaṇam brahma-vāhasam gīrbhiḥ sakhāyaṁ rīgmiyam ।
gāṁ na dohasa huce ।

“With hymns I call Indra, the brāhmaṇa,—the carrier of prayers
(brāhmaṇa-vāhasam), the friend who is worthy of praise,—as men do a
cow which is to be milked.”

vii. 33, 11. Uta asi Maitrāvaruṇo Vasishṭha Urvāśyāḥ brahman manaso
‘dhi jātaḥ । draptors skannam brahmanā daivyena viśve devāḥ pushkara
tvā ’dadanta ।

“And thou, o Vasishṭha, art a son of Mitra and Varuṇa (or a Ma-
trāvaruṇa-priest), born, o brāhmaṇa, from the soul of Urvāśi. All the

6 Vardāhanām = yuddhi-karaṇa stotram (Sāyaṇa).
7 Compare R.V. iii. 32, 10; x. 109, 4, below, and the words, the highest heaven of
invention.”
8 Compare R.V. x. 71 and x. 125.
ACCORDING TO THE RIG- AND ATHARVA-VEDAS.

gods placed in the vessel thee, the drop which had fallen through
divine contemplation.”

viii. 16, 7. Indro brahma Indraḥ rishir Indraḥ puru puruhutaḥ | ma-
hān mahībhīḥ saclībhīḥ |

“Indra is a brāhmān, Indra is a rishi,” Indra is much and often in-
voked, great through his mighty powers.”

x. 71, 11. (See the translation of the entire hymn below. The sense of
brāhmān in verse 11 will depend on the meaning assigned to jāta-
vidyā.)

x. 77, 1. (In this passage, the sense of which is not very clear, the
word brāhmān appears to be an epithet of the host of Maruts.)

x. 85, 3. Somam manyate pāpivān yat sampiṁshanti oshādhiṁ | somāṁ
yam brahmāno viḍūr na tasya aśnāti kuschna | 16. Dve te chakre Śūrye
brahmāno pituthā viḍūḥ | atha ekāṁ chakraṁ yad guhā tad addhātayāḥ
id viḍūḥ | 34. ... Śūryāṁ yo brahmā viḍyāt sa iś vādhyam
arhati |

“A man thinks he has drunk soma when they crush the plant (so
called). But no one tastes of that which the brāhmān know to be
soma (the moon). 16. The brāhmāns rightly know, Śūryā, that thou
hast two wheels; but it is sages (addhātayaḥ) alone who know the one
wheel which is hidden. 34. The brāhmān who knows Śūryā deserves
the bride’s garment.”

x. 107, 6. Tam eva rishīṁ tam u brahmāṇam āhur yajnanyāṁ sāma-gām
uktha-saśam | sa śukrasya tanvo veda tisraḥ yaḥ prathamo daksinaya
rārādha |

“They call him a rishi, him a brāhmān, reverend, a chanter of
Sāma verses (sāma-gām), and reciter of ukthas,—he knows the three
forms of the brilliant (Agni)—the man who first worshipped with a
largess.”

Even in later times a man belonging to the Kshattriya and Vaisya
castes may perform all the Vedic rites. Any such person, therefore,
and consequently a person not a Brāhman might, according to this
verse, have been called, though, no doubt, figuratively, a priest
(brahma).

9 Different deities are called rishi, kavi, etc., in the following texts: v. 29, 1; vi.
14, 2; viii. 6, 41; ix. 96, 18; ix. 107, 7; x. 27, 22; x. 112, 9.
x. 117, 7. . . . Vađan brahma avadato vaniyān priñann āpir aprīnan-
tam abhi syāt |
| "A brāhmaṇ 11 who speaks is more acceptable than one who does not
speak: a friend who is liberal excels one who is illiberal." 12
x. 125, 5. Yaṁ kāmaye taṁ tam ugraṁ kriñomi tam brahmaṇaṁ tam
rishiṁ tam sumedāham |
| "I (says Vāch) make him whom I love formidable, him a brahmaṇ,
him a rishi, him a sage."

This would seem to prove that sometimes, at least, the brāhmaṇ was
such not by birth or nature, but by special favour and inspiration of
the goddess. In this passage, therefore, the word cannot denote the
member of a caste, who would not be dependent on the good will of
Vāch for his position.

II. In the passages which follow the word brāhmaṇ does not seem to
signify so much a "sage or poet," as a "worshipper or priest."

i. 10, 1. Gāyanti tvā gāyatraṅgo archanti arkam arkiṇaḥ | brahmaṇaṁ
tvā S'atākroto uḍ vaṁśam iva yemirā |
| "The singers sing thee, the hymners recite a hymn, the brāhmaṇs,
o Sātākrau, have raised thee up like a pole." 13
i. 33, 9. Amanyamāṇān abhi manyamānair nir brahmaḥbhir adhamo
dasyum Indra |
| "Thou, Indra, with the believers, didst blow against the unbelievers,
with the brāhmaṇs thou didst blow away the Dasyu." 14
i. 101, 5. Yo viśvasya jagataḥ prānatas patir yo brahmaṇs prathamo
gah avindat | Indro yo dasyaṁ adharaṁ avātirat . . .
| "Indra, who is lord of all that moves and breathes, who first found
the cows for the brāhmaṇ, who hurled down the Dasyu." 15
i. 108, 7. Yaḍ Inārāṇi madathaṁ see durone yad brahmaṇi rājani vā
yajatra | ataḥ pari vrishnave ā hi yātām athā somasya pībataṁ sustaya |
| "When, o adorable Indra and Agni, ye are exhilarated in your own

11 The word here seems clearly to indicate an order or profession, as the silent
priest is still a priest.
12 See Dr. Haug's remark on this verse, Ait. Br. Intro. p. 20. The contexts of
the two last passages are given in my article "Miscellaneous Hymns from the R. and
13 Compare i. 5, 8; i. 7, 1; viii. 16, 9. See Dr. Haug's remark on this verse,
14 See on this verse the remarks of M. Bréal, Hercule et Cacus, etc. p. 152.
abode, or with a brähmān or a rājan, as come thence, ye vigorous (deities), and then drink of the poured out soma."

i. 158, 6. Dirghatamaḥ Mamateyo jujurvān dasame yuge | apām artham yatiyām brahmā bhavati sārathiḥ |

"Dirghatamas, son of Mamata, being decrepit in his tenth lustre, (though) a brähmān, becomes the charioteer of (or is borne upon) the waters which are hastening to their goal."

(Professor Aufrecht understands this to mean that Dirghatamas is verging towards his end, and thinks there is a play on the word "charioteer" as an employment not befitting a priest.)

ii. 39, 1. . . . Gṛihṛa iva vrikṣaṁ nīdhamantam acha | brahmāṇā iva vidathe ukthaśūṣā . . . | "Ye (Aśvins) (cry) like two vultures on a tree which contains their nest; like two brähmāns singing a hymn at a sacrifice."

iv. 50, 7. Sa iva pratījanyāni viśva sūshmena tathāv abhi viryena | Brīhaspatiṁ yaḥ subhratām bibharti valgāyati vandate pūrva-bhājam | 8. Sa it kaheti sudhitaṁ okasi sve tasmai iḷa pīvate visavadānim | tasmai viśaṁ svayam eva namante yasmin brahmā rājani pūrvaḥ eti | 9. Apraṭīto iṣayati sam dhanāni pratījanyāni uta yā sajanyā | avasyave yo varvaḥ kriṇoti brahmāṁ rājā tam avanti devaḥ |

"That king overcomes all hostile powers in force and valour who maintains Brīhaspati in abundance, who praises and magnifies him as (a deity) enjoying the first distinction. He dwells prosperous in his own palace, to him the earth always yields her increase, to him the"
people bow down of themselves,—that king in whose house a brāhmān walks first. 9. Unrivalled, he conquers the riches both of his enemies and his kinsmen—the gods preserve the king who bestows wealth on the brāhmān who asks his assistance.”

iv. 58, 2. Vayaṁ nāma pra bravāma ghritasya asmin yajne dhārayāma namobhiḥ | upo brahmā śrinavat śasyamānaṁ chatuḥ-śringo avanīd gau- raḥ etat |

“Let us proclaim the name of butter; let us at this sacrifice hold it (in mind) with prostrations. May the brāhmān (Agni?) hear the praise which is chanted. The four-horned bright-coloured (god) has sent this forth.”

v. 29, 3. Utā brahmāṇo Maruto me asya Indraḥ somasya sushutasya peyāḥ |

“And, ye Maruts, brāhmāns, may Indra drink of this my soma which has been poured out,” etc.

v. 31, 4. Anavas te ratham aśvāya taksāḥ Tvāṣṭro vaṁjam puruhūta dyumantam | brahmāṇaḥ Indram mahayanto arkair avardāhayann Ahaye hantavai u |

“The men have fashioned a car for thy (Indra’s) horse, and Tvāṣṭrī a gleaming thunderbolt, o god greatly invoked. The brāhmāns, magnifying Indra, have strengthened him for the slaughter of Ahi.”

v. 32, 12. Evaḥ hi tvāṁ rituthā yātayantam magḥa viprebhyo daḍataṁ śṛiṇomi | kiṁ te brahmāṇo grihate sakhāyo ye tvāyāḥ nidadhuḥ kāmam Indra |

“I hear of thee thus rightly prospering, and bestowing wealth on, the sages (viprebhayāḥ). What, o Indra, do the brāhmāns, thy friends, who have reposed their wishes on thee, obtain?”

v. 40, 8. Grāvno brahmā yuyujānaḥ saparyan kirīṇā devān namasa upaśikshan | Atrīḥ sūryasya divi chakshur ā adhāt Svarēhanor apa māyāḥ aghukṣant |

“Applying the stones (for pressing soma), performing worship, honouring the gods with praise and obeisance, the brāhmān Atri placed

18 Compare viii. 69, 4; x. 39, 11; x. 107, 5; and the word purohita, used of a ministering priest as one placed in front. Prof. Aufrecht, however, would translate the last words, “under whose rule the priest receives the first or principal portion.”


20 Are the Ribhus intended?
the eye of the sun in the sky, and swept away the magical arts of
Swarbhanu."

vii. 7, 5. Asādi vrito vahnir ajaganvān Agnir brahmā nri-shadane
vidhartya |

"The chosen bearer (of oblations), Agni, the brāhmān, having arrived,
has sat down in a mortal's abode, the Upholder."

vii. 42, 1. Pra brahmāno Angiraso nakshanta |

"The brāhmāns, the Angirases, have arrived," etc.

viii. 7, 20. Kva nūnāṁ sudānava mañathā vrika-bahrīsah | brahmā
ko vaḥ saparyati |

"Where now, bountiful (Maruts), are ye exhilarated, with the sacrifi-
cial grass spread beneath you? What brāhmān is serving you?"

viii. 17, 2. Ā tvā brahma-yujā hari vahatāṁ Indra keśinā | upa brah-
māni naḥ śrīnu | 3. Brahmānas tvā vayaṁ yujā somapāṁ Indra somināḥ |
sutavanto havāmahe |

"Thy tawny steeds with flowing manes, yoked by prayer (brahma-
yujā), bring thee hither, Indra; listen to our prayers (brāhmāni). 3.
We brāhmāns, offerers of soma, bringing oblations, continuously invoke
the drinker of soma."

viii. 31, 1. Yo yajāti yajāte it sunavach cha pachāti cha | brahmā id
Indrasya chākanat |

"That brāhmān is beloved of Indra who worships, sacrifices, pours
out libations, and cooks offerings."

viii. 32, 16. Na nūnāṁ brahmaṇāṁ piṇam prāśūnāṁ aṣṭi sunvātāṁ | na soma apratā pape |

"There is not now any debt due by the active brāhmāns who pour
out libations. Soma has not been drunk without an equivalent."

viii. 33, 19. Aḍhāḥ paśyasva mā upari santaram pāda kau haya | mā
te kasa-plakau dhiśan strī hi brahmā babhūvitha |

"Look downward, not upward; keep thy feet close together; let
them not see those parts which should be covered; thou, a brāhmān,
hast become a woman."

viii. 45, 39. Ā te etā vacho-yujā hari grihyām sumadrathā | yad īm
brahmabhyaḥ id dadaḥ |

21 Compare viii. 45, 39, below: brahma-yujā occurs also in i. 177, 2; iii. 35, 4;
viii. 1, 24; viii. 2, 27.
"I seize these thy tawny steeds, yoked by our hymn (vacho-yuṣṭa) to a splendid chariot, since thou didst give (wealth) to the brāhmaṇa.

viii. 53, 7. Kva sya vṛṣabho yuvā tuvi-grīvo anānataḥ brahmaḥ kastam saparyati |

"Where is that vigorous, youthful, large-necked, unconquered (Indra)?

viii. 66, 5. Abhi Gandharvam atriṇaḥ abudhneshu rajasse ā Indro brahamabhiyaḥ id evirāhe |

"Indra clove the Gandharva in the bottomless mists, for the prosperity of the brāhmaṇa."

viii. 81, 30. Mo su brahmaḥ iva tandrayur bhuvovājānāṃ pate | matsva sutasya gomataḥ |

"Be not, o lord of riches (Indra), sluggish like a brāhmaṇa." 23 Be exhilarated by the libation mixed with milk."

viii. 85, 5. Ā yad vajram bāhver Indra dhatse mada-chyatam Ahave hantavai u pra parvatāh anavanta pra brahmaṇo abhinakshanta Indram |

"When, Indra, thou seizest in thine arms the thunderbolt which brings down pride, in order to slay Ahi, the (aerial) hills and the cows utter their voice, and the brāhmaṇs draw near to thee."

ix. 96, 6. Brahma devānāṁ padavih kavināṁ rishir viprānāṁ mahisho mrigānāṁ | syeno gridhranāṁ svadhitir vanānāṁ somāḥ pavitram ati eti vishin |

"Soma, resounding, overflows the filter, he who is a brāhmaṇ among the gods, a leader among poets, a rishi among the wise, a buffalo among wild beasts, a falcon among kites, an axe among the woods."

ix. 112, 1. Nānānāṁ vai u no dhiyo'vi vratāni janānām | takṣaḥ rishṭaṁ rutsam bhishag brahmaṁ suvantam ichhati. |

"Various are the thoughts and endeavours of us different men. The carpenter seeks something broken, the doctor a patient, the brāhmaṇ some one to offer libations." 24

22 Compare viii. 87, 9, yuvanti hariḥ ishirasya gathaḥ urau rathe uruyuge | Indra-vahā vachoṣṭaḥ ; i. 7, 2, vachoṣṭaḥ ; i. 14, 6, manoyuṣṭa ; vi. 49, 5, rathe . . . manasi yuṣṭaḥ.

23 Dr. Haug (Introdt. to Ait. Br. p. 20) refers to Ait. Br. v. 34, as illustrating this reproof. See p. 376 of his translation. This verse clearly shows that the priests formed a professional body.

24 This verse also distinctly proves that the priesthood already formed a profession. Verse 3 of the same hymn is as follows: "I am a poet, my father a physician, my
ix. 113, 6. Yatra brahmā pavamāna chhandasyāṁ vāchaṁ vadan |
grāvṛā some mahiyate somena ānandāṁ janayann Indrāya Indo pari |
svaṇa |

“O pure Soma, in the place where the brāhmān, uttering a metrical hymn, is exalted at the soma sacrifice through (the sound of) the crushing-stone, producing pleasure with soma, o Indu (Soma) flow for Indra.”

x. 28, 11. Tebhhyo godhā ayathāṁ kareḥ etad ye brahmaṇaḥ pratīpi-
yanti annaiḥ | simi ukṣaṇaḥ avaspiṣṭān adanti svayam balāni tanvaḥ |
śrīnāṇaḥ | (The word brahmaṇaḥ occurs in this verse, but I am unable |
to offer any translation, as the sense is not clear.)

x. 71, 11. (See translation of this verse below, where the entire hymn is given.)

x. 85, 29. Parā dehi śāmulyam brahmabhya vi bhaja vasu | . . . 35. |
Śūrīyāḥ paśya rāpāṇi tāni brahmā tu śūndhati |

“Put away that which requires expiation (?). Distribute money to |
the brāhmān. . . 35. Behold the forms of Śūrīyā. But the brāhmān |
purifies them.”

x. 141, 3. Somaṁ rājānam avase Agniṁ gīrbhir havāmahe | Adityān |
Vishnuṁ Śūryam brahmāṇaṁ cha Bṛhhaspatim |

“With hymns we invoke to our aid king Soma, Agni, the Adityas, |
Vishnu, Śūrya, and Bṛhhaspate, the brāhmān.”

III. In the following passages the word brāhmān appears to designate |
the special class of priest so called, in contradistinction to hotri, udgātri, |
and adhvaryu.

ii. 1, 2 (= x. 91, 10). Tava Agne hotraṁ tava potram rīviyaṁ tava |
neshtaṁ tvam īd agnih pīṭaṁ rava | tava praśāstraṁ tvam adhārīyaṁ |
brhāma cha asi grihapatiś cha no dame | 2. Tvam Agne Indro virahabhaḥ |
satān asi tvam Vishnu urugyō namasyaḥ | tvam brahmā rayivid Bṛha- |
manaspaṭe tvam vidhartaḥ sachase purandhyā |

“Thine, Agni, is the office of hotri, thine the regulated function of |
potri, thine the office of neshtri, thou art the agnih of the pious man, |
thine is the function of praśāstri, thou actest as adhvaryu, thou art the |
brāhmān, and the lord of the house in our abode. 2. Thou, Agni, art |
Indra, the chief of the holy, thou art Vishnu, the wide-stepping, the |
mother a grinder of corn” (kārur aham tato bhisag upala-prakṣhini nānas). Unfortunately there is nothing further said which could throw light on the relations in which the different professions and classes of society stood to each other.
adorable, thou, o Brahmaṇaṇaspati, art the brāhmaṇ, the possessor of wealth, thou, o sustainer, art associated with the ceremonial.”

iv. 9, 3. Sa sadma pari niyate hota mandro diviṣṭiṣhuh | uta pota ni shidati | 4. Uta gnā Agnir adhvare uta grihapatir dame | uta brahma ni shidati |

“He (Agni) is led round the house, a joyous hotṛi at the ceremonies, and sits a potṛi. 4. And Agni is a wife (i.e. a mistress of the house) at the sacrifice, and the master of the house in our abode, and he sits a brāhmaṇ.”

x. 52, 2. Aham hota ni asīdam yajīyān vīśve devāh maruto mā jumanti | ahar ahar Ásvina adhvaryavām vām brahmaṃ samī bhavati sā ahutīr vām |

(Agni says) “I have sat down an adorable hotṛi; all the gods, the Maruts, stimulate me. Day by day, ye Ásvins, I have acted as your adhvaryu; the brāhmaṇ is he who kindles the fire: this is your invocation.”

I shall now bring forward the whole of the texts in which the word brāhmaṇa- which, no doubt, originally meant a son, or descendant, of a brāhmaṇ, occurs in the Rig-veda. They are the following:

i. 164, 45. Chatvāri vāk parimitā padāni tāni vidūr brāhmanāḥ ye manishinaḥ | guhā trini nihitā na ingayanti turiyam vāko manushyaḥ vadanti |

“Speech consists of four defined grades. These are known by those brāhmans who are wise. They do not reveal the three which are esoteric. Men speak the fourth grade of speech.”

This text is quoted and commented upon in Nirukta xiii. 9.

vi. 75, 10. Brāhmanāsaḥ pitaraḥ somyāsaḥ śive no dyāvā-prthiivi ane-hasā | Pūsha naḥ pātu duritād rītāvridhāḥ . . . . |

“May the brāhmaṇ fathers, drinkers of soma, may the auspicious, the sinless, heaven and earth, may Pūshan, preserve us, who prosper by righteousness, from evil, etc.”

25 There are two more texts in which the word brāhman is found, viz. i. 15, 5, and ii. 36, 5, on which see the following note. The word brāhmaputra (compare Áśv. S’. S. ii. 18, 13) “son of a brahman,” is found in ii. 43, 2: Udgātā iva śakunō śama gīyası brāhman-putraḥ iva savaneshu āśvesı | “Thou, o bird, singest a śama verse like an udgātri; thou singest praises like the son of a brāhmaṇ at the libations.” (Ind. Stud. ix. 342 ff.) Vīpa, used in later Sanskrit as synonymous with Brāhman, has in the R.V. the sense of “wise,” “sage” assigned by Nigh. 3, 16 (≡medhāvī-nāma), and in Nir. 10, 19, ≡medhāvinaḥ. It is often applied as an epithet to the gods.
vii. 103, 1 (= Nirukta 9, 6). Saṁvatsaraṁ ṣāsayānāḥ brāhmaṇāḥ \textit{erata-charināḥ} | vācham Parjanya-jinvitām pra maṇḍukāḥ avādishuḥ . . . . | 7. Brāhmaṇāsō atiśṭre na some sarva na pūrṇam abhito vadan-
taḥ | saṁvatsaraśya tad ahaṁ pari śthā yaḥ maṇḍukāḥ prācṛtiṁ
babbhuva | 8. Brāhmaṇāsāḥ somino vācham akṛta brahma kriñvantaḥ
parivastarīnām | adhvaryavo ghormiṇāḥ sishvāṇāḥ āvīr bhavanti guhyā
na ke chīt |

"After lying quiet for a year, those rite-fulfilling brāhmaṇas\(^{26}\) the
frogs have (now) uttered their voice, which has been inspired by Par-
janya . . . . 7. Like brāhmaṇas at the Atiśṭra soma rite, like (those
brāhmaṇas) speaking round about the full pond (or soma-bowl\(^{27}\)), you,
frogs, surround (the pond) on this day of the year, which is that of the
autumnal rains. 8. These soma-offering brāhmaṇas (the frogs) have
uttered their voice, performing their annual devotion (brahma); these
adhvaryu priests sweating with their boiled oblations (or in the hot
season) come forth from their retreats like persons who have been
concealed."

x. 16, 6. \textit{Yat te kṛishṇaṁ sakunāḥ śūyanto pipīlaḥ sarpaḥ uta va śvā-
vādaḥ} | Agnis tad viśvād agadān karotu Somaḥ cha yo brāhmaṇāṁ āviveśa |

"Whatever part of thee any black bird, or ant, or serpent, or wild
beast has mutilated, may Agni cure thee of all that, and Soma who has
entered into the brāhmaṇa.\(^{28}\)"

\(^{26}\) In the Nighantu, iii. 13, these words \textit{brāhmaṇāḥ erata-charināḥ} are referred to
as conveying the sense of a simile, though they are unaccompanied by a particle of
similitude. In his Illustrations of the Nirukta, p. 126, Roth thus remarks on this
passage: "This is the only place in the first nine mandalas of the R.V. in which the
word Brāhmaṇa is found with its later sense, whilst the tenth mandala offers a number
of instances. This is one of the proofs that many of the hymns in this book were com-
posed considerably later (than the rest of the R.V.). The word \textit{brāhmaṇa} has another
signification in i. 15, 5; ii. 38, 5; and vi. 75, 10." (In the first of these texts, Roth
assigns to the word the sense of the Brāhmaṇa's soma-vessel. See his Lexicon, \textit{e.v.}
It does not appear what meaning he would give to the word in vi. 75, 10. He has in
this passage overlooked R.V. i. 164, 45, which, however, is duly adduced in his Lexicon).
See Wilson's translation of the hymn; as also Müller's, in his Anc. Sansk.
Lit. p. 494 f.

\(^{27}\) \textit{Saras}. See R.V. viii. 66, 4, quoted in Nirukta, v. 11, where Yāśaka says, "The
ritualists inform us that at the mid-day oblation there are thirty \textit{uktha} platters
destined for one deity, which are then drunk at one draught. These are here called
\textit{saras}." (Compare Roth's Illustrations on the passage. See also R.V. vi. 17, 11, and
viii. 7, 10, with Sāyaṇa's explanations of all three passages).

\(^{28}\) Compare A.V. vii. 115, 1 f.; xii. 5, 6.
29 I cannot pretend that I am satisfied with some parts of the translation I have attempted of this very difficult hymn; but I give it such as it is, as the interpretation of the Vedic poems is still to a certain extent tentative. Verses 4 and 6 are explained in Sayaya's Introduction to the Rig-veda, pp. 30 f. of Müller's edition. I am indebted here, as elsewhere, to Prof. Aufrecht for his suggestions.

30 I quote here, as somewhat akin to this hymn, another from the A.V. vi. 108, being a prayer for wisdom or intelligence: 1. Tvaṁ na medhe prathamā gobbhir asvebhīr ā gahi | tvamā sūryasya raśmibhīs tvaṁ na asi yajnīyā | 2. Medhām aham prathamām
the track of speech, and found her entered into the rishis. Taking, they divided her into many parts: the seven poets celebrate her in concert. 4. And one man, seeing, sees not speech, and another, hearing, hears her not; while to a third she discloses her form, as a loving well-dressed wife does to her husband. 5. They say that one man has a sure defence in (her) friendship; he is not overcome even in the conflicts (of discussion). But that person consorts with a barren delusion who has listened to speech without fruit or flower. 6. He who abandons a friend who appreciates friendship, has no portion whatever in speech. All that he hears, he hears in vain, for he knows not the path of righteousness. 7. Friends gifted both with eyes and ears have proved unequal in mental efforts. Some have been (as waters) reaching to the face or armpit, while others have been seen like ponds in which one might bathe. 8. When brahmans who are friends strive (?) together in efforts of the mind produced by the heart, they leave one man behind through their acquirements, whilst others walk about boasting to be brahmans. (This is the sense Professor Aufrecht suggests for the word ohabrāhmāṇaḥ. Professor Roth s.v. thinks it may mean "real priests." The author of Nirukta xiii. 13, explains it as meaning "reasoning priests," or "those of whom reasoning is the sacred science.") 9. The men who range neither near nor far, who are neither (reflecting) brahmans nor yet pious worshippers at libations,—these, having acquired speech, frame their web imperfectly, (like) female

brāhmaṇantaṁ brahma-jñāte pishishtuṁ | prapītāṁ brahmachāriḥ sīrīḥ devānāṁ avase huva | 3. Yām medhāṁ Ribhavo vidur yām medhāṁ asūrīḥ viduh | rishayo bhadrīṁ medhāṁ yāṁ vidus tāṁ mayy ā vesāyāmasi | 4. Yām rishayo bhūta-kriyo medhāṁ medhāvino viduh | tayā māṁ adya medhaye āgno medhāvināṁ kriya | 5. Medhāṁ sūyam medhāṁ prātar medhāṁ madhyandinam pari medhāṁ sūryasya rāmābhir vachasā"vesa-gāmahe 1. "Come to us, wisdom, the first, with cows and horses; (come) thou with the rays of the sun; thou art to us an object of worship. 2. To (obtain) the succour of the gods, I invoke wisdom the first, full of prayer, inspired by prayer, praised by rishis, imbued by Brahmachārins. 3. We introduce within me that wisdom which Ribhus know, that wisdom which divine beings (asūrīḥ) know, that excellent wisdom which rishis know. 4. Make me, o Agni, wise to-day with that wisdom which the wise rishis—the makers of things existing—know. 5. We introduce wisdom in the evening, wisdom in the morning, wisdom at noon, wisdom with the rays of the sun, and with speech " (vachasā). Regarding the rishayo bhūta-kriyo see above, p. 37, note.

31 Compare x. 125, 3; i. 164, 45; (x. 30, 11); and A.V. xii. 1, 45.
32 Compare Isaiah vi. 9, 10; and St. Matthew xiii. 14, 15.
33 Viś-sakhyā, Yāska.
34 Compare i. 171, 2; ii. 35, 2; vi. 16, 47.
weavers,\textsuperscript{25} being destitute of skill. 10. All friends rejoice at the arrival of a renowned friend who rules the assembly; for such a one, repelling evil, and bestowing nourishment upon them, is thoroughly prepared for the conflict (of discussion). 11. One man possesses a store of verses (richām); a second sings a hymn (gāyatra) during (the chanting of) the ṭakvaris; one who is a brāhmān declares the science of being (jātā-vidyām), whilst another prescribes the order of the ceremonial.\textsuperscript{26}

R.V. x. 88, 19 (= Nir. vii. 31). Yāvan-mātram uṣhasa no pratikāṁ suparnyo vasate Mātariśvāḥ | tācād dadhāti uṣa yajnam ayan brāhmaṇo hotur avaro niṣhitān |

“As long as the fair-winged Dawns do not array themselves in light, o Mātariśvan, so long the brāhmaṇ coming to the sacrifice, keeps (the fire), sitting below the hotṛ-priest.”

(See Professor Roth’s translation of this verse in his Illustrations of the Nirukta, p. 113).

x. 90, 11 (= A.V. xix. 5, 6; Vaj. S. xxxi.). See above, pp. 8–15.

x. 97, 22. Oshadhaṁ saṁśivadante Somena saha rājña | yasmai kriṇoti brāhmaṇas taṁ rājan parayāmasi |

“The plants converse with king Soma,\textsuperscript{27} (and say), for whomsoever a brāhmaṇ acts (kriṇott, officiates), him, o king, we deliver.”

x. 109, 1. Te 'vadān prathamāh brahma-kilbishe akūpāraḥ salilo Mātariśvāḥ | viśhurās tapa ugro mayobhūr āpo devir prathamajāṁ ritenā | Soma rājā pratham obrahma-jāyaṁ punaḥ prāyachadh ahrīnityamānāḥ | anvartita Varno Mitraḥ āstā Āgnir hota hastagrihyā tināya | 3. Hastena eva grāhyah ādhir asyāh “brahma-jāya iyam” iti cha id avochan | na dūtaya prakṣe tasthe esā tathā rāṣṭram gupitāṁ kṣattriyasya | 4. Devāḥ etasyām avadanta pūrve sapta rishayas tapase ye nisheduḥ | bhīma jāya brāhmaṇasya upanīthā durāhaṁ dadhāti parame vyoman |

\textsuperscript{25} Such is the sense which Prof. Aufrecht thinks may, with probability, be assigned to sīrī, a word which occurs only here.

\textsuperscript{26} According to Yāska (Nir. i. 8), these four persons are respectively the hotri, udgātri, brahman, and adhvarṣyu priests. The brahman, he says, being possessed of all science, ought to know everything; and gives utterance to his knowledge as occasion arises for it (jāte jāte). See Dr. Haug’s remarks on this verse, Ait. Br. Introd. p. 20.

\textsuperscript{27} Compare oshadhaḥ Soma-rājñaḥ, “the plants whose king is Soma,” in verses 18 and 19 of this hymn.
5. Brahmachāri charati vevishad viśhāḥ sa devānām bhavati ekam angam |
tena jāyām avo avindow Bṛihspatidh Somena nitām jhuvaṁ na devāḥ |
6. Punar vai devāḥ adaduḥ punar manushyāḥ uta | rājanaḥ satyamā |
 kriyānāḥ brāhma-jāyām punar daduḥ | 7. Punardāya brāhma-jāyām kriyāt devair nikilbisham | ājraṁ prithivyāḥ bhaktvāya urugāyam upāsate |

"These (deities), the boundless, liquid Mātariśvan (Air), the fiercely-
flaming, ardently-burning, beneficent (Fire), and the divine primeval
Waters, first through righteousness exclaimed against the outrage on
a brāhmān. 2. King Soma, unenvious, first gave back the brāhmān's
wife; Varuṇa and Mitra were the invaders; Agni, the invoker, brought
her, taking her hand. 3. When restored, she had to be received back
by the hand, and they then proclaimed aloud, 'This is the brāhmān's
wife;' she was not committed to a messenger to be sent:—in this way
it is that the kingdom of a ruler (or Kshatriya) remains secured to
him. 4. Those ancient deities, the Rishis, who sat down to perform
austerities, spoke thus of her, 'Terrible is the wife of the brāhmān;
when approached, she plants confusion in the highest heaven.
5. The Brahmachārin (religious student) continues to perform observances.
He becomes one member of the gods. Through him Bṛihspati obtained
his wife, as the gods obtained the ladle which was brought by Soma.
6. The gods gave her back, and men gave her back; kings, performing
righteousness, gave back the brāhmān's wife. 7. Giving back the brāhmān's
wife, delivering themselves from sin against the gods, (these kings)
enjoy the abundance of the earth, and possess a free range of
movement."

35 Compare R.V. xvi. 85, 39 ff. (=A.V. xiv. 2, 2 ff.) Punah patnām Agnir adūd
āyushā saha varehasā | dīrgāhyur asyāḥ yāḥ patir jīvati saradāḥ satam | 40. Somāh
prathamā vivide Gandharvā vivide uttarāḥ (the A.V. reads: Somasyā jāyā prathamān
Gandharvas te 'pavrāḥ patiḥ) | trítiyo Agnīsh te patis turīyas te manushyāḥ | Somo
dadad Gandhirvāya Gandharve dadad Agnye | roṣṭāḥ cha putrāns cānā Ṛṣṇi
mahyam atho śrīmān | "Agni gave back the wife with life and splendour: may he who
is her husband live to an old age of 100 years! Soma was thy first, the Gandharva
was thy second, Agni thy third, husband; thy fourth is one of human birth. Soma
gave her to the Gandharva, the Gandharva to Agni, Agni gave me wealth and sons,
and then this woman." The idea contained in this passage may possibly be referred
to in the verse before us (x. 109, 2).

30 I am indebted to Prof. Aufrecht for this explanation of the verse.

40 See R.V. i. 164, 34, 35, above.

41 See my paper on the Progress of the Vedic Religion, in the Journal of the Royal
Asiatic Society for 1865, pp. 374 ff.

42 See A.V. x. 7, 1 ff.; 9, 26.
This hymn is repeated in the Atharva-veda with the addition of ten more verses which I shall quote in the next section.

I shall here state summarily the remarks suggested by a perusal of the texts which I have quoted, and the conclusions which they appear to authorize regarding the relation of the Vedic poets and priests to the other classes of the Indian community at the time when the earlier hymns of the Rig-veda were composed.

First: Except in the Purusha Sūkta (translated above in pp. 9 ff.) there is no distinct reference in the hymns to any recognised system of four castes.

Second: In one text (iii. 34, 9, see p. 176) where mention is made of the Āryan “colour,” or “race,” all the upper classes of the Indian community are comprehended under one designation, as the Kshattriyas and Vaiśyas as well as the Brāhmans were always in after-times regarded as Āryas (see above, p. 176.)

Third: The term brāhmaṇa occurs only in eight hymns of the Rigveda, besides the Purusha Sūkta, whilst brāhmān occurs in forty-six. The former of these words could not therefore have been in common use at the time when the greater part of the hymns were composed. The term rājanya is found only in the Purusha Sūkta; and kshattriya in the sense of a person belonging to a royal family, a noble, occurs only in a few places, such as x. 109, 3. This text is quoted above. In viii. 104, 13, Kshattriya is perhaps a neuter substantive: Na vai u Somo vṛjīnam kinoti na kshattryan mithyā āhārayantam | “Soma does not prosper the sinner, nor the man who wields royal power deceitfully.”
genius or virtue (x. 107, 6), or elected by special divine favour to receive the gift of inspiration (x. 125, 5).

Seventh: Brāhmāṇa appears to be equivalent to brāhmā-putra, "the son of a brāhmān" (which, as we have seen, occurs in ii. 43, 2), and the employment of such a term seems necessarily to presuppose that, at the time when it began to become current, the function of a brāhmān, the priesthood, had already become a profession.

The Rig-veda Sanhitā contains a considerable number of texts in which the large gifts of different kinds bestowed by different princes on the authors of the hymns are specified, and these instances of bounty are eulogized.

Of these passages R.V. i. 125; i. 126; v. 27; v. 30, 12 ff.; v. 61, 10; vi. 27, 8; vi. 45, 31 ff.; vi. 47, 22 ff. may be consulted in Prof. Wilson's translation; and a version of R.V. x. 107, which contains a general encomium on liberality will be found in the article entitled "Miscellaneous Hymns from the Rig- and Atharva-vedas," in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1866, p. 32 ff. The following further texts, which describe the presents given by different princes to the rishis, viz. vii. 18, 22 ff.; viii. 3, 21 ff.; viii. 4, 19 ff.; viii. 5, 37 ff.; viii. 6, 46 ff.; viii. 19, 36 f.; viii. 21, 17 f.; viii. 24, 29 f.; viii. 46, 21 ff.; viii. 54, 10 ff.; viii. 57, 14 ff.; x. 33, 4 ff.; x. 62, 6 ff.; x. 93, 14 f. are translated in the article "On the relations of the priests to the other classes of Indian Society in the Vedie age" in the same Journal for 1866, pp. 272 ff., to which I refer.

On the other hand the hymns of the Rig-veda contain numerous references to persons who, if not hostile, were at least indifferent and inattentive to the system of worship which the rishis professed and inculcated; and niggardly in their offerings to the gods and their gifts to the priests. The article to which I have just referred contains (pp. 286 ff.) a long list of such passages, from which I extract the following:

i. 84, 7. Yaḥ ekaḥ id vidayate vasu mārtavya dāsūshe | iśāno apratish-kutaḥ Indro anga | 8. Kadā martyam arādhasam padā kshumpam iṣva sphurat | kadā naḥ sabruvd girah Indro anga |

"Indra, who alone distributes riches to the sacrificing mortal, is lord and irresistible. 8. When will Indra crush the illiberal man like a bush with his foot? when will he hear our hymns?"
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i. 101, 4. ... viṅgo chid Indro yo asunvato vadhaḥ ... |
"Indra, who is the slayer of him, however strong, who offers no libations."

i. 122, 9. Jano yo Mitra-varunāv abhidhrug apo na vāṃ sunoti akṣha-
yādhruk | svayaṃ sa yakshaṃ hriḍaye ni dhatte āpa yad iti hotrubhir
pitāvā |
"The hostile man, the malicious enemy, who pours out no libations to you, o Mitra and Varuṇa, plants fever in his own heart, when the pious man has by his offerings obtained (your blessing)."

i. 125, 7. Mā priṃanto duritam evaḥ a aran mā jāriṣuḥ sūryaḥ
svratāsaḥ | anyas teshām paridhir astu kaś chid aprīṇantam abhi saṁ
yantu sokāḥ |
"Let not the liberal suffer evil or calamity; let not devout sages decay; let them have some further term; let griefs befall the illiberal (aprīṇantam).

i. 182, 3. Kim atra dasrā kriṅuthāḥ kim āśāthe jano yaḥ kaścid ahavir
mahiyate | ati kramiṣṭham juratam paṇer asum jyotir viprāya kriṅutāṁ
vachasayaev |
"What do ye here, o powerful (Āśvins)? why do ye sit (in the house of) a man who offers no oblation, and (yet) is honoured? Assail, wear away the breath of the niggard, and create light for the sage who desires to extol you."

ii. 23, 4. Suntīdhir naṇasi trāyase janaṁ yas tubhyaṁ dāśad na tam
aṁho āśnavat | brahma-dvishaś tapano mayumīr asi Brihaspati mahi tat
te mahītvanam |
"By thy wise leadings thou guidest and protectest the man who worships thee; no calamity can assail him. Thou art the vexer of him who hates devotion (brahma-dvishaḥ), and the queller of his wrath: this, o Brihaspati, is thy great glory."

iv. 25, 6. ... na asushever āpir na sakḥa na jāmīr duṣkṛtvayo ava-
hanta iḍ avācaḥ | 7. Na revatā paṇīnā sakhyam Indro asunvata suta-
pāḥ saṁ griṅite | ā asya vedāḥ khidati hanti nagnaṁ vi susheye paktaye
kevala ʾbhūt |
"Indra is not the relation or friend or kinsman of the man who offers no libations; he is the destroyer of the prostrate irreligious man.
7. Indra, the soma-drinker, accepts not friendship with the wealthy niggard who makes no soma-libations; but robs him of his riches, and
slays him when stripped bare, whilst he is the exclusive patron of the man who pours out soma and cooks oblations."

vi. 44, 11. . . . jahī amuhiṃ pra vriha aprinataḥ |

"Slay (o Indra) those who offer no libations; root out the illiberal.

viii. 53, 1. Ut tvā mandantu stomāḥ kriyushva rādho adhivāḥ | ava brāhma-dvīṣho jahi | pādā paniṃ arādhaso ni badhasva mahān asī | na hi tvā kaṣchana prati |

"Let our hymns gladden thee; give us wealth, o thunderer. Slay the haters of devotion. 2. Crush with thy foot the niggards who bestow nothing. Thou art great; no one is comparable to thee."

It seems evident, then, from these texts (and there are many more of the same tenor), that the irreligious man, the parcus deorum cultor et infrequens, was by no means a rare character among the Āryas of the Vedic age, and that the priests often found no little difficulty in drawing forth the liberality of their contemporaries towards themselves and in enforcing a due regard to the ceremonial of devotion. And if we consider, on the other hand, that the encomiums on the liberality of different princes to the poets and priests which are contained in the passages to which I before adverted, are the production of the class whose pretensions they represent, and whose dignity they exult, we shall, no doubt, see reason to conclude that the value of the presents bestowed has been enormously exaggerated, and make some deduction from the impression which these texts are calculated to convey of the estimation in which the priests were held at the time when they were composed. But after every allowance has been made for such considerations, and for the state of feeling indicated by the complaints of irreligion and illiberality of which I have cited specimens, it will remain certain that the brāhmaṇ, whether we look upon him as a sage and poet, or as an officiating priest, or in both capacities, was regarded with respect and reverence, and even that his presence had begun to be considered as an important condition of the efficacy of the ceremonial. Thus, as we have already seen, in i. 164, 35, the brāhmaṇ is described as the highest heaven of "speech;" in x. 107, 6, a liberal patron is called a rishi and a brāhmaṇ, as epithets expressive of the most distinguished eulogy; in x. 125, 5, the goddess Vāch is said to make the man who is the object of her special affection a brāhmaṇ and a rishi; in vi. 45 7; vii. 7, 5; viii. 16, 7; and ix. 96, 6, the term brāhmaṇ is applied
honorifically to the gods Indra, Agni, and Soma; in iv. 50, 8, 9, great prosperity is declared to attend the prince by whom a brāhmaṇ is employed, honoured, and succoured; and in iii. 53, 9, 12; v. 2, 6; vii. 33, 2, 3, 5; and vii. 83, 4, the highest efficacy is ascribed to the intervention and intercession of this class of functionaries.

Again, whatever exaggeration we may suppose in the texts which eulogize the liberality of princely patrons, in regard to the value of the presents bestowed, there is no reason to doubt that the ministers of public worship, who possessed the gift of expression and of poetry, who were the depositaries of all sacred science, and who were regarded as the channels of access to the gods, would be largely rewarded and honoured.44

"It is to be observed that, in these eulogies of liberality, mention is nowhere made of Brāhmaṇas as the recipients of the gifts. In two places, viii. 4, 20, and x. 33, 4, a rishi is mentioned as the receiver. In later works, such as the S'atapatha Brāhmaṇa, on the contrary, the presents are distinctly connected with Brāhmaṇas. Thus it is said in that work, ii. 2, 2, 6: Devyūḥ vai deviḥ deviḥ aha eva deviḥ aha ye brāhmaṇāḥ suṁvaṁso 'nucchānās te manushya-deviḥ | tesāṁ devedā vībhaktāh eva yajñāḥ āhataṁ eva deviṁnām dakshināḥ manushya-deviṁnām brāhmaṇānām suṁvaṁ- bhūṁ anucchānānām | āhutiḥ eva deviṁ pritiṁ dakshinābhīr manushya-deviṁnām brāhmaṇānām suṁvaṁvado 'nucchānān | te enam uhye deviḥ pritiḥ sūdhāyāṁ dadhati | "Two kinds of gods are gods, viz. the gods (proper), whilst those Brāhmaṇas who have the Vedic tradition, and are learned, are the human gods. The worship (yajña) of these is divided into two kinds. Oblations constitute the worship offered to the gods, and presents (dakshinā) that offered to the human gods, the Brāhmaṇas, who possess the Vedic tradition and are learned. It is with oblations that a man gratifies the gods, and with presents that he gratifies the human gods, the Brāhmaṇas, who possess the Vedic tradition, and are learned. Both these two kinds of gods, when gratified, place him in a state of happiness" (sūdhāyāṁ); or "convey him to the heavenly world," as the expression is varied in the parallel passage of the same work, iv. 3, 4, 4). It is similarly said in the Taitt. Sanh. i. 7, 3, 1: Paroṣaḥ vai anye deviḥ iṣyaṁ pratyakṣah anye | yad yajate ye eva deviḥ paroṣaḥ iṣyaṁ tāṁ eva taṁ yajati | yad anvāḥāryaṁ āharatī ete vai deviḥ pratyakṣah yad brāhmaṇās tāṁ eva tena pritiṁ | ato dakshināḥ eva asya esah | ato yajñasya eva cihḍram api- dadhitāḥ yat vai yajñasya krūram yad vishahām tad anvāḥāryaṁ anvāḥārati | tad anvāḥāryasya anvāḥāryatvam | devadūṭiḥ vai ete yad ritojya yad anvāḥāryaṁ āharati devadūṭiṁ eva pritiṁ | "Some gods are worshipped in their absence, and others in their presence. It is to those gods who are worshipped in their absence that the sacrifice offers the oblation which he presents. And it is these gods who are visible, i.e. the Brāhmaṇas, whom he gratifies with the anvāḥārya (present of cooked rice) which he afterwards brings. Now this anvāḥārya is the present (dakshinā) connected with it (the sacrifice). Then he covers over the faults of the sacrifice. Whatever in it is excessive or defective, that he removes by means of the anvāḥārya. In this consists the nature of that offering. These officiating priests are the messengers of the gods; and it is the messengers of the gods whom the sacrificer gratifies with this anvāḥārya gift which he presents."
It is further clear, from some of the texts quoted above (ii. 1, 2; iv. 9, 3; x. 52, 2), as well as i. 162, 5, and from the contents of hymns ii. 36; ii. 37; ii. 43; and x. 124, 1,45 that in the later part of the Vedic era, to which these productions are probably to be assigned, the ceremonial of worship had become highly developed and complicated, and that different classes of priests were required for its proper celebration.46 It is manifest that considerable skill must have been required for the due performance of these several functions; and as such skill could only be acquired by early instruction and by practice, there can be little doubt that the priesthood must at that period have become a regular profession.47 The distinction of king or noble and priest appears to be recognized in i. 108, 7, as well as in iv. 50, 8, 9; whilst in v. 47, 7, 14, a similar distinction is made between king and rishi; and it is noticeable that the verse, in other respects nearly identical, with which the 36th and 37th hymns of the eight manḍala respectively conclude, ends in the one hymn with the words, “Thou alone, Indra, didst deliver Trasadasyu in the conflict of men, magnifying prayers” (brahmaṇī vardhayan); whilst in the other the last words are, “magnifying (royal) powers” (kāḥatrāṇī vardhayan), as if the former contained a reference to the functions of the priest, and the latter to those of the prince. (Compare viii. 35, 16, 17.)

While, however, there thus appears to be every reason for supposing that towards the close of the Vedic period the priesthood had become a profession, the texts which have been quoted, with the exception of the verse in the Puruṣa Sukta (x. 90, 12), do not contain anything which necessarily implies that the priests formed an exclusive caste, or, at least, a caste separated from all others by insurmountable barriers, as in later times. There is a wide difference between a profession, or even a hereditary order, and a caste in the fully developed Brahmanical sense.

45 See also i. 94, 6, where it is said: “Thou (Agni) art an adhvaryu, and the earliest hotṛi, a praśāstri, a potṛi, and by nature a purohita. Knowing all the priestly functions (ārτeiyā) wise, thou nourishest us,” etc. (tvam adhvaryur uta hotaśi pūrayāh praśāstāḥ potā janashāḥ purohitāḥ | viśvā vidvān ārτeiyā dhīra pushyasy āgne śīy ādi).

46 See Prof. Müller’s remarks on this subject, Anc. Sansk. Lit. pp. 485 ff.; and Dr. Haug’s somewhat different view of the same matter in his Introd. to Ait. Br. pp. 11 ff.

47 In regard to the great importance and influence of the priests, see Müller’s Anc. Sansk. Lit. pp. 485 ff.
Even in countries where the dignity and exclusive prerogatives of the priesthood are most fully recognized (as in Roman Catholic Europe), the clergy form only a profession, and their ranks may be recruited from all sections of the community. So, too, is it in most countries, even with a hereditary nobility. Plebeians may be ennobled at the will of the sovereign. There is, therefore, no difficulty in supposing that in the Vedic era the Indian priesthood—even if we suppose its members to have been for the most part sprung from priestly families—may have often admitted aspirants to the sacerdotal character from other classes of their countrymen. Even the employment of the word brāhmaṇa in the ṛg-veda does not disprove this. This term, derived from brahman, "priest," need not, as already intimated, signify anything further than the son or descendent of a priest (the word brahmaputra, "son of a priest," is, as we have seen, actually used in one text),—just as the rājanya means nothing more than the descendent of a king or chief (rājan), a member of the royal family, or of the nobility.

The paucity of the texts (and those, too, probably of a date comparatively recent) in which the word brāhmaṇa occurs, when contrasted with the large number of those in which brāhmān is found, seems, as I have already observed, to prove conclusively that the former word was but little employed in the earlier part of the Vedic era, and only came into common use towards its close. In some of these passages (as in vii. 103, 1, 7, 8; x. 88, 19) there is nothing to shew that the Brāhman is alluded to as anything more than a professional priest, and in vii. 103, the comparison of frogs to Brāhmans may seem even to imply a want of respect for the latter and their office. In other places (i. 164, 45, and x. 71, 8, 9) a distinction appears to be drawn between intelligent and unintelligent Brāhmans, between such as were thoughtful and others who were mere mechanical instruments in carrying on the ceremonial of worship, which, certainly points to the existence of a sacerdotal class. In another passage (x. 97, 22) the importance of a Brāhman to the proper performance of religious rites appears to be clearly expressed. In x. 109, where the words brāhmān (passim) and brāh-

46 In R.V. viii. 50, 9, it is said: "Whether an unwise or a wise man, o Indra, has offered to thee a hymn, he has gladdened (thee) through his devotion to thee (avipro vō yad avidhad vipro vā Indra te vachah | sa pra mamandat tvāyā ity ūdi)."
mana (in verse 4) seem to be used interchangeably—the inviolability of Brähman's wives, the peril of interfering with them, and the blessing attendant on reparation for any outrage committed against them, are referred to in such a way as to shew at once the loftiness of the claim set up by the Brähmans on their own behalf, and to prove that these pretensions were frequently disregarded by the nobles. In x. 16, 6, the Brähmans are spoken of as inspired by Soma, and in vi. 75, 10, the manes of earlier Brähmans are reckoned among those divine beings who have power to protect the suppliant. But in none of these texts is any clear reference made to the Brähmans as constituting an exclusive caste or race, and nothing whatever is said about their being descended from an ancestor distinct from those of the other classes of their countrymen.

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

But in addition to the negative evidence adduced in the preceding section, that during the age to which the greater part of the hymns of the Rig-veda are referable, the system of castes had, to say the least, not yet attained its full development, we find also a considerable amount of proof in the hymns themselves, or in later works, or from a comparison of both, that many of the hymns either were, or from a remote antiquity were believed to be, the productions of authors not of sacerdotal descent; and that some of these persons also acted as priests. The most signal instance of this kind is that of Viśvāmitra; but from the abundance of the materials which exist for its illustration I shall reserve it for the next chapter, where I shall treat of the contests between the Brähmans and the Kshattryias.

In later times, when none but Brähman priests were known, it seemed to be an unaccountable, and—as contradicting the exclusive sacerdotal pretensions of the Brähmans—an inconvenient circumstance, that priestly functions should have been recorded as exercised by persons whom tradition represented as Rājanyas; and it therefore became necessary to explain away the historical facts, by inventing miraculous legends to make it appear that these men of the royal order had been
in reality transformed into Brāhmans, as the reward of their superhuman merits and austerities—an idea of which we shall meet with various illustrations in the sequel. The very existence, however, of such a word as rājārshi, or “royal rishi,” proves that Indian tradition recognized as rishis or authors of Vedic hymns persons who were considered to belong to Rājanya families. A number of such are named (though without the epithet of rājars) in the Anukramaṇikā or index to the Rig-veda; but Sāyaṇa, who quotes that old document, gives them this title. Thus, in the introduction to hymn i. 100, he says: Atra anukramyate “sa yo vrīshā ’ekonā Vārshāgirāḥ Rijrāsvāmbarśa-Sahadeva-Bhayamāna-Surādhasah” iti | Vrīshāgirō mahārājasya putrabhūtāḥ Rijrāsvādayo pancha rūjarsyāyō sadehāṁ sūktāṁ dadriśuḥ | atas te asya sūktasya rīshyōḥ | utkāṁ hū arshānuksamanyitam “sūktāṁ sa yo vrīshety etat pancha Vārshāgirāḥ viduḥ | niyuktōḥ nāmadheyaiḥ svair api ’chaitat tyād’ iti rīchī iti | “It is said in the Anukramaṇikā, ‘Of this hymn (the rishis) are Rijrāśva, Ambarīsha, Sahadeva, Bhayamāna, and Surādhas, sons of Vṛishāgir.’ Rijrāśva and others, sons of King Vṛishāgir, in all five rājars, saw this hymn in a bodily form. Hence they are its rishis (or seers). For it is declared in the Ārsha Anukramaṇī: ‘The five sons of Vṛishāgir, who are mentioned by name in the verse beginning “this praise” (the 17th), know this hymn.’” The 17th verse is as follows: Ettat tyat te Indra vrīshme utkhaṃ Vārshāgirāḥ abhi griṇanti rādhaḥ | Rijrāśvaḥ prasāthibhir Ambarīshah Sahadevo Bhayamānah Surādhaḥ | “This hymn the Vārshāgiras, Rijrāśva, with his attendants, and Ambarīsha, Sahadeva, Bhayamāna, and Surādhas, utter to thee, the vigorous, o Indra, as their homage;” on which Sāyaṇa repeats the remark that these persons were rājarsis (etad utkhaṃ stotraṁ rādhaṁ samāśrādhasaṁ tvat-priti-hetūṁ Vārshāgirāḥ Vṛishāgirō rājānaḥ putrāḥ Rijrāsvādayo ’bhī griṇanti abhinukhyena vadanti | . . . . Rijrāśvaḥ etat-sajno rājarsīḥ prasāthibhiḥ pārśva-sthair anyair rishibhiḥ saha Indram astaut | ke te pārśva-sthāḥ | Ambarīshādayaḥ chatvāro rājarsyāḥ). Ambarīsha is also said to be the rishi of ix. 98. Again, “Trasadasyu, son of Purukutsa, a Rājarshi,” is said by Sāyaṇa on R.V. iv. 42, to be the rishi of that hymn (Purukutsasya pūtras Trasadasyuḥ rājarsyīḥ | . . . atrānuksamāṇikā ‘mama đvītā daśa Trasadasyuḥ Purukutsyāḥ). In the 8th and 9th verses Trasadasyu is thus mentioned: Āsmākam atra pitaras te āsan sapta rīshyō Daurgahe ādhyāmāne | te a
ayajanta Trasadasyum asyāḥ Indraṁ na vrittraturam arāḍhadevam | 9. Purukutsāṇi hi vām adāśad havyebhir Indra-varuṇa namobhiḥ | atha rājānāṁ Trasadasyum asyāḥ vṛittrahanāṁ dadathur arāḍhadevam | 8. “These seven rishis were our fathers. When the son of Durgaha was bound they gained by sacrifice for her (Purukutsāni) a son Trasadasyu, a slayer of foes, like Indra, a demigod. 9. Purukutsāṇi worshipped you, O Indra and Varuṇa, with salutations and obeisances; then ye gave her king Trasadasyu, a slayer of enemies, a demigod.” I give Sāyaṇa’s note on these verses: “Purukutsaya mahīśhī Daurgahe bandhana-sthite | paṭyāv arājakaṁ dṛishtā rāśtram putrasya lipsāya | yadṛcchhayā samāyātan saptarṣhīṃ parāpaṇayat | te ca prītāḥ puruḥ prochur ‘yajendra-varuṇau bhṛiṣam’ | sā chendra-varuṇav ishtvā Trasadasyum aśijanat | itihāsam imāṁ jānann rishir braṭe richav iha” | atha asmākam atra asmin arājake desā asyām prīthivyāṁ vā pitaraḥ pālayitāraḥ utpādakās te asam abhavan | ete saptarṣhayah prasiddhāḥ Daurgahe Durgahasya putre Purukutsa badhyamāne dṛiṣhgam pāśair yasmād asyāḥ asyai Purukutsāṇai Trasadasyum āyajanta prādur Indra-Varuṇayor anugraḥāt | “The queen of Purukutsa, when her husband, the son of Durgaha, was imprisoned, seeing the kingdom to be destitute of a ruler, and desirous of a son, of her own accord paid honour to the seven rishis who had arrived. And they, again, being pleased told her to sacrifice to Indra and Varuṇa. Having done so she bore Trasadasyu. Knowing this story, the rishi utters these two verses;’’” which Sāyaṇa then explains. Similarly Sāyaṇa says on v. 27: “Tryaruna son of Trivrishṇa, Trasadasyu son of Purukutsa, and Aśvamedha son of Bharata, these three kings conjoined, are the rishis of this hymn; or Atri is the rishi” (Atrāṇukramanikā | “Anasvanta śat Trivrishṇa-paurukutsaya dvau Tryaruna-Trasadasyu rājānau Bhārataḥ cha Aśvamedhaḥ | ।… ‘na ātmā ātmane dadyād’ iti sarvāṣv Atriṁ kechit” ।… Trivrishṇasya putras Tryarunāḥ Purukutsasya putras Trasadasyur Bharatasya putro ‘śamedhaḥ ete trayo ’pi rājānaḥ sambhuya asya sūktasya rishayaḥ | yadvā Atrir eva rishiḥ). The Anukramanikā, however, adds that according to some, as “no one would give gifts to himself, none of the princes mentioned as donors could be the author; but Atri must be the rishi.” As the hymn is spoken by a fourth person, in praise of the liberality of these kings, it is clear they cannot well be its authors. And a similar remark applies to iv. 42, 8 f. However, the Hindu tradition, being such as it is, is good proof that kings could, in
conformity with ancient opinion, be rishis. Trasadasyu and Trayaruṇa are also mentioned as the rishis of ix. 110. The rishis of iv. 43 and iv. 44 are declared by Śayaṇa, and by the Anukramaṇikā, to be Purumālha, and Ajamilha, sons or descendants of Suhotra (iv. 43, Atrānukramaṇikā ‘kaḥ u śaśvat’ sapta Purumālha-jamālha Sauhotrau tv Āśvinām hi | iv. 44, Purumālha-jamālha eva rishi). Though these persons are not said by either of these authorities to be kings, yet in the Vīṣṇu and Bhāgavata Purāṇas the latter is mentioned as being of royal race, and a tribe of Brāhmans is said to have been descended from him (see above p. 227). In the sixth verse of iv. 44, the descendants of Ajamilha are said to have come to the worship of the Āśvins (naro yad vām Āśvinā stoma ma avan sadhastitum Ajamilmāso agman). The following hymns, also, are said by tradition to have had the undermentioned kings for their rishis, viz.: vi. 15, Vitahavya (or Bharadvāja); x. 9, Sindhudvīpa, son of Ambarīṣha (or Triśiras, son of Tvashtrī); x. 75, Sindhukshit, son of Priyamedha; x. 133, Sudās, son of Pijavana; x. 134, Māndhātri, son of Yuvanāśva (see above, p. 225); x. 179, Sībi, son of Uśīnara, Pratardana, son of Divodāsa and king of Kāśi (see above, p. 229), and Vasumanas, son of Rohidaśa; and x. 148 is declared to have had Prithī Vainya as its rishi. In the fifth verse of that hymn it is said: Śrudhi havam Indra sāra Prithyāḥ uta stavase Venyasya arkaḥ | “Hear, o heroic Indra, the invocation of Prithī; and thou art praised by the hymn of Venya.” In viii. 9, 10, also, Prithī Vainya is mentioned at the same time with three rishis: Yad vāṃ Kakhavin uta yad Vyasvaḥ rishir yad vāṃ Dirghhatamāḥ jukāva | Prithī yad vāṃ Vainyaḥ sadaneshu eva id ato Āśvinā chetayethām | “Whatever oblation (or invocation) Kakhivat has made to you, or the rishi Vyasva, or Dirghatamas, or Prithī, son of Vena, in the places of

50 In the Vīṣṇu Purāṇa, as we have seen above, p. 237, Trayaṭṭuṇa, Pushkarin, and Kapi are said to have been sons of Urukshaya, and all of them have become Brāhmans; and in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, Trayarupi, Pushkararupi, and Kapi are said to have all become Brāhmans.

51 The S. P. Br. v. 3, 5, 4, refers to Prithī as “first of men who was installed as a king” (Prithī ha vai Vainya manushyaṇām prathamo ‘bhishahīcha). I extract from Dr. Hall’s edition of Prof. Wilson’s Vīṣṇu Purāṇa, vol. iii. the following verse, added by the editor from the Vaiṭu Purāṇa about royal rishis: Mānaṇe Vainave (?) vanta Aḍāvamīs cha ye nṛpiḥ | Aḍā Aikshvakā Nabhaga jayā rojrayahasya tu te | “Kings in the race of Manu, Vena (?), and Ida, the descendants of Ida, Ikshvāku, and Nabhāga are to be known as having been rajarshis.”
sacrifice, take notice of that, o Aśvins.” Here Sāyaṇa refers to Prithī as “the royal rishi of that name.”

From the details I have supplied it is clear that in many cases the evidence is against the supposition that the princes to whom the hymns are ascribed were in reality their authors. The only instances in which the authorship seems to be established by the tenor of the hymns themselves are those of the Vārshagiras, or, at all events, that of Prithī. But, as has been already remarked, the fact that ancient Hindu tradition recognizes royal rishis as the authors of hymns is sufficient to prove that such cases were not unknown. Even if we were to suppose that flattery had any share in the creation of these traditions, it no doubt proceeded upon the belief of those who put them into circulation, that in earlier times the distinction between the priests and other classes was not so sharply defined as in their own day.

I proceed, however, to the case of Devāpi, in which the materials for forming a judgment are more adequate and satisfactory, and prove that he was not merely a rishi but an officiating priest.

In the Anukramaṇikā, R.V. x. 98 is ascribed to him as its author; and Yāska states as follows in the Nirukta, ii. 10:

_Tatra itihāsam āchakshate | Devāpiḥ cha Ārṣṭīsheṇaḥ S’antanuḥ cha_
_Kauravyau bhrātarau bābhūvatuḥ | sa S’antanuḥ kanīyau abhishecayān-
chakre | Devāpiḥ tapāḥ pratipede | tataḥ S’antanoḥ rājya dvādaṣa var-
shāṇi devo na vavarsha | tam añhyu brāhmaṇaḥ “adharmas tvayā charito_
jyeshṭham bhrātaram antarītya abhishecitam | tasmāt to devo na var-
shati” iti | sa S’antanur Devāpiṁ sīśikṣha rājyena | tam uḍācha Devā-
piḥ “purohitas te ’sāni yājayeṇi cha tvā” iti | tasya etad varsha-kāma-
sūktam | tasya esāhā bhavati |

“Here they relate a story. Devāpi son of Ṛishiṣheṇa, and Santanu, belonged to the race of Kuru and were brothers. Santanu, who was the younger, caused himself to be installed as king, whilst Devāpi betook himself to austerity and fervour. Then the god did not rain for twelve years of Santanu’s reign. The Brāhmaṇs said to him: ‘Thou hast practised unrighteousness in that, passing by thy elder brother, thou hast caused thyself to be installed as king. It is for this reason that the god does not rain.’ Santanu then sought to invest Devāpi with the sovereignty; but the latter said to him: ‘Let me be thy
purohita and perform sacrifice for thee.’ This hymn, expressing a desire of rain, is his. The following verse is part of it.”

Yāska then quotes a verse of R.V. x. 98, the whole of which is as follows:

"Bṛihaspati prati me devatām ihi Mitro vā yad Varuṇo vā asi Pūṣaḥ |
Ādityaṁ vā yad Vasubhir Marutvān sa Parjanyāṁ S'antanave vrīṣṭhāya |
2. Ā devo dāto ajīrasa chikītuṇ ādeva Devāpe abhi mām āgachhat |
prati-chinaḥ prati mām ā varītsva dāadhāmi te dvunatīṁ vāčam āsan |
3. Asme dhehi dvunatīṁ vāčam āsan Bṛihaspati anamīvām iṣhirām |
yayā vrīṣṭhīṁ S'antanave vanāva ādivo drapo madhumāṁ ā vīceṣā |
4. Āno drapsāṁ madhumanto viśantu Indra dehi adhirathāṁ sahasram |
ni shīda hotram tituthā yaajasva devān Devāpe havishā saparyā |
5. Ārṣṭiṣṭena hotram rishir niṣvidan Devāpir deva-sumatiṁ chikītuṇ |
sa uttarasām adharaṁ samudram apo divyāḥ aṣeṣjad varṣhyaḥ abhi |
6. Asmin samudre adhi uttarasmin āpo devebuff nirvītāḥ atiṣṭhan |
tāḥ adravān Ārṣṭiṣṭenaṁ vrīṣṭhāḥ Devāpinā preshitaṁ mriṣṭiṣṭhau |
7. Yad Devāpiḥ S'antanave purohito hotrāya vrīṣṭhā kriṣpayann adādhet |
deva-brutāṁ vrīṣṭhī-vaṁiṁ varāṇo Bṛihaspatir vāčam asmai ayachhat |
8. Yaṁ tuva Devāpiḥ śvusuchāno Agne Ārṣṭiṣṭenaṁ manushyaṁ samiddha |
viṣvebhār devair anumadyamānāḥ pra Parjanyāṁ iraya vrīṣṭiṁantum |
9. Tvāṁ pāve vrīṣhaya gīrḥiṁ āyaṇ ivāṁ adhvareshu puruḥata viṣve |
sahasrāṁ adhirathāṁ asme a no yajnāṁ rohidasāva upa yāhi |
10. Etāni Agni navatīr nava tvē ahutāṁ adhirathāṁ sahasrā |
tebhīr vardhasa tanvāḥ śura pāveṇ āvo no vrīṣṭhīṁ iṣhito riiṭhi |
11. Etāni Agne navatīṁ sahasrā sam pra yachha vrīṣhna Indrāya bhūgam |
vīdevān pathaḥ rituśo devayānāṁ apo aulānaṁ ādi deveshā dhehi |
12. Agne bādhasa vi mṛidho vi durgahā āpa amtvāṁ apo rakṣāṁsi sedha |
asmat samudrād bṛihato divo no apāṁ bhūmanam upa nah eṣi ja ṭa īḥa |

“Approach, Bṛihaspati, to my worship of the gods, whether thou art Mitra, Varuṇa, Pūshan, or art attended by the Ādityas, Vasus, or Maruts: cause Parjanya to rain for Santanu. 2. The god, a rapid messenger, has become aware, and has come from thee, o Devāpi, to me, (saying) ‘approach towards me; I will place a brilliant hymn

53 Compare R.V. ii. 1, 2.
55 It looks as if Agni were here to be understood by Bṛihaspati, see verses 9–12.
in thy mouth.' 3. Place in our mouth, o Bṛihaspati, a brilliant hymn, powerful, and spirited, whereby we two may solicit rain for Santanu. The drop full of sweetness has descended on us from the sky. 4. May the drops full of sweetness come down upon us: give us, o Indra, a thousand waggon-loads (of them?). Perform the function of a hotṛi, sacrifice in due form, worship the gods with an oblation, o Devāpi. 5. The rishi Devāpi, son of Rishṭišeṇa, performing the function of a hotṛi, knowing (how to gain) the goodwill of the gods, has discharged from the upper to the lower ocean those waters of the sky which fall in rain. 6. The waters remained shut up by the gods in this upper ocean: they rushed forth when released by the son of Rishṭišeṇa, when discharged by Devāpi into the torrents. 7. When Devāpi, placed in front of Santanu (as his purohita), chosen for the office of hotṛi, fulfilling his function, kindled (the fire),—then, granting the prayer for rain which was heard by the gods, Bṛihaspati gave him a hymn. 8. Do thou, o Agni, whom the man Devāpi the son of Rishṭišeṇa has inflamed and kindled,—do thou, delighted, with all the the gods, send hither the rain-bearing Parjanya. 9. Former rishis have approached thee with their hymns; and all (approach) thee, o god, much-invoked, in their sacrifices: give us thousands of waggon-loads: come, thou who art borne by red horses, to our sacrifice. 10. These ninety-nine thousands of waggon-loads (of wood and butter?) have been thrown into thee, o Agni, as oblations. Through them grow, hero, to (the bulk of) thy former bodies; and stimulated, grant us rain from the sky. 11. (Of) these ninety thousands give, o Agni, a share to the vigorous Indra. Knowing the paths which rightly lead to the gods, convey the oblation (?) to the deities in the sky. 12. Overcome, o Agni, our enemies, our calamities; drive away sickness, and rakshases. From this great ocean of the sky-discharge upon us an abundance of waters.

The fact of Devāpi being reputed as the author of this hymn, and as the purohita and hotṛi of his brother, seems to have led the legendary writers to invent the story of his becoming a Brähman, which (as men-

44 So the word mrīkāhēṇi is explained in Böhtlingk and Roth's Lexicon.
45 Or, "descendant of Manush" (manushya).
46 This is a common epithet of Agni.
47 This means, I suppose, "burst forth into vast flames."
tioned by Professor Weber, Indische Studien, i. p. 203) is recorded in the Sālya-parvan of the Mahābhārata, verses 2281 ff. where he is there said to have attained this distinction at a certain place of pilgrimage called Prithūdaka; where Śindhudvīpa and Viśvāmitra also were received into the higher caste:

Tatrārṣṭiṣeṇaḥ Kauravya brāhmaṇyaṁ sāṁbita-vrataḥ | tapasa mahatā rājān prāptavān rishi-sattamaḥ | Śindhudvīpāḥ cha rājarṣhir Devāpiś cha mahātapāḥ | brāhmaṇyaṁ labdhavān yatra Viśvāmitras tathā muniḥ | mahātapasvā bhagavān ugra-tejāḥ mahātapāḥ | . . . 2287. Purā kṛta-yugo rajann Ārṣṭiṣeṇo dvijottamaḥ | vasan guru-kule nityān nityam adhyayane rataḥ | tasya rājān guru-kule vasato nityam eva cha | samāptiṁ nāgamaṁ vidyā nāpi vedāḥ viśāmpate | sa nivrūnas tato rājāṁs tapas tepe mahātapāḥ | tato vai tapasā tena prāpya vedān anuttamanān | sa vidvān veda-yuktāḥ cha siddhaḥ śāpy rishi-sattamaḥ | . . . | evam siddhaḥ sa bhagavān Ārṣṭiṣeṇaḥ pratāpavān | tasmān eva tadā tīrvthe Śindhudvīpāḥ pratāpavān | Devāpiś cha mahārāja brāhmaṇyaṁ prāpatur mahat |

2281. "There the most excellent rishi Ārṣṭiṣeṇa, constant in his observances, obtained Brāhmaṇhood by great austere fervour; as did also the royal rishi Śindhudvīpa, and Devāpi great in austere fervour, and the glorious muni Viśvāmitra, of great austere fervour and fiery vigour." Some other particulars of Ārṣṭiṣeṇa are given further on: 2287. "Formerly in the Kṛta age the most excellent Brāhmaṇ Ārṣṭiṣeṇa dwelt constantly in his preceptor's family, devoted to incessant study; but could not complete his mastery of science or of the vedas. Being in consequence discouraged, he betook himself to intense austere fervour. By this means he acquired the incomparable Vedas, and became learned and perfect. . . . At the same place of pilgrimage the majestic Śindhudvīpa and Devāpi obtained the great distinction of Brāhmaṇhood."

It will be observed that here Ārṣṭiṣeṇa is, in opposition to the authority of the Nirukta, made a distinct person from Devāpi.

55 This prince also, as we have seen above, is mentioned among those Rūjanyas who composed Vedic hymns.
56 The Vedas are here spoken of in the plural, although Ārṣṭiṣeṇa is said to have lived in the Kṛta age. But the M. Bh. itself says elsewhere (see above, p. 145) that there was then but one Veda.
In a note to his (French) translation of the Rig-veda, M. Langlois (vol. iv. 502) supposes that the hymn above translated (x. 98), like the Purusha Sūkta, is very much posterior in date to the other hymns in the collection. The names of Devāpi and Sāntanu indicate, he thinks, as the date of its composition, a period not far preceding that of the great war of the Mahābhārata. Professor Weber, on the other hand, considers (Indische Studien, i. 203) that the Sāntanu and Devāpi mentioned in that work (Ādi-parvan, 3750 f.) cannot be the same as the persons alluded to in the Rigveda, because their father was Pratīpa, not Rishṭisheṇa; and because he thinks it doubtful whether a prince who preceded the Pāṇḍavas by only two generations could have been named in the Rig-veda, and appear there as an author of hymns.

The verses of the Ādi-parvan just referred to are as follows:

Pratīpaṣya trayāḥ putrāḥ ajnire Bharatarshabhaḥ | Devāpiḥ Sāntanaḥ chaiva Vāhilkāḥ mahārathah | Devāpiḥ cha pravāruja teshāṁ dharmahitepsayaḥ | Sāntanaḥ cha mahīm lebhe Vāhilkāḥ cha mahārathah |

"Three sons were born to Pratīpa, viz. Devāpi, Sāntanu, and Vāhlikā the charioteer. Of these Devāpi, desiring the benefits of religious excellence, became an ascetic; whilst Sāntanu and Vāhlikā obtained (the rule of) the earth."

The Harivaṃśa gives a different story about the same Devāpi, verse 1819:

Pratīpa Bhīmasenāt tu Pratīpasya tu Sāntanah | Devāpir Vāhilkās chaiva trayāḥ eva mahārathah | . . . . 1822. Upādhyāyas tu devānāṁ Devāpir abhavat muniḥ | Chyavanasya kṛitaḥ putrāḥ ihaśas chāsid mahātmanah |

"Pratīpa sprang from Bhīmasena; and Sāntanu, Devāpi, and Vāhlikā were the three chariot-driving sons of Pratīpa. . . . . 1822. Devāpi became a muni, and preceptor of the gods, being the adopted son of Chyavana, by whom he was beloved."

The Vishṇu Purāṇa (iv. 20, 7 ff.) concurs with the preceding authorities in making Devāpi and Sāntanu to be sons of Pratīpa, and descendants of Kuru, and his son Jahnu. It repeats the legend given in the Nirukta of the country of Sāntanu being visited by a drought of twelve years duration, in consequence of his having assumed the royal authority while his elder brother lived. And although, as will be seen, the sequel of the story is widely different from that recorded by the
Nirukta, the earlier incidents in the two narratives are so similar, that it would appear to have been the intention of the Puranic writer to identify the Devāpi and Sāntanu whose history he relates with the persons of the same names, although of different parentage, mentioned in Yāska's work. He may, however, possibly have transferred an older legend to more recent personages. The passage of the Vishnū Purāṇa is as follows:

Rikshād Bhūmasena tatā sa Dīlīpaḥ | Dīlīpat Pratīpaḥ tasyāpi De-

vāpi Sāntanu-Vāhlikā-sanyāsa trayāḥ putrāḥ bāhūṣuḥ | Devāpi bālaḥ
eva aranyāṁ viveśa | Sāntanur avanipatīr abhavat | ayaṁ cha tasya
gleḥ prāthivyāṁ gṛyate “yāṁ yāṁ karāḥyāṁ spṛśati jīrṇāṁ yau-
vanam eti saḥ | sāntiḥ chāṇoti yenāgyāṁ karmanā tena Sānt-

anuḥ” | tasyā Sāntanaḥ rāṣṭre devādaśa varṣhāṇi devo na vavarga |
tataśa aśeṣa rāṣṭre-vināśam avenkhyā asau rājā brāhmaṇāṇ apri-
chhadd “bhok kasmād asmin rāṣṭre devo na varshati | ko mama aparādaḥ”
iti | to tam uĉur “agrajasya te r̥hā iyam avani tvayā bhujyate pari-
vettā tvam” | ity uktāḥ sa āmvan tān aprīchhat “kim mayā vidheyam”
iti | tena tam uĉur “yāved Devāpi na pataṇābhir doshair abbhā-
yate tvayā tasya arhaṁ rājyam | tad alam etena tasmai diyatām” | ity
ukte tasya mantri-pravareṇa Asmasāraṁ tatra aranye tapasvino veda-
vāda-virodhā-vaktāraḥ prayojitaḥ | tair ati-rijumater mahipati-putrasya
buddhir veda-virodha-mārgaṁsārīnī akriyata | rājā cha Sāntanur dvija-
vachanotpamam-parivedana-śokas tān brāhmaṇaṁ agraniṁkriya agraja-rājya-
pradānaṁ aranyāṁ jagāma | tad āsramam upagatāḥ cha tām avanipati-
putraṁ Devāpiṁ upatasthuḥ | te brāhmaṇāḥ veda-vādānuṛiddhāṁ va-
chāṁsi “rājyam agrajena kattavyam” ity arthavanti tam uĉuh | asāv
api veda-vāda-virodha-yuktē-dūshhitam āneka-prakāram tām āha | tatas te
brāhmaṇāḥ Sāntanum uĉur “āgaṁhā bhō rājām alam atra ati-nir-
bandhena | prāsāntaḥ eva asāv anāvrishti-doshah | patito 'yam anādi-
kāla-mahita-veda-vachana-dūshhanocchāraṇāt | patito cha agraje naiva
pārvetāryam bhavati” | ity uktāḥ Sāntanuḥ svā-parum āgatyā rājyam
akarot | veda-vāda-virodhi-vachanoḍchāraṇa-dūshkte cha jyeshṭhe 'śmin
bhṛtārī tishtāty api Devāpāv akhila-sasya-nishpattaye vavarga bhaga-
vān Parjanyaḥ |

“From Riksha sprang Bhūmasena; from him Dīlīpa; from him Pratīpa, who again had three sons called Devāpi, Sāntanu, and Vāhlikā. Devāpi while yet a boy retired to the forest; and Sāntanu became
king. Regarding him this verse is current in the world: 'Every decrepit man whom he touches with his hands becomes young. He is called Sántanu from that work whereby he obtains supreme tranquility (śānti).' The god did not rain on the country of this Sántanu for twelve years. Beholding then the ruin of his entire realm, the king enquired of the Brāhmans: 'Why does not the god rain on this country; what is my offence?' The Brāhmans replied: 'This earth, which is the right of thy elder brother, is now enjoyed by thee; thou art a parivettri (one married before his elder brother).'

Receiving this reply, he again asked them: 'What must I do?' They then answered: 'So long as Devāpi does not succumb to declension from orthodoxy and other offences, the royal authority is his by right; to him therefore let it be given without further question.' When they had so said, the king's principal minister Āśmasārin employed certain ascetics propounding doctrines contrary to the declarations of the Vedas to proceed into the forest, by whom the understanding of the very simple-minded prince (Devāpi) was led to adopt a system at variance with those sacred books. King Sántanu being distressed for his offence in consequence of what the Brāhmans had said to him, went, preceded by those Brāhmans, to the forest in order to deliver over the kingdom to his elder brother. Arriving at the hermitage, they came to prince Devāpi. The Brāhmans addressed to him statements founded on the declarations of the Veda, to the effect that the royal authority should be exercised by the elder brother. He, on his part, expressed to them many things that were vitiating by reasonings contrary to the tenor of the Veda. The Brāhmans then said to Sántanu, 'Come hither, o king: there is no occasion for any excessive hesitation in this affair: the offence which led to the drought is now removed. Your brother has fallen by uttering a contradiction of the words of the Veda which

60 This is illustrated by Manu iii, 171 f.: Dāragnaḥatra-saṁyogaṁ kurute yo 'gra_js
sthite | parivettri sa vijneyaḥ parivittā tu pūrvajāḥ | 172. Parivitthā parivettri yāyā
cha parivedyate | sarve te narakāṁ yānti dātri-yājaka-panchamāḥ | "171. He who, while his elder brother is unwedded, marries a wife with the nuptial fires, is to be
known as a parivettri, and his elder brother as a parivitti. 172. The parivitti, the
parivettri, the female by whom the offence is committed, he who gives her away, and
fifthly the officiating priest, all go to hell." The Indian writers regard the relation
of a king to his realm as analogous to that of a husband to his wife. The earth is
the king's bride.
have been revered from time without beginning; and when the elder brother has fallen, the younger is no longer chargeable with the offence of pārvettrya (i.e. of marrying before his elder brother). When he had been so addressed, Sāntanu returned to his capital, and exercised the royal authority. And although his eldest brother Devāpi continued to be degraded by having uttered words opposed to the doctrines of the Veda, the god Parjanya rained in order to produce a harvest of all sorts of grain."

Can the compiler of the Purāṇa have deviated from the conclusion of this history as found in the Nirukta, and given it a new turn, in order to escape from the conclusion that a Rājanya could officiate as a purohita?

The same story is briefly told in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, ix. 22, 14–17.

In the Udyogaparvan of the Mahābhārata, on the other hand, Devāpi’s virtues and orthodoxy are extolled in the highest terms, and his exclusion from the throne is ascribed solely to his being a leper, v. 5054:

"Devāpis tu mahātejās tvag-doshī rājā-sattamah | dhārmikaḥ satya-vādi | cha pitūḥ suśrūṣhane rataḥ | paura-jānapadānāṁ cha sammataḥ śādhu-satkritaḥ | sarveshām bāla-vṛiddhānāṁ Devāpir hridayangamah | vadan-yaḥ satyasāndhaḥ cha sarva-bhūta-hite rataḥ | vartamānāḥ pitūḥ śāstre brāhmaṇānāṁ tathaiva cha | . . . . | tam brāhmaṇāḥ cha vṛiddhās cha paura-jānapadāḥ saha | sarve nivārayāmāsura Devāpar abhishekanam | sa tach chhrutvā tu nripatir abhisēka-nivāraṇam | aśru-kāntho 'bhavat rājā paryāśochara chaṭṭamajam | evaṁ vādanyo dharmajāḥ satyasāndhaḥ cha so 'bhavat | priyāḥ praśānām api sa tvag-doshēṇa pradāśhitak | "hināṅgam prātiṣṭhānāṁ nābhīnandanti devataḥ" | iti kriyā nripa-kṛṣṭham pra-tvadēdhan āśivārabhāḥ | . . . | nivāritaṁ nripaṁ drīṣṭvā Devāpiḥ saṁśrito vanam |

“But the glorious Devāpi, a most excellent prince, righteous, veracious, and obedient to his father, was a leper. He was esteemed by the inhabitants both of town and country, honoured by the good, beloved by all, both young and old, eloquent, true to his engagements, devoted to the welfare of all creatures, and conformed to the commands of his father, and of the Brāhmans.” [The king his father grew old and was making preparations for the investiture of his successor; but public opinion was opposed to the devolution of the royal authority on
a leper, however virtuous]. "The Brahmans and aged men, together with the dwellers both in town and country, all restrained him from the investiture of Devāpi. The king, learning their opposition, was choked with tears, and bewailed his son's fate. Thus Devāpi was eloquent; acquainted with duty, true to his promise, and beloved by the people, but vitiated by leprosy. The Brahmans forbade the king (to make Devāpi his successor), saying, 'the gods do not approve a king who labours under any corporeal defect.' . . . Perceiving that the king (his father) was hindered (from carrying out his wishes) Devāpi retired to the forest."

On the same subject, the Matsya Purāṇa, 49, v. 39 ff., states as follows:

Dilipasya Pratipastu tasya putrās trayāḥ samāhitāḥ | Devāpiḥ Sántanuḥ chaiva Bāhlikaś chaiva te trayāḥ | Bāhlīkasya tu dāyādāḥ satpa Bāhlīṣ-varāḥ nyāpāḥ | Devāpis tu apadhevastaḥ prajābhīr abhavaḥ muniḥ | rishayāḥ uchhuḥ | prajābhīs tu kinarthaṁ vai apadhevato janēvaraḥ | ko dōśāḥ rājaputrasya prajābhīhiḥ samudāhītāḥ | Sūta uvācha | kilāśid rājaputras tu kushī tam nābhya-pājayan | ko'rthān vai atra (? vetty atra) devānāṁ kshattram prati dvijottamāḥ |

"The son of Dilipa was Pratipa, of whom three sons are recorded, Devāpi, Sāntana, and Bāhlika. The sons of the last were the seven Bāhlīśvara kings. But the Muni Devāpi was rejected by the people. The rishis enquired: 'why was that prince rejected by the people? what faults were alleged against him?' Sūta replied: 'the prince was leprous, and they paid him no respect. Who knows the designs of the gods towards the Kshatriya race?'"

No more is said of Devāpi in this passage. The Vishnu Purāṇa has the following further curious particulars regarding him, iv. 24, 44 ff.:

Devāpiḥ Pauravo rājā Maruś chekshvāku-vanśājaḥ | mahāyoga-balopetāu Kalāpa-grāma-saṁśrayau | kṛite yuge iñāgatyā kṣhattrā-prāvarta-takau hi tāu | bhavishyato Manor vanśe vijja-bhūtāu vyavasthitau | etena krama-yogena Manu-putraṁ vasundhārāḥ | kṛite-tretā-saṁjnāṃ yugāni trīṇi bhujyate | Kalau tu vijja-bhūtās te kechit tishṭhanti bhūtale | yathāīva Devāpi-Maru saṁpratāṁ samavasthitau |

"King Devāpi of the race of Puru,2 and Maru of the family of

---

62 In the twentieth chapter, as we have seen, he is said to be of the race of Kuru
Ikshvāku, filled with the power of intense contemplation (mahāyoga) are abiding in the village of Kalāpa, continuing to exist as seeds in the family of Manu; they shall come hither in the (next) Kṛita age, and re-establish the Kṣhattriya race. According to this order the earth is enjoyed by the sons of Manu throughout the three ages called Kṛita, Tretā, and Dwāpara. But during the Kali certain persons remain upon earth as seeds (of a future race), as Devāpi and Maru now exist."

According to the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, ix. 22, 17, it is the lunar race, which had perished in the Kali age, that Devāpi is to restore in the future Kṛita (soma-vāṁśa kalau nāṣṭe kṛitādu sthāpayishyatī).

I shall quote here from the 132nd section of the Matsya Purāṇa, entitled Manvantara-varganam (a description of the Manvantaras) some of the particulars about the rishis with which it concludes:


 Various readings—Bhalandaḥ cha Vṛṣācha Sankūlasa."
brāhmaṇaḥ kṣattreyah vaiśyaḥ rishiputraṁ nibodhata | 118. Rishikāṇāṁ sutāḥ hy ete rishi-putraḥ śrutarshayaḥ |

"98. Bhṛgu, Kāśya, Prachetas, Dadhīcha, Ātmavat, (99) Aurva, Jamadagni, Kripa, Sāradvata, Arśṭiśeṣa, Yudhājit, Vītahavya, Suvarchas, (100) Vaiṇa, Prithu, Divodāsa, Brāhmaṇa, Gṛītṣa, S‘auṇaka, these are the nineteen 65 Bhṛguśis, composers of hymns. 101. Angiras, Vedhasa, Bharadvāja, Bhalandana, 66 Ritabādha, Garga, Siti, Sankṛiti, Gurudhīra, 67 Māṇḍhātri, Ambarīsha, Yuvanāśva, Purukutsa, 68 Pradyumna, S‘ravaṇasya, 69 Ajamiḍha, Haryaśva, Takshapa, Kavi, Prisadaśa, Virūpa, Kaṇva, Muddgale, Utathya, S‘aradvat, Vājaśravas, Apaśya, Suvittra, Vāmadeva, Ajita, Bṛihaduktha, Dirghatamas, Kākṣikāvat, are recorded as the thirty-three eminent Angirases. These were all composers of hymns. Now learn the Kāśyas. . . . . 111. Viśvāmitra, son of Gādhi, Devarāja, Bala, the wise Madhuchhandas, Rishabha, Aghamarṣaṇa, (112) Aśṭaka, Lohita, Bhrītakīla, Vedaśravas, Devaṛāta, Purāṇāśva, Dhananjaya, the glorious (113) Mithila, Sālankayana, these are to be known as the thirteen devout and eminent Kuśikas.70 . . . . . 115. Manu Vaivasvata, Iḍa, king Purūravas, these are to be known as the eminent utterers of hymns among the Kṣattreyas. 116. Bhalanda, Vandy, and Sankīrtti, 71 these are always to be known as the three eminent persons among the Vaiśyas who were composers of hymns. 117. Thus ninety-one72 persons have been declared, by whom hymns have been given forth, Brāhmaṇa, Kṣattraya, and Vaiśya. Learn the sons of the rishis. 118. These are the offspring of the rishikas, sons of rishis, secondary rishis (śrutarshis)." 73

The section ends here.

64 I am indebted for an additional copy of this section of the Mataya Purāṇa (of which some account is given by Prof. Aufricht in his Catalogue, p. 41), to the kindness of Mr. Griffith, Principal of Queen’s College, Benares, who, at my request, has caused it to be collated with various other MSS. existing in Benares. I have not thought it necessary to exhibit all the various readings in the part I have quoted.
65 The number of nineteen is only obtained by making Vaiṇa and Prithu two persons.
66 Instead of this word, one Benares MS. has Lakṣmana.
67 Two MSS. have Turavita.
68 This word is divided into two in the MS.
69 Two MSS. have, instead, Vasaśravas and Tamasyavat.
70 Unless some of the words I have taken as names are really epithets, fifteen persons are enumerated here.
71 Some MSS. have Bhalandaka, Vanda or Vāsas, and Sankīla or Sankīma.
72 This is the total of several lists, some of which I have omitted.
It will be observed from a comparison of this extract with the details previously given, that some of the rājarshis, or rishis of royal blood, such as Ārṣātisheṇa, Vitahavya, Prithu (the same as Prithi) are spoken of as belonging to the family of Bhṛigu, while others of the same class, such as Māndhātri, Ambariśha, Yuvaṇāśva, Purukutsa, are reckoned among the Angirasas. Viśvāmitra and his descendants are merely designated as Kuśikas without any specific allusion to their Rājanya descent; but Manu, Iḍa, and Purūravas, are distinctly recognized as being as once authors of hymns and Kshattriyas; and, what is more remarkable, three Vaiśyas are also declared to have been sacred poets. These traditions of an earlier age, though scanty in amount, are yet sufficient to show that in the Vedic times the capacity for poetical composition, and the prerogative of officiating at the service of the gods, was not regarded as entirely confined to men of priestly families.

Sscr. III.—Texts from the Atharva-veda illustrating the progress of Brāhmanical pretensions.

I have already quoted (in pp. 21 and 22) three short passages from the Atharva-veda regarding the origin of the Brāhmaṇ and Kshatriya castes. I shall now bring forward some other texts from the same collection which show a much greater development of the pretensions of the priests to a sacred and inviolable character than we meet in any part of the Rig-veda, if the 109th hymn of the tenth book (cited above) be excepted.

I shall first adduce the 17th hymn of the fifth book, to which I have already alluded, as an expansion of R.V. x. 109.


" . . . . . . . 4. That calamity which falls upon the village, of which they say, 'this is a star with dishevelled hair,' is in truth the brāhmānī's wife, who ruins the kingdom; (and the same is the case) wherever (a country) is visited by a hare attended with meteors. . . . . . . 7. Whenever any miscarriages take place, or any moving things are destroyed, whenever men slay each other, it is the brāhmānī's wife who kills them. 8. And when a woman has had ten former husbands not brāhmāns, if a brāhmān take her hand (i.e. marry her), it is he alone who is her husband. 9. It is a Brāhman only that is a husband, and not a Rājanya or a Vaiśya. That (truth) the Sun goes forward proclaiming to the five classes of men (panchabhyaṁ mānaṇe bhyaḥ), . . . . . . . 12. His (the king's) wife does not repose opulent (sātavāhi) and handsome upon her bed in that kingdom where a brāhmānī's wife is foolishly shut up. 13. A son with large ears (vikarṇaḥ) and broad head is not born in the house in that kingdom, etc. 14. A charioteer with golden neckchain does not march before the king's hosts in that kingdom, etc. 15. A white horse with black ears does not make a show yoked to his (the king's) chariot in that kingdom, etc. 16. There is no pond with blossoming lotuses in his (the king's) grounds in that kingdom where, etc. 17. His (the king's) brindled cow is not milked by his milkmen in that kingdom, etc. 18. His (the king's) milch cow does not thrive, nor does his ox endure the yoke, in that country where a Brāhman passes the night wretchedly without his wife."

This hymn appears to show that, however extravagant the pretensions of the Brāhmans were in other respects, they had, even at the comparatively late period when it was composed, but little regard to

73 The word here in the original is sūnānām, with which it is difficult to make any sense. Should we not read sēnānām?
76 Compare R.V. x. 107, 10.
the purity of the sacerdotal blood, as they not only intermarried with women of their own order, or even with women who had previously lived single, but were in the habit of forming unions with the widows of Rājanyas or Vaiśyas,75 if they did not even take possession of the wives of such men while they were alive.76 Even if we suppose these women to have belonged to priestly families, this would only show that it was no uncommon thing for females of that class to be married to Rājanyas or Vaiśyas—a fact which would, of course, imply that the caste system was either laxly observed, or only beginning to be introduced among the Indians of the earlier Vedic age. That, agreeably to ancient tradition, Brāhmans intermarried with Rājanya women at the period in question, is also distinctly shewn

75 That the remarriage of women was customary among the Hindus of these days is also shewn by A.V. ix. 5, 27 f., quoted in my paper on Yama, Jour. R. A. S. for 1865, p. 299.
76 This latter supposition derives a certain support from the emphasis with which the two verses in question (A.V. v. 17, 8, 9) assert that the Brāhmaṇ was the only true husband. Whence, it may be asked, the necessity for this strong and repeated asseveration, if the Rājanya and Vaiśya husbands were not still alive, and prepared to claim the restoration of their wives? The verses are, however, explicable without this supposition.

It is to be observed, however, that no mention is here made of Sūdras as a class with which Brāhmans intermarried. Sūdras were not Āryas, like the three upper classes. This distinction is recognised in the following verse of the A.V. xix. 62, 1: “Make me dear to gods, dear to princes, dear to every one who beholds me, both to Sūdra and to Aryan.” (Unless we are to suppose that both here and in xix. 32, 8 ārya=a Vaiśya, and not ārya, is the word). In S'atapatha Brāhmaṇa, Kārya Sākhā (Ādiśra ḫaṅḍa, i. 6), the same thing is clearly stated in these words (already partially quoted above, p. 176), for a copy of which I am indebted to Prof. Müller: Tena sarva eva propadeta na hi devaḥ sarveṇaiva sangachhante | ārya eva brāhmaṇo vā kṣattriyo vā vaiśya vā te hi yajniyāḥ | no eva sarveṇaiva samvadeta na hi devaḥ sarveṇaiva samadante āryenaiva brāhmaṇena vā kṣattriyena vā vaiśyaena vā te hi yajniyāḥ | yady evaṁ śudreṇa samvīda vindet “īttham enam nīchakṣavā” ity anyam brāhiyād eśaṁ dīkṣitaṁ yopachāraḥ. “Every one cannot obtain this (for the gods do not associate with every man), but only an Aryan, a Brāhmaṇ, or a Kṣattriya, or a Vaiśya, for these can sacrifice. Nor should one talk with everybody (for the gods do not talk with every body), but only with an Āryan, a Brāhmaṇ, or a Kṣattriya, or a Vaiśya, for these can sacrifice. If any one have occasion to speak to a Sūdra, let him say to another person, ‘Tell this man so and so.’ This is the rule for an initiated man.”

In the corresponding passage of the Mādhyandina Sākhā (p. 224 of Weber’s edition) this passage is differently worded.

From Manu (ix. 149–157; x. 7 ff.) it is clear that Brāhmans intermarried with Sūdra women, though the offspring of those marriages was degraded.
by the story of the rishi Chyavana and Sukanyā, daughter of king Saryāta, narrated in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, and quoted in my paper entitled "Contributions to a Knowledge of Vedic Mythology," No. ii., in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1866, pp. 11 ff. See also the stories of the rishi Śyāvāśva, who married the daughter of king Rathavītī, as told by the commentator on Rig-veda, v. 61, and given in Professor Wilson’s translation, vol. iii. p. 344.

The next hymn, from the same work, sets forth with great liveliness and vigour the advantages accruing to princes from the employment of a domestic priest.


"1. May this prayer of mine be successful; may the vigour and strength be complete, may the power be perfect, undecaying, and victorious of those of whom I am the priest (purohita). 2. I fortify their kingdom, and augment their energy, valour, and force. I break the arms of their enemies with this oblation. 3. May all those who fight against our wise and prosperous (prince) sink downward, and be prostrated. With my prayer I destroy his enemies and raise up his friends. 4. May those of whom I am the priest be sharper than an axe, sharper than fire, sharper than Indra’s thunderbolt. 5. I strengthen their weapons; I prosper their kingdom rich in heroes. May their power be undecaying and victorious. May all the gods foster their designs.
6. May their valorous deeds, o Maghavat, burst forth; may the noise of the conquering heroes arise; may their distinct shouts, their clear yells, go up; may the gods, the Maruts, with Indra as their chief, march forward with their host. 7. Go, conquer, ye warriors; may your arms be impetuous. Ye with the sharp arrows, smite those whose bows are powerless; ye whose weapons and arms are terrible (smite) the feeble. 8. When discharged, fly forth, o arrow, sped by prayer. Vanquish the foes, assail, slay all the choicest of them; let not one escape.”

The two following hymns from the same collection declare the guilt, the peril, and disastrous consequences of oppressing Brāhmaṇas, and robbing them of their property. The threats and imprecations of haughty sacerdotal insolence could scarcely be expressed more energetically.

hantābhiṣastā Indras tathā tad vedhaso vidiṣṭā

15. Ishur iva digdhā
nripate pridakur iva gopate
sa brāhmaṇasya ishur ghorā tayā vidhyati
piyataḥ

“1. King, the gods have not given thee (this cow) to eat. Do not, o Rājanya (man of royal descent), seek to devour the Brāhman's cow, which is not to be eaten. 2. The wretched Rājanya, unlucky in play, and self-destroyed, will eat the Brāhman's cow, saying, ‘Let me live to-day, (if I can) not (live) to-morrow.’ 3. This cow, clothed with a skin, contains deadly poison, like a snake. Beware, Rājanya, of this Brāhman's (cow); she is ill-flavoured, and must not be eaten. 4. She takes away his regal power, destroys his splendour, consumes him entire like a fire which has been kindled. The man who looks upon the Brāhman as mere food to be eaten up, drinks serpent's poison. 5. Indra kindles a fire in the heart of that contemner of the gods who smiles the Brāhman, esteeming him to be inoffensive, and foolishly covets his property. Heaven and earth abhor the man who (so) acts. 6. A Brāhman is not to be wronged, as fire (must not be touched) by a man who cherishes his own body. Soma is his (the Brāhman's) kinsman, and Indra shields him from imprecations. 7. The wicked (?) man who thinks the priests' food is sweet while he is eating it, swallows (the cow) bristling with a hundred sharp points, but cannot digest her. 8. The priest's tongue is a bow-string, his voice is a barb, and his windpipe is arrow-points smeared with fire. With these god-directed, and heart-subduing bows, the priest pierces the scorners of the gods. 9. Brāhmans bearing sharp arrows, armed with missiles, never miss their mark when they discharge a shaft. Shooting with fiery energy and with anger, they pierce (the enemy) from afar. 10. The descendants of Vītahavya, who ruled over a thousand men, and were ten hundred in number, were overwhelmed after they had eaten a Brāhman's cow. 11. The cow herself, when she was slaughtered, destroyed them,—those men who cooked the last she-goat of Kesaraprāṃbandhā. 12. Those hundred persons whom the earth shook off, after they had wronged the priestly race, were overwhelmed in an inconceivable manner. 13. He lives among mortals a hater of the gods; infected with poison he becomes reduced to a skeleton; he who wrongs a Brāhman the kins-”

77 I am not aware whether any traces of this story are discoverable in the Purāṇas or Mahābhārata. See the first verse of the hymn next to be quoted.
man of the deities, fails to attain to the heaven of the Forefathers. 14. Agni is called our leader; Soma our kinsman. Indra neutralizes imprecations (directed against us); this the wise understand. 15. Like a poisoned arrow, O king, like a serpent, O lord of cows,—such is the dreadful shaft of the Brähman, with which he pierces his enemies."


"1. The Śṛṅjayas, descendants of Vītahavya, waxed exceedingly; they almost touched the sky; but after they had injured Bṛhigu, they were overwhelmed. 2. When men pierced Bṛihatsāman, a Brāhma descended from Āngiras, a ram with two rows of teeth swallowed their children. 3. Those who spit, or throw filth (?) upon a Brāhma, sit eating hair in the midst of a stream of blood. 4. So long as this Brāhma's cow is cut up (?) and cooked, she destroys the glory of the kingdom; no vigorous hero is born there. 5. It is cruel to
slaught her; her ill-flavoured flesh is thrown away. When her milk is drunk, that is esteemed a sin among the Forefathers. 6. Whenever a king, fancying himself mighty, seeks to devour a Brähman, that kingdom is broken up, in which a Brähman is oppressed. Becoming eight-footed, four-eyed, four-eared, four-jawed, two-faced, two-tongued, she (the cow) shatters the kingdom of the oppressor of Brähmans. 8. (Ruin) overflows that kingdom, as water swamps a leaky boat: calamity smites that country in which a priest is wronged. 9. Even trees, o Nárada, repel, and refuse their shade to, the man who claims a right to the property of a Brähman. This (property), as king Varuṇa hath said, has been turned into a poison by the gods. No one who has eaten a Brähman’s cow continues to watch (i.e. to rule) over a country. 11. Those nine nineties (of persons) whom the earth shook off, when they had wronged the priestly race, were overwhelmed in an inconceivable manner (see verse 12 of the preceding hymn). 12. The gods have declared that the cloth wherewith a dead man’s feet are bound shall be thy pall, thou oppressor of priests. 13. The tears which flow from a persecuted man as he laments,—such is the portion of water which the gods have assigned to thee, thou oppressor of priests. 14. The gods have allotted to thee that portion of water wherewith men wash the dead, and moisten beards. 15. The rain of Mitra and Varuṇa does not descend on the oppressor of priests. For him the battle has never a successful issue; nor does he bring his friend into subjection.”

The attention of the reader is directed to the intensity of contempt and abhorrence which is sought to be conveyed by the coarse imagery contained in verses 3, and 12–14, of this last hymn.

There is another section of the same Veda, xii. 5, in which curses similar to those in the last two hymns are fulminated against the oppressors of Brähmans. The following are specimens:

“4. Prayer (brāhmāṇ) is the chief (thing); the Brāhman is the lord (adhipati). 5. From the Kshattriya who seizes the priest’s cow, and oppresses the Brāhman, (6) there depart piety, valour, good fortune, (7) force, keenness, vigour, strength, speech, energy, prosperity, virtue, (8) prayer (brāhmāṇ), royalty, kingdom, subjects, splendour, renown, lustre, wealth, (9) life, beauty, name, fame, inspiration and expiration, sight, hearing, (10) milk, sap, food, eating, righteousness, truth, oblation, sacrifice, offspring, and cattle;—(11) all these things depart from the Kshattriya who seizes the priest’s cow. 12. Terrible is the Brāhman’s cow, filled with deadly poison. . . . 13. In her reside all dreadful things, and all forms of death, (14) all cruel things, and all forms of homicide. 15. When seized, she binds in the fetters of death the oppressor of priests and despiser of the gods.”

A great deal more follows to the same effect, which it would be tiresome to quote.

I subjoin some further texts, in which reference is made to brāhmāṇs.

In xix. 22, 21 (= xix. 23, 30) it is said:

_Brahma-jyeshthah samhritā viryāṇi brahmāgre jyeṣṭhaṁ divam ātatānaṁ bhūtānāṁ brahmā prathamo ha jajne tenārhati brahmaṁā sparśahkitum kaḥ_

“Powers are collected, of which prayer (or sacred science, brāhmāṇ) is the chief. Prayer, the chief, in the beginning stretched out the sky. The priest (brāhmāṇ) was born the first of beings. Who, then, ought to vie with the brāhmāṇ.

A superhuman power appears to be ascribed to the brāhmāṇ in the following passages,—unless by brāhmāṇ we are to understand Bṛhaspati:

_xix. 9, 12._ _Bṛhāmā Prajāpatir Dhāta lokaḥ vedāḥ saptas-pishayo 'gnayah | tair me kritaṁ svastyayanam Indro me 'harma yachhatu brahmā me 'harma yachhatu_
“May a prosperous journey be granted to me by prayer, Prajāpati, Dhātṛi, the worlds, the Vedas, the seven rishis, the fires; may Indra grant me felicity, may the brāhmāṇ grānt me felicity.”

xix. 43, 8. Yatra brahma-vido yanti dīkṣhayā tapasā saha | brahma mā tatra nayatu brahma brahma dadhātu me | brahmaṇe svāhā.

“May the brāhmāṇ conduct me to the place whither the knowers of prayer (or of sacred science) go by initiation with austerity. May the brāhmāṇ impart to me sacred science. Svāhā to the brāhmāṇ.”

The wonderful powers of the Brahmachārin, or student of sacred science, are described in a hymn (A.V. xi. 5), parts of which are translated in my paper on the progress of the Vedic Religion, pp. 374 ff.

And yet with all this sacredness of his character the priest must be devoted to destruction, if, in the interest of an enemy, he is seeking by his ceremonies to effect the ruin of the worshipper.

v. 8, 5. Yam ami puro dādhire brahmaṇam apabhūtaye | Indra sa me adhospadaṁ tam prayasyāmi nrityave |

“May the brāhmāṇ whom these men have placed in their front (as a purohita) for our injury, fall under my feet, o Indra; I hurl him away, to death (compare A.V. vii. 70, 1 ff.).

**SECT. IV.**—Opinions of Professor R. Roth and Dr. M. Haug regarding the origin of caste among the Hindus.

I shall in this section give some account of the speculations of Prof. R. Roth and Dr. M. Haug on the process by which they conceive the system of castes to have grown up among the Indians.

The remarks which I shall quote from Prof. Roth are partly drawn from his third “Dissertation on the Literature and History of the Veda,” p. 117, and partly from his paper on “Brahma and the Brāhmans,” in the first volume of the Journal of the German Oriental Society.78 He says in the latter essay: “The religious development of India is attached through the course of three thousand years to the word brāhmāṇ. This conception might be taken as the standard for estimating the progress of thought directed to divine things, as at every step taken by the latter, it has gained a new form, while at the same time

78 The reader who is unacquainted with German will find a fuller account of this article in the Benares Magazine for October 1861, pp. 823 ff.
it has always embraced in itself the highest spiritual acquisition of the nation. . . . The original signification of the word brāhma, as we easily discover it in the Vedic hymns, is that of prayer; not praise or thanksgiving, but that invocation which, with the force of the will directed to God, seeks to draw him to itself, and to receive satisfaction from him. . . . From this oldest sense and form of brāhma (neuter) was formed the masculine noun brahma, which was the designation of those who pronounced the prayers, or performed the sacred ceremonies; and in nearly all the passages of the Rig-veda in which it was thought that this word must refer to the Brahmanical caste, this more extended sense must be substituted for the other more limited one. . . . From this sense of the word brahma, nothing was more natural than to convert this offerer of prayer into a particular description of sacrificial priest: so soon as the ritual began to be fixed, the functions which were before united in a single person, who both prayed to the gods and sacrificed to them, became separated, and a priesthood interposed itself between man and God.”

Then further on, after quoting R.V. iv. 50, 4 ff. (see above, p. 247), Prof. Roth continues: “In this manner here and in many places of the liturgical and legal books, the promise of every blessing is attached to the maintenance of a priest by the king. Inasmuch as he supports and honours the priest, the latter ensures to him the favour of the gods. So it was that the caste of the Brāhmans arose and attained to power and consideration: first, they were only the single domestic priests of the kings; then the dignity became hereditary in certain families; finally a union, occasioned by similarity of interests, of these families in one larger community was effected; and all this in reciprocal action with the progress made in other respects by theological doctrine and religious worship. Still the extension of the power which fell into the hands of this priestly caste would not be perfectly comprehensible

79 In his third Dissertation on the Literature and History of the Veda, Prof. Roth remarks: “In the Vedic age, access to the gods by prayer and sacrifice was open to all classes of the community; and it was only the power of expressing devotion in a manner presumed to be acceptable to the deities, or a readiness in poetical diction, that distinguished any individual or family from the mass, and led to their being employed to conduct the worship of others. The name given to such persons was purohita, one ‘put forward;’ one through whose mediation the gods would receive the offering presented. But these priests had as yet no especial sanctity or exclusive prerogative which would render their employment imperative.”
from this explanation alone. The relation of spiritual superiority in which the priests came to stand to the kings was aided by other historical movements.”

Professor Roth then proceeds: “When—at a period more recent than the majority of the hymns of the Rig-veda—the Vedic people, driven by some political shock, advanced from their abodes in the Punjab farther and further to the south, drove the aborigines into the hills, and took possession of the broad tract of country lying between the Ganges, the Jumna, and the Vindhya range; the time had arrived when the distribution of power, the relation of king and priest, could become transformed in the most rapid and comprehensive manner. Principalities separated in such various ways, such a division into tribes as had existed in the Punjab, were no longer possible here, where nature had created a wide and continuous tract with scarcely any natural boundaries to dissever one part from another. Most of those petty princes who had descended from the north with their tribes must here of necessity disappear, their tribes become dissolved, and contests arise for the supreme dominion. This era is perhaps portrayed to us in the principal subject of the Mahābhārata, the contest between the descendants of Pāṇḍu and Kuru. In this stage of disturbance and complication, power naturally fell into the hands of those who did not directly possess any authority, the priestly races and their leaders, who had hitherto stood rather in the position of followers of the kings, but now rose to a higher rank. It may easily be supposed that they and their families, already honoured as the confidential followers of the princes, would frequently be able to strike a decisive stroke to which the king would owe his success. If we take further into account the intellectual and moral influence which this class possessed in virtue of the prerogative conceded to, or usurped by, them, and the religious feeling of the people, it is not difficult to comprehend how in such a period of transition powerful communities should arise among the domestic priests of petty kings and their families, should attain to the highest importance in every department of life, and should grow into a caste which, like the ecclesiastical order in the middle ages of Christianity, began to look upon secular authority as an influence from the fulness of their power, to be conferred at their will; and how, on the other hand, the numerous royal families should
sink down into a nobility which possessed, indeed, the sole right to the
kingly dignity, but at the same time, when elected by the people,
required inauguration in order to their recognition by the priesthood,
and were enjoined above all things to employ only Brāhmans as their
counsellors."

In order to render the probability of this theory still more apparent,
Professor Roth goes on to indicate the relations of the other castes to
the Brāhmans. The position which the three superior classes occupied
in the developed Brahmanical system was one of gradation, as they
differed only in the extent of their religious and civil prerogatives, the
Kṣhattriya being in some respects less favoured than the Brāhman, and
the Vaiśya than the Kṣhattriya. With the Śūdras, on the other hand,
the case was quite different. They were not admitted to sacrifice, to
the study of the Vedas, or to investiture with the sacred cord. From
this Professor Roth concludes that the three highest castes stood in a
closer connection with each other, whether of descent, or of culture,
than any of them did to the fourth. The Indian body politic, more-
over, was complete without the Śūdras. The Brāhman and Kṣhattriya
were the rulers, while the Vaiśyas formed the mass of the people.
The fact of the latter not being originally a separate community is
confirmed by the employment assigned to them, as well as by their
name Vaiśya, derived from the word Viś, a word which in the Veda
designates the general community, especially considered as the pos-
sessor of the pure Aryan worship and culture, in contradistinction to
all barbarian races. Out of this community the priesthood arose in
the manner above described, while the Kṣhattriyas were the nobility,
descended in the main from the kings of the earlier ages. The fourth
caste, the Śūdras, consisted, according to Prof. Roth, of a race subdued
by the Brahmanical conquerors, whether that race may have been a
branch of the Arian stock which immigrated at an earlier period into
India, or an autochthonous Indian tribe.

In his tract on the origin of Brāhmanism, from which I have already
quoted (see above, pp. 11 and 14), Dr. Haug thus states his views on
this question: "It has been of late asserted that the original parts of
the Vedas do not know the system of caste. But this conclusion was
prematurely arrived at without sufficiently weighing the evidence. It
is true the caste system is not to be found in such a developed state;
the duties enjoined to the several castes are not so clearly defined as in the Law Books and Purāṇas. But nevertheless the system is already known in the earlier parts of the Vedas, or rather presupposed. The barriers only were not so insurmountable as in later times.” (p. 6).

This view he supports by a reference to the Zend Avesta, in which he finds evidence of a division of the followers of Ahura Mazda into the three classes of Atharvas, Rathaesthas, and Vaśtrya fšhuyans, which he regards as corresponding exactly to the Brāhmans, Kshattriyas, and Vaiśyas of India. The Atharvas, or priests, in particular formed a class or even a caste; they had secrets which they were prohibited from divulging; they were the spiritual guides of their nation, and none but the son of a priest could become a priest—a rule which the Parsīs still maintain. From these facts, Dr. Haug deduces the conclusion that the nation of which both the Indo-Arians and the Perso-Arians originally formed a part had been divided into three classes even before the separation of the Indians from the Iranians; and he adds (p. 7): “From all we know, the real origin of caste appears to go back to a time anterior to the composition of the Vedic hymns, though its development into a regular system with insurmountable barriers can be referred only to the latest period of the Vedic times.”

I shall furnish a short analysis of some other parts of Dr. Haug’s interesting tract. He derives (p. 7) the word brāhmaṇa from brāhmāṇ (neuter), which originally meant “a sacred song, prayer,” as an effusion of devotional feeling. Brāhmaṇa was the “sacred element” in the sacrifice, and signified “the soul of nature, the productive power.” The Brahmanic sacrifices had production as their object, and embraced some rites which were intended to furnish the sacrificer with a new spiritual body wherewith he might ascend to heaven, and others calculated to provide him with cattle and offspring (p. 8). The symbol of this brāhmaṇa, or productive power, which must always be present at the sacrifice, was a bunch of kuśa grass, generally called Veda (a word alternating with brāhmaṇa), which, at the sacrifice, was passed from one priest to another, and given to the sacrificer and his wife. The corresponding symbol of twigs used by the Parsīs was called in Zend bāresma, which Dr. Haug considers to have been originally the same as brāhmaṇa (p. 9). As it was essential to the success of these sacrifices
that every portion of the complicated ceremonial should be accurately performed, and as mistakes could not be avoided, it became necessary to obviate by an atonement (prāyāśchittī) the mischief which would otherwise have ensued; and the priest appointed to guard against or expiate such mistakes, when committed by the other priests—the hotrī, adhvaryu, and udgātṛi—was called, “from the most ancient times,” the brāhmān (masculine), who was a functionary pre-eminently supplied with brāhmā (neuter) or sacred knowledge, and thereby connected “with the soul of nature, the cause of all growth, the last cause of all sacrificial rites” (p. 10). The office of brāhmān was not one to which mere birth gave a claim, but had to be attained by ability and study. The descend- ants of these brāhmān priests were the Brāhmans, and the speculations of the most eminent brāhmān priests on divine things, and especially on sacrificial rites, are contained in the works called Brāhmaṇas (p. 12).

Dr. Haug considers that no such a class as that of the brāhmān priests existed at the early period when the ancestors of the Hindus separated from those of the Parsis in consequence of religious differences. The few rites preserved by the Parsis as relics of the remotest antiquity closely resemble those of the Brāhmans. Dr. Haug finds that in the Homa ritual of the former (corresponding to the Soma ceremony of the latter) only two priests, called Zota and Raspi or Rathwī, are required, whom he recognises as corresponding to the Hotṛi and Adhvaryu of the latter. So long as the rites were simple, no brāhmān priest was wanted; but when they became complicated and multiform, the necessity for such a functionary arose. And it was only then that the sons of the brāhmāna, i.e. the Brāhmans, could rise through the possession of sacred knowledge, derived from their fathers, to great power, and form themselves into a regular caste. The development of these ceremonies out of their primitive simplicity into the complexity and multiformity which they ultimately assumed must, Dr. Haug thinks, have been the work of many centuries. This transformation must have taken place in the region bordering on the Sarasvatī, where the expansion of the Brahmanical system, and the elevation of the Brāhmans to full spiritual supremacy, is to be sought, before the Indo-Arians advanced south-eastwards into Hindostan proper (p. 14). The ascendancy of the Brāhmans was not however attained without opposition on the part of the kings (p. 18). Dr. Haug concludes by relating the reception
of Viśvāmitra into the order of Brāhmans, and by giving some account of the rishis and the several classes into which they were divided.

As the question is generally stated by Dr. Haug in pages 6 and 12 ff., the difference between him and other European scholars is one of age and not of principle, for neither party admits any distinction of race or congenital diversity between the three superior castes or classes.
CHAPTER IV.

EARLY CONTESTS BETWEEN THE BRAHMANS AND KSHATRIYAS.

I proceed to give some legendary illustrations of the struggle which no doubt occurred in the early ages of Hindu history between the Brāhmans and the Kshatriyas, after the former had begun to constitute a fraternity exercising the sacerdotal profession, but before the respective provinces of the two classes had been accurately defined by custom, and when the members of each were ready to encroach on the prerogatives claimed as their own exclusive birthright by the other.

SECT. I.—Manu’s Summary of refractory and submissive monarchs.

I shall begin with the following passage, which we find in the Institutes of Manu, vii. 38 ff., regarding the impious resistance, as the lawgiver considered it, of certain monarchs to the legitimate claims of the priests, and the dutiful behaviour of others.


“Let the king constantly reverence ancient Brāhmans skilled in the Vedas, and pure in conduct; for he who always respects the aged is honoured even by the Rākshāses. 39. Let him, even though humble-

\footnote{In support of this reading, see M. Loiseleur Deslongchamps’s and Sir G. C. Haughton’s notes on the passage.}
minded, be continually learning submissiveness from them: for a sub-
missive monarch never perishes. 40. Through want of this character
many kings have been destroyed with all their possessions; whilst by
humility even hermits have obtained kingdoms. 41. Veṇa perished
through want of submissiveness, and king Nahuṣa, and Śūdās the son
of Pijavana, and Sumukha, and Nimi. 42. But through submissiv-
ness Prithu and Manu attained kingly power, Kuvera the lordship of
wealth, and the son of Gāḍhī (Viśvāmitra) Brāhmaṇhood. 81

Veṇa is again referred to in Manu ix. 66 f.: Ayaṁ dvijair hi vid-
vadbhīṁ paśudharmo nigārhitāṁ | manushyāṁ api proktā Veṇe rājyaṁ
prasāsatī | 67. Sa mahīṁ akhilāṁ bhunjan rājarshi-pravaraḥ purāṁ
| vargānāṁ sankaraṁ chakre kāmopahata-četanaṁ |

“This custom (of raising up seed to a deceased brother or kinsman
by his widow) fit only for cattle, was declared to be (law) for men also,
when Veṇa held sway. This eminent royal rishi, who in former times
ruled over the whole earth, having his reason destroyed by lust,
occaisioned a confusion of castes.”

The legendary history of nearly all the kings thus stigmatized or
celebrated can be traced in the Purāṇas and other parts of Indian
literature. I shall supply such particulars of the refractory monarchs
as I can find.

It will be observed that Manu is spoken of as an ordinary prince;
and that even Kuvera, the god of wealth, is said to have attained his
dignity by the same species of merit as the other persons whom the
writer eulogizes. I am not aware whether any legends exist to the
same effect. Something of a contrary tendency is found with regard
to the deity in question in the passage of the Mahābhārata, of which
an extract is given above, in p. 140, note 249.

81 Kullūka remarks on this passage: Gāḍhī-putro Viśvāmitraṛ cha khattriyāṁ saṁ
tenaiva dehena brāhmanyam prōptavāṁ rājya-labhāvasare brāhmanyam-prōptir aprastutā
'pi vinayotkarśhāram uktā | īḍyāḥ 'yaṁ śāstrūnushṭhāna-nishiddha-varjana-rūpa-
viny vagyayena khattrīyro 'piā ṛciel abhām brāhmanyam lebhe | "Viśvāmitra, the son of
Gāḍhī, being a Khattriya, obtained Brāhmaṇhood in the same body (i.e. without
being again born in another body). The attainment of Brāhmaṇhood by one who at the
time held kingly authority, although an unusual occurrence, is mentioned to show the
excellence of submissiveness. Through that quality, as exhibited in the observance of
scriptural injunctions, and in abstinence from things forbidden, he, being a Khattrīya,
obtained Brāhmaṇhood, so difficult to acquire.”
II. EARLY CONTESTS BETWEEN

I have not met with any story of Sumukha's contest with the Brähmans. Some MSS. read Suratha instead of Sumukha.

The name of Sudās, the son of Pijavana, occurs in several parts of the Rig-veda. I shall return to him in relating the contest between Vasishṭha and Viśvāmitra. I begin with the story of Veṇa.

SECT. II.—Legend of Veṇa.

According to the Vishṇu Purāṇa, i. 13, Veṇa was the son of Anga, and the descendant in the ninth generation of the first Manu, Svāyambhuva; the line of ancestors from the latter downwards being as follows: Uttānapāda, Dhruva, Ślishti, Rīpu, Chākshusha, the sixth Manu called Chākshusha, Uru, Anga (see Wilson's Vishṇu P. vol. i.). Veṇa thus belongs to a mythical age preceding by an enormous interval that of the descendants of Manu Vaivasvata mentioned in the preceding chapter of this volume; five Manvantaras, or periods of 308,571 years each, having intervened in the present Kalpa between the close of the Svāyambhuva, and the beginning of the existing, or Vaivasvata, Manvantara.

Hutab hug Varuno Dhata Pavha Bhaim Nirakara | etc chanye cha yo devaḥ sapamagraha-karaṇaḥ | nirvasya te sarira-sthāḥ sarva-devamayo nirvāḥ | etaj jñātvā mayā 'jnaptāṁ yad yathā kriyataṁ tatha | na dātavyaṁ na hotavyaṁ na yashṭavyaṁ cha vo dvijāḥ | 14. Bharatūḥ suśrūṣaṁ dharmo yathā striṇām paro mataḥ | mamajna-pālanaṁ dharmo bhavatāṁ cha tathā dvijāḥ | rishyāḥ ucyuḥ | 'dehi anyānām maha-ṛaja mā dharmo yātu sankṣhayam | havishāṁ pariṇāma-yāṁ yad etad akhilaṁ jagat | 15. Dharmo cha sankṣhayāṁ yāte kṣhīyate chākhilaṁ jagat |' Parāsara uvācha | iti vijnāpyamāno 'pi sa Veṇaḥ paramarshībhīḥ | yadda dāḍāti nānuṇāṁ praktaḥ praktaḥ punah punah | tatas te munayaḥ sarva kopāmaraḥ-samanvitāḥ | 'hanyatāṁ hanyatām pāpaḥ | ity ucyuḥ te parasparam | 16. 'Yo yajna-puruṣaṁ devam anādi-ṇi dhanaṁ prabhūm | vinindaty aḍhamāchāro na sa yogo bhuvah patiḥ | ity ucyuḥ maṇtra-pātaiś te kuśair muni-gaṇaḥ nirvāma | nirvajnūr nihatam pārvam bhagavan-nindanādīnā | tatas cha munaya reṇuṁ daḍriṣuḥ sarvanto dvijā | 'kim etad' iti chāsanam papracchus te janaṁ tada | 17. Akhyataṁ cha janaṁ teṣām 'chaurbhitva arājake | rāṣṭre tu lokair āraṇḍham para-vaśānaṁ āturaṁ | 18. Teṣām udīrṇa-veganām chaurvāṇaṁ muni-sattamah | sumahaṁ dührasye reṇuḥ para-vittpahāriṇāṁ | tatas sammantraya te sarve munayas tasya bhūbhriṭaḥ | mamanthuḥ ārum putrārtham anapatyasya yatnataḥ | maṇyaṁcha samuttaṁ tasyoroh puṣuṣaṁ kila | dagha-dhūnyapratikāsah kharvatisyo | tihrasvakaḥ | 19. Kīṃ karomiti tān savān vipraṁ āha sa chāturāḥ | niṣkiteti tam ucyuḥ te nihādas tene sa bhavat | 20. Tatas tat-sambhavaḥ jātaḥ Vindhya-saila-nivāsināḥ | nihādaṁ muni-sārdula pāpa-karmopalakaṁ āh | 21. Tenā dvārena niḥkrantaṁ tāt paṁ paṁsaḥ bhopateḥ | nishādās te tathā jātaḥ Veṇa-kalmasha-sambhavaḥ | 22. Tato 'syā dakshināṁ hataḥ mamanthu te tada ṛjijāḥ | madyamāṇe cha tatrāḥhit Prithu Vainyaḥ pratapavān | śripumānaṁ sva-vapuṣuḥ sākshād Agni ivaṃvalan | 23. Adyam ajagavaṁ nāma khat papāta tato dhanaḥ | saras chā divyaṁ nabhasah kavachaṁ cha papāta ha | tasmai jāte tu bhūtāni samprahriṣṭāni sarvasaḥ | satputreṇa cha jātena Veṇo 'pi tridivaṁ yayau | pun-nāmno narakāt trātaḥ sa tene nishādātmāna | 7. The maiden named Sunitha, who was the first-born of Mṛtyu (Death) was given as wife to Anga; and of her Veṇa was born. 8. This son of Mṛtyu's daughter, infected with the taint of his ma-

32 See above, p. 124, and note 230.
ternal grandfather, was born corrupt, as if by nature. 9. When Vena was inaugurated as king by the eminent rishis, he caused this proclamation to be made on the earth: 'Men must not sacrifice, or give gifts, or present oblations. Who else but myself is the enjoyer of sacrifices? I am for ever the lord of offerings.' 10. Then all the rishis approaching the king with respectful salutations, said to him in a gentle and conciliatory tone: 11. 'Hear, o king, what we have to say: 12. We shall worship Hari, the monarch of the gods, and the lord of all sacrifices, with a Dirghasattra (prolonged sacrifice), from which the highest benefits will accrue to your kingdom, your person, and your subjects. May blessings rest upon you! You shall have a share in the ceremony. 13. Vishnu the lord, the sacrificial Male, being propitiated by us with this rite, will grant all the objects of your desire. Hari, the lord of sacrifices, bestows on those kings in whose country he is honoured with oblations, everything that they wish.' Vena replied: 'What other being is superior to me? who else but I should be adored? who is this person called Hari, whom you regard as the lord of sacrifice? Brahman, Janardana, Rudra, Indra, Vayu, Yama, Ravi (the Sun), Agni, Varuna, Dhatri, Pushan, Earth, the Moon,—these and the other gods who curse and bless are all present in a king's person: for he is composed of all the gods.33 Knowing this, ye must

33 The orthodox doctrine, as stated by Manu, vii. 3 ff., coincides very nearly with Vena's estimate of himself, although the legislator does not deduce from it the same conclusions: 3. Raksharam asya sarvasya rajanam asrijat prabhuh | 4. Indraniyamurkinim Agni cha Varunasya cha | Chandra-Vidteyayos chaiva matr ah nirgritya suvele | 5. Yasmad esham surendra nam matrHyoh nirmto nripaH | yasmad abhihavaty esha sarva-huthani tejasa | 6. Japaty aditya-vach chaisha chakshumishi cha manamasi cha | na chainam bhavet jyakti karti aspy abhiwikshitum | 7. So 'gnir bhavati VayuH cha so 'rkaH Somoh sa Dharmarit | sa KuveraH so Varunah sa Mahendrah prabhavataH | 8. Balo 'pi navaamantavyo "manushyaH" iti bhumiHapah | mahati devataH hy esha nara-rupaH tishthati | "3. The lord created the king for the preservation of this entire world, (4) extracting the eternal essential particles of Indra, Vayu, Yama, Surya, Agni, Varuna, Chandra, and Kuvera. 5. Inasmuch as the king is formed of the particles of all these gods, he surpasses all beings in brilliancy. 6. Like the Sun, he distresses both men's eyes and minds; and no one on earth can ever gaze upon him. 7. He is Agni, Vayu, Surya, Soma, Yama, Kuvera, Varuna, and Indra, in majesty. 8. Even when a child a king is not to be despised under the idea that he is a mere man; for he is a great deity in human form."
act in conformity with my commands. Brähmans, ye must neither give gifts, nor present oblations nor sacrifices. 14. As obedience to their husbands is esteemed the highest duty of women, so is the observance of my orders incumbent upon you.' The rishis answered: 'Give permission, great king: let not religion perish: this whole world is but a modified form of oblations. 15. When religion perishes the whole world is destroyed with it.' When Veṇa, although thus admonished and repeatedly addressed by the eminent rishis, did not give his permission, then all the munis, filled with wrath and indignation, cried out to one another, 'Slay, slay the sinner. 16. This man of degraded life, who blasphemes the sacrificial Male, the god, the lord without beginning or end, is not fit to be lord of the earth.' So saying the munis smote with blades of kuṣa grass consecrated by texts this king who had been already smitten by his blasphemy of the divine Being and his other offences. The munis afterwards beheld dust all round, and asked the people who were standing near what that was. 17. They were informed: 'In this country which has no king, the people, being distressed, have become robbers, and have begun to seize the property of others. 18. It is from these robbers rushing impetuously, and plundering other men's goods, that this great dust is seen? Then all the munis, consulting together, rubbed with force the thigh of the king, who was childless, in order to produce a son. From his thigh when rubbed there was produced a man like a charred log, with flat face, and extremely short. 19. 'What shall I do?' cried the man, in distress, to the Brähmans. They said to him, 'Sit down' (nīshāda); and from this he became a Nīshāda. 20. From him sprang the Nīshādas dwelling in the Vindhyā mountains, distinguished by their wicked deeds. 21. By this means the sin of the king departed out of him; and so were the Nīshādas produced, the offspring of the wickedness of Veṇa. 22. The Brähmans then rubbed his right hand; and from it, when rubbed, sprang the majestic Prithu, Veṇa's son, resplendent in body, glowing like the manifested Agni. 23. Then the primeval bow called Ājagava fell from the sky, with celestial arrows, and a coat of mail. At Prithu's birth all creatures rejoiced. And through the birth of this virtuous son, Veṇa, delivered from the hell called Put by this eminent person, ascended to heaven.'

54 This alludes to the fanciful derivation of puttra, "son," from put + tra.
The Harivaṃśa (sect. 5) relates the same story thus, with little variation from the Vished Purāṇa:

Vaiśampāyana uvācha | Āśīd dharmasya goptā vai pūrvam Atri-samaḥ prabhuh | Atri-vaṁśa-samutpannas tv Ango nāma praajasāpatiḥ | tasya putro 'bhavaḥ Veno natyartham dharmo-kovidāḥ | jāto Mrityu-sutāyāṁ vai Sunithāyam praajasāpatiḥ | sa mātāmaha-doshena tena kālātmajatmājaḥ | sva-dharmān pristhataḥ kritvā kāmāḥ lobheshu avarttata | māryādhāṁ sthāpayamāṇa dharmāpetaṁ sa pārthivaḥ | veda-dharmān atikramya so 'dharmo-nirāto 'bhavat | niḥ-svādhīnyā-vāsahākāruṣa tasmin rājani śāsatu | prāvvarttanaṃ papaṁ somāṁ hutaṁ yajnesu devataḥ | "na yashtavyam na hotavyam" iti tasya praajasāpatiḥ | āśīt praṭijñā krūreyāṁ vināśe samupasthite | ahum iyyaḥ chā yashtā chā yajnaḥ cheti kuruśṛvaḥ | "mayi yajnāḥ viśhātavyaḥ mayi hotavyam" ity api | tām atikrāntamaryādām adadānanam asāṃpratam | uchur maharshayaḥ sarve Marichi-pramukham tataḥ | "vayam dīkṣāṁ pravekṣhīyanāḥ saṁvatsara-ganān bahūn | adharmaṁ kuru mā Vena naisha dharmo samātaḥ | anvaye 'treḥ praśutas tvam praajasāpati asāṃsa vyam | 'praajas cha pālayishye 'ham' iti te samayaḥ kriyam | tāṁs tathā bruvataḥ sarvān maharshin abravit tataḥ | Venaḥ prahasya durbuddhiv inam artham anartha-vit | Venaḥ uvācha | "erasaṭā dharmasya kaḥ chānyāḥ bṛotavyaṃ kasya vā mayaḥ | śruta-virya-tapaḥ-satyaṁ mayā vā kaḥ samo bhuvī | prabhavaṁ sarva-bhūtānam dharmānāṁ chā viśeṣhataḥ | sammaṛdhāḥ na vidur nāma bhavanto mām achetasāḥ | ičhan daheyaṁ prithivīm plavayeyāṁ jalaṁ tathā | āyāṁ bhuvāṁ chaiva raudhayaṁ nātra kārya vīdhāraṇā" | yada na sakyate mohād avalepāḥ ca pārthivāḥ | anumetum tataḥ Venaḥ tataḥ kruḍāḥ mahaṣhayaḥ | nigrihyām tamaḥmaṇo visphurantam mahā-balām | tato 'sya savayam ārum te mananthur jāta-manyavaḥ | tasmāṁ tu māthymānaṁ vai rājnaḥ āruvā vījānīvān | hrasvo 'timātrāḥ purushḥ kriṣṇāḥ cāpi bāhubha ha | sa bhaṭāḥ prāṇjalir bhūteva sārēva Jana-majaya | tam Atrir vihvalaṁ drishṭvā nishidtya abravit tataḥ | nishāda-vaṁśa-kartā te sau bāhubha vadaṃ vara | dhīvarān aṣṭijach cāpi Vena-kalmasha-sambhāvaṇ | ye chānyā Vindhya-nilayās Tukhrās Tumburās tathaḥ | adharma-ruchayas tata viḍḍhi tān Vena-sambhavān | tataḥ punar mahaṭmānaḥ pānīṁ Venaśya daksinām | arāṇīṃ iva saṁrabhāḥ mamanthu jāta-manyavaḥ | Prithīs tasmāt samuttasthau carāj jvalana-sannihitaḥ | dipyamanāḥ sva-vapuṣṭā sākshād Aṅgir iva jvalan | "There was formerly a Prajasati (lord of creatures), a protector of
righteousness, called Anga, of the race of Atri, and resembling him in power. His son was the Prajāpati Vena, who was but indifferently skilled in duty, and was born of Sūnīthā, the daughter of Mrītyu. This son of the daughter of Kāla (Death), owing to the taint derived from his maternal grandfather, threw his duties behind his back, and lived in covetousness under the influence of desire. This king established an irreligious system of conduct: transgressing the ordinances of the Veda, he was devoted to lawlessness. In his reign men lived without study of the sacred books and without the vashaṭkāra, and the gods had no Soma-libations to drink at sacrifices. 'No sacrifice or oblation shall be offered,'—such was the ruthless determination of that Prajāpati, as the time of his destruction approached. 'I,' he declared, 'am the object, and the performer of sacrifice, and the sacrifice itself: it is to me that sacrifice should be presented, and oblations offered.' This transgressor of the rules of duty, who arrogated to himself what was not his due, was then addressed by all the great rishis, headed by Marīchi: 'We are about to consecrate ourselves for a ceremony which shall last for many years: practise not unrighteousness, o Vena: this is not the eternal rule of duty. Thou art in very deed a Prajāpati of Atri's race, and thou hast engaged to protect thy subjects.' The foolish Vena, ignorant of what was right, laughingly answered those great rishis who had so addressed him: 'Who but myself is the ordainer of duty? or whom ought I to obey? Who on earth equals me in sacred knowledge, in prowess, in austere fervour, in truth? Ye who are deluded and senseless know not that I am the source of all beings and duties. Hesitate not to believe that I, if I willed, could burn up the earth, or deluge it with water, or close up heaven and earth.' When owing to his delusion and arrogance Vena could not be governed, then the mighty rishis becoming incensed, seized the vigorous and struggling king, and rubbed his left thigh. From this thigh, so rubbed, was produced a black man, very short in stature, who, being alarmed, stood with joined hands. Seeing that he was agitated, Atri said to him 'Sit down' (nīṣhīda). He became the founder of the race of the Nīshādas, and also progenitor of the Dīvaras (fishermen), who sprang from the corruption of Vena. So too were produced from him the other inhabitants of the Vindhya range, the Tukhrās, and Tumburas, who are prone to lawlessness. Then the mighty sages, excited and incensed, again rubbed
the right hand of Vena, as men do the arany wood, and from it arose Pṛthu, resplendent in body, glowing like the manifested Agni."

Although the Harivaṃśa declares Vena to be a descendant of Atri, yet as the Prajāpati Atri is said in a previous section to have adopted Uttānapāda, Vena’s ancestor, for his son (Hariv. sect. 2, verse 60, Uttānapādaḥ jagrāha putram Atriḥ praṭīpatiḥ) there is no contradiction between the genealogy given here and in the Vishnu Purāṇa.

The story of Vena is told in the same way, but more briefly, in the Mahābhārata, Śāntip. sect. 59. After narrating the birth of Pṛthu, the writer proceeds, verse 2221:

*Tatā śrāṇīr Vainyo mahāṛṣiṁ tān uvācha ha | "susūkṣmaṁ me samutpannā buddhir dhāmārtha-dārsinī | anayā kim mavā kāryyaṁ tad me tatvena śaṁsata | yaṁ māṁ bhavanto vakṣyanti kāryam artha-samanvitam | tad ahaṁ vai karishyāmi nātṛa kāryaṁ vihāraṇaṁ" | tam uciḥ tattra devas te te chaiva paramarṣayāḥ | "niyato yatā yāṁ dharmo vai ivam asaṁkhaṁ samāchara | priyāpriye parityajya samaḥ sarvesu jantuṣu | kāma-krodhau cha lobhāṁ cha mānaṁ chotṣijyaṁ dārataḥ | yaṁ cha dharmāṁ parichate loke kaśchana mānavah | nigrāhyas te eva-bāhuḥhyāṁ śāsvad dharmam avekṣataḥ | pratijāṁ nāṁ chādhiḥrasva manasā karmāṇaṁ girā | "pihāyisyāṁ aham bhavaṁ brahmaṁ ity eva chaśakṛt | adandaṁ mo divyāṁ cheti pratijāṁ hi vibho | lokam cha sankarāṁ kriṣṇaṁ trāṭasmiti parantapa" | Vainyas tatāś tuvācha devan rishi-purogamān | "brāhmaṁ aṁo mahābhagāṁ namasyaṁ puruṣaṁ dharmahāṁ | "evam asto" itī Vainyas tu tair uktō brahmaśāyediḥ | purodhāṁ chādbhavat tasya Sukro brahmamayo niḥdiḥ | mantriṇo Bālakhyās cha Śaṅkaraṁ goṇas tatha | mahāṛṣi bhagavāṁ Gargas tasya sāmnatsaro bhavat |

"The son of Vena (Pṛthu) then, with joined hands, addressed the great rishi: ‘A very slender understanding for perceiving the principles of duty has been given to me by nature: tell me truly how I must employ it. Doubt not that I shall perform whatever you shall declare to me as my duty, and its object.’ Then those gods and great rishis said to him: ‘Whatever duty is enjoined perform it without hesitation, disregarding what thou mayest like or dislike, looking on all creatures with an equal eye, putting far from thee lust, anger, cupidity, and pride. Restrain by the strength of thine arm all those men who swerve from righteousness, having a constant regard to duty. And in thought, act, and word take upon thyself, and continually renew, the
engagement to protect the terrestrial Brāhmān (Veda, or Brāhmans?) .... And promise that thou wilt exempt the Brāhmans from punishment, and preserve society from the confusion of castes.” The son of Vena then replied to the gods, headed by the rishis: ‘The great Brāhmans, the chief of men, shall be reverenced by me.’ ‘So be it,’ rejoined those declarers of the Veda. Sukra, the depository of divine knowledge, became his purohita; the Bālakhiliyas and Sārasvatyas his ministers; and the venerable Garga, the great rishi, his astrologer.”

The character and conduct of Prithu, as poured into the last passage presents a strong, and when regarded from a Brahmanical point of view, an edifying, contrast to the contempt of priestly authority and disregard of Vedic observances which his predecessor had shown.

In legends like that of Vena we see, I think, a reflection of the questions which were agitating the religious world of India at the period when the Purāṇas in which they appear were compiled, viz., those which were then at issue between the adherents of the Veda, and the various classes of their opponents, Baudhā, Jainā, Chārvāka, etc. These stories were no doubt written with a purpose. They were intended to deter the monarchs contemporary with the authors from tampering with those heresies which had gained, or were gaining, circulation and popularity, by the example of the punishment which, it was pretended, had overtaken the princes who had dared to deviate from orthodoxy in earlier times. Compare the account given of the rise of heretical doctrines in the Vishṇu Purāṇa (pp. 209 ff. vol. iii. of Dr. Hall’s edition of Professor Wilson’s translation), which the writer no doubt intended to have something more than a merely historical interest.

The legend of Vena is told at greater length, but with no material variation in substance, in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, iv. sections 13–15. See also Professor Wilson’s note in his Vishṇu Purāṇa, vol. i. in loco.

In ascribing to Vena an irreligious character and a contempt for the priests, the Purāṇas contradict a verse in the Rig-veda x. 93, 14, in which (unless we suppose a different individual to be there meant) Vena is celebrated along with Duḥśīma, Prithavāna, and Rāma for his conspicuous liberality to the author of the hymn (pra tād Duḥśīno Prithavānā Veno pra Rāmō vuccham asūre mlaghavatsu | yo yuktvahy

pancha sata aṃṣagah pathā viśrāvi eśām). The two other passages,
viii. 9, 10, and x. 148, 5,—in which he is alluded to as the father of Pritthu have been quoted above, p. 268.

I observe that a Vena, called Bhārgava (or a descendant of Bṛigu), is mentioned in the list of traditional authors of hymns, given at the end of Professor Aufrecht’s Rig-veda, vol. ii., as the rishi of R.V. ix. 85, and x. 123.

Sect. III.—Legend of Purūravas.

Purūravas has been already alluded to (in pp. 158, 221, 226, 268, and 279 f.) as the son of Iḍa (or Iḍā), and the grandson of Manu Vaivasvata; as the author of the triple division of the sacred fire; and as a royal rishi. We have also seen (p. 172) that in Rig-veda i. 31, 4, he is referred to as sukrite, a “beneficent,” or “pious,” prince. Rig-veda x. 95 is considered to contain a dialogue between him and the Apsaras Urvaśī (see above, p. 226). In verse 7 of that hymn the gods are alluded to as having strengthened Purūravas for a great conflict for the slaughter of the Dasyus (mahe yat tvā Purūravo raṇāya avarḍāhayan dasyu-hatyāya devaḥ); and in the 18th verse he is thus addressed by his patronymic: Ἰτι tvā devaḥ ēmb āhur Aīla yathā ēm etad bhavasi mrityu-bandhuḥ | praṭā te devān havishā yajāti svarge u tvam api māda-yāse | “Thus say these gods to thee, o son of Ila, that thou art indeed nothing more than a kinsman of death: (yet) let thy offspring worship the gods with an obligation, and thou also shalt rejoice in heaven.”

It thus appears that in the Vedic hymns and elsewhere Purūravas is regarded as a pious prince, and Manu does not include him in his list of those who resisted the Brāhmans. But the M. Bh., Ādiparvan 3143 speaks of him as follows:

Purūravās tato vidvān Īlayāṁ samapadyata | sā vai tasṭāḥbhavād mātā pitā chaīveti naḥ kṛutam | trayoḍāsa samudrasya devpān āśan Purūravāḥ | amānushair vṛtaḥ sarvair mānushaḥ san mahāyasāḥ | viprāḥ sa vigrāham chakre vṛyyonmattaḥ Purūravāḥ | jahāra cha sa vīprāḥnām rātnāṁ utkroṣṭatām api | Sanatkumāras taṁ rājan Brahma-lokād upeta āha | anuṛdhaṁ tataḥ chakre pratyagriṇād na chāpy asau | tato maharṣhibhiḥ krudhaḥ sadyaḥ śaṅko vyānaśyata | lobbhāvito bala-maḍād nasṭa-sangho narādhipaḥ | sa hi gandharva-loka-sthān Urvaśyā sahito virāt | ādināya kriyārthe 'gnin yathāvad vihitāṁs tridiḥā |
"Subsequently the wise Purūravas was born of Ilā, who, as we have heard, was both his father and his mother. Ruling over thirteen islands of the ocean, and surrounded by beings who were all superhuman, himself a man of great renown, Purūravas, intoxicated by his prowess, engaged in a conflict with the Brāhmans, and robbed them of their jewels, although they loudly remonstrated. Sanatkumāra came from Brahmā's heaven, and addressed to him an admonition, which, however, he did not regard. Being then straightway cursed by the incensed rishis, he perished, this covetous monarch, who, through pride of power, had lost his understanding. This glorious being (vīrāt), accompanied by Urvaśī, brought down for the performance of sacred rites the fires which existed in the heaven of the Gandharvas, properly distributed into three." (See Wilson's Vishṇu Purāṇa, 4to. cd. pp. 350 and 394 ff. with note p. 397.)

I cite from the Harivaṃśa another passage regarding Purūravas, although no distinct mention is made in it of his contest with the Brāhmans:

Harivaṃśa 8811. Pitā Budhasyottama-vīrya-karmā Purūravāḥ yasya suto nṛi-devaḥ | prānāgnir ādyo 'gnim aśejanad yo nashtaṁ śāmbi-garbha-bhavaṁ bhavātmā | tathaiva paścāch chakame mahātmā purorvasiṁ aparasaṁ varishṭhāṁ | pitaḥ purā yo 'mrīta-sarva-deho muni-pravīrār vāra-gātī-ghoraṁ | nṛiḥ kusāgraiḥ punar eva yaṁ cha dhiṁmān kṛito 'gnir divi pūjyate cha |

"He (the Moon) was the father of Budha (Mercury), whose son was Purūravas, a god among men, of distinguished heroic deeds, the vital fire, worthy of adoration, the generator, who begot the lost fire which sprang from the heart of the śāmbi-wood, the great personage, who, placed to the west, loved Urvaśī, the paragon of Apsarases, who was placed to the east. This king with his entire immortal body was formerly swallowed up with the points of Kuśa grass by the munis terrible with their resplendent forms; but was again made wise, and is worshipped in heaven as fire."

Sect. IV.—Story of Nahusha.

The legend of Nahusha, grandson of Purūravas (see above, p. 226),

85 The name of Nahush occurs in the Rig-veda as that of the progenitor of a race.
the second prince described by Manu as having come into hostile collision with the Brāhmans is narrated with more or less detail in different parts of the Mahābhārata, as well as in the Purāṇas. The following passage is from the former work, Ādipt. 3151:

Āyusko Nahushaḥ putro dhīman satya-parākramaḥ | rājyaṁ śāśaṁ sumahad dharmena prthivipate | pitṛin devān rishin viprān gandharvo-raga-rākshaśan | Nahushaḥ pālayāmasya brahma ksatram atho viśaḥ | sa hatvā dasyu-saṅghatān rishin karam adāpayat | paśwash chaiva tān prishthe vāhayāmasya vīryavaṇa | kārayāmasya chendratvam abhibhūya divaukasaḥ | tejaśa tapasā chaiva vikramenavijāsa tathā |

"Nahusha the son of Āyus, wise, and of genuine prowess, ruled with justice a mighty empire. He protected the pitṛis, gods, rishis, wise men, gandharvas, serpents (uraga), and rākshasas, as well as Brāhmans, Kshattriyas, and Vaiśyas. This energetic prince, after slaying the hosts of the Dasyus, compelled the rishis to pay tribute, and made them carry him like beasts upon their backs. After subduing the celestials he conquered for himself the rank of Indra, through his vigour, austere fervour, valour and fire."

The story is thus introduced in another part of the same work, the Vanaparvan, section 180. Yudhishṭhira found his brother Bhīmasena seized by a serpent in a forest (see above, p. 133). This serpent, it appears, was no other than king Nahusha, who on being questioned thus relates his own history:

Nahusho nāma rājāḥ āham āsas pūrvas tavānagha | prathitaḥ panchamaḥ Somād Āyoḥ putro narādhipa | kratubhīs tapasā chaiva svādhīyāyena damenā cha | trailokyaśivarīyam avyagram prāpto ’haṁ vikramena cha | tad aiśvaryaṁ samāśādyā darpo mām agamat tadā | sahasraṁ hi devī ātinām uśaḥ śivīkām mama | aiśvarya-mada-matto ’ham avamanya tato āgajān | imāma Agastyena daśām ētiḥaḥ prthivipate | . . . ahaṁ hi divi divyena vimānena charan purā | abhimānena mattaḥ san kanchid nāyam achintayam | brahmaraśhi-deva-gandharva-yakṣa-rākshaśa-paṅgāḥ | karūn mama prayachhanti sarve trailoko-vāsinaḥ | chakshuḥ śyam prapaśyami prāquite prthivipate | tasya tejo harāmy āsu tad hi drīśṭer balam mama | maharṣīṁgāṁ sahasraṁ hi uśaḥ śivīkām mama |

See above, p. 165, note 7, and pp. 179 f. Nahusha Mānava is the traditional rishi of Rig-veda ix. 101, verses 7–9, and Yayāti Nahusha of verses 4–6 of the same hymn. See list of rishis in Professor Aufrecht’s Rig-veda ii. 464 ff.
sa mām apanayo rājan bhṛaṅśayāṃśa vai śrīyaḥ | tatra hy Agastyaḥ
pādena vahan aprīṣṭo mayā muniḥ | Agastyaṇa tato 'smī yokto dharmaṁ sarpeti vai rūdhā | tatas tasmād vināṅgryaḥ prachyutaḥ chyuta-lakṣha-
naḥ | pratapan bhubde "tmānaṁ vyālibhātam adhomukham | ayaḥcha
tam ahaṁ vipraṁ "śāpasyānto bhaved" iti | "pramādaṁ sampramāda-
shaḥ bhaṅgavan kṣantanī arhasi" | tataḥ sa mām uvāchedam prapatantaṁ kṛpaṇvitaṁ | "Yudhishṭhira dharmarājaṁ śāpāṁ tvāṁ mochayishyati" |
... ity uktvā "jagaraṁ deham muktvā na Nahusho nṛpaḥ | divyaṁ
varuḥ samāsthāya gatas triḍivam eva ca ā |

"I was a king called Nahusha, more ancient than thou, known as the
son of Ayus, and fifth in descent from Soma. By my sacrifices, austere
fervour, sacred study, self-restraint, and valour, I acquired the undis-
turbed sovereignty of the three worlds. When I had attained that
dominion, pride took possession of my soul: a thousand Brāhmans
bore my vehicle. Becoming intoxicated by the conceit of my lordly
power, and contemning the Brāhmans, I was reduced to this condition
by Agastya." The serpent then promises to let Bhīmasena go, if Yu-
dhishṭhira will answer certain questions (above referred to in p. 133 ff.).
Yudhishṭhira afterwards enquires how delusion had happened to take
possession of so wise a person as their conversation shewed Nahusha to
be. The latter replies that he had been perverted by the pride of
power, and proceeds: "Formerly, as I moved through the sky on a
celestial car, intoxicated with self-conceit, I regarded no one but my-
self. All the inhabitants of the three worlds, brāhmanical rishis, gods,
gandharvas, yakshas, rākshasas, pammaghas, paid me tribute. Such was
the power of my gaze that on what creature soever I fixed my eyes, I
straightway robbed him of his energy. A thousand of the great sages
bore my vehicle. That misconduct it was, o king, which hurled me
from my high estate. For I then touched with my foot the muni
Agastya who was carrying me. Agastya in his wrath cried out to me
'Fall, thou serpent.' Hurl therefore from that magnificent car, and
fallen from my prosperity, as I descended headlong, I felt that I had
become a serpent. I entreated the Brāhman (Agastya), 'Let there be
a termination of the curse: thou, o reverend rishi, shouldest forgive
one who has been deluded through his inconsideration.' He then com-
passionately replied to me as I fell, 'Yudhishṭhira, the king of right-
eousness, will free thee from the curse.'" And at the close of the
conversations between Yudhishtihira and the serpent, we are told that "King Nahusha, throwing off his huge reptile form, became clothed in a celestial body, and ascended to heaven."

The same story is related in greater detail in the Udyogaparvan, sections 10–16, as follows:

After his slaughter of the demon Vrittra, Indra became alarmed at the idea of having taken the life of a Brähman (for Vrittra was regarded as such), and hid himself in the waters. In consequence of the disappearance of the king of the gods, all affairs, celestial as well as terrestrial, fell into confusion. The rishis and gods then applied to Nahusha to be their king. After at first excusing himself on the plea of want of power, Nahusha at length, in compliance with their solicitations, accepted the high function. Up to the period of his elevation he had led a virtuous life, but he now became addicted to amusement and sensual pleasure; and even aspired to the possession of Indrani, Indra's wife, whom he had happened to see. The queen resorted to the Angiras Vrihaspati, the preceptor of the gods, who engaged to protect her. Nahusha was greatly incensed on hearing of this interference; but the gods endeavoured to pacify him, and pointed out the immorality of appropriating another person's wife. Nahusha, however, would listen to no remonstrance, and insisted that in his adulterous designs he was no worse than Indra himself: 373. Ahalyā dharshitā pūrvam rishi-patnī yaśasvinī | īvāto bhartur Indreṇa sa vah kim na nivāritaḥ | 374. Bāhuni cha nīśāṁsāni kṛitanindreṇa vai purā | vai dharmyānī upadās chaiva sa vah kim na nivāritaḥ | "373. The renowned Ahalyā, a rishi's wife, was formerly corrupted by Indra in her husband's lifetime (see p. 121 f.): Why was he not prevented by you? 374. And many barbarous acts, and unrighteous deeds, and frauds, were perpetrated of old by Indra: Why was he not prevented by you?" The gods, urged by Nahusha, then went to bring Indrani; but Vrihaspati would not give her up. At his recommendation, however, she solicited Nahusha for some delay, till she should ascertain what had become of her husband. This request was granted. The gods next applied to Vishnu on behalf of Indra; and Vishnu promised that if Indra would sacrifice to him, he should be purged from his guilt, and recover his dominion, while Nahusha would be destroyed. Indra sacrificed accordingly; and the result is thus told: 419. Vibhajya brahma-hatyām tu vriksheahu
THE BRAHMANS AND KSHATRIYAS.

cha nadishu cha | parvateshu prithivyām cha strīshu chaiva Yudhis-
thira | sa vibhajya cha bhāteshu visṛjya cha sureśvaraḥ | vijvaro
dhuta-pāpma cha Vāsavo 'bhavad utmavān | “Having divided the guilt
of brahmanicide among trees, rivers, mountains, the earth, women,
and the elements, Vāsava (Indra), lord of the gods, became freed from
suffering and sin, and self-governed.” Nahusha was by this means
shaken from his place. But (unless this is said by way of prolepsis,
or there is some confusion in the narrative) he must have speedily
regained his position, as we are told that Indra was again ruined,
and became invisible. Indrāṇī now went in search of her husband;
and by the help of Upasruti (the goddess of night and revealer of secrets)
discovered him existing in a very subtle form in the stem of a lotus
growing in a lake situated in a continent within an ocean north of the
Himālaya. She made known to him the wicked intentions of Nahusha,
and entreated him to exert his power, rescue her from danger, and
resume his dominion. Indra declined any immediate interposition on
the plea of Nahusha’s superior strength; but suggested to his wife
a device by which the usurper might be hurled from his position. She
was recommended to say to Nahusha that “if he would visit her on a
celestial vehicle borne by rishis, she would with pleasure submit herself
to him” (449. Rishi-yānena divyena mām upaihi jagatpate | evaṁ tava
vasa prītā bhavishyāmiti taṁ vada). The queen of the gods accordingly
went to Nahusha, by whom she was graciously received, and made this
proposal: 457. Ichhāmy ahām athāpūrvaṁ vahanaṁ te surādhīpa | yaṁ
na Vishnu na Rudrasya nāsuraṁ na rākṣasāṁ | vahantu tvām mahā-
bhāgāḥ rishayaḥ sangataḥ vibho | sarve śivikayā rājann etad hi mama
rochate | “I desire for thee, king of the gods, a vehicle hitherto un-
known, such as neither Vishnu, nor Rudra, nor the asuras, nor the rak-
shases employ. Let the eminent rishis, all united, bear thee, lord, in a
car: this idea pleases me.” Nahusha receives favourably this appeal
to his vanity, and in the course of his reply thus gives utterance to his
self-congratulation: 463. Na hy alpa-vīryo bhavati yo vāhān kurute mu-
nin | aham tapasvi balavān bhūta-bhavya-bhavat-prabhuḥ | mayi kruddhe
jagad na syād mayi sarvam pratishtitam | . . . . . . . . . tasmāt te vahanaṁ
devi karishyāmi na saṁsayaḥ | saptarshayo māṁ vakshyanti sarve brah-
marshyas tathā | pacya māhātmyam asmākaṁ riddhiṁ cha varavarṇini |
. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 468. Vimāne yojayītā sa rishin niyamam āsthitān | abrahamayo
EARLY CONTESTS BETWEEN

Balopeto matta mada-balena cha | Kannavrittaḥ sa ādhūstāmā vāhayāmāsa tān rishin | “He is a personage of no mean prowess who makes the munis his bearers. I am a fervid devotee of great might, lord of the past, the future, and the present. If I were angry the world would no longer stand; on me everything depends. . . . Wherefore, o goddess, I shall, without doubt, carry out what you propose. The seven rishis, and all the brāhman-rishis, shall carry me. Behold, beautiful goddess, my majesty and my prosperity.” The narrative goes on: “Accordingly this wicked being, irreligious, violent, intoxicated by the force of conceit, and arbitrary in his conduct, attached to his car the rishis, who submitted to his commands, and compelled them to bear him.” Indraṇī then again resorts to Vṛihapati, who assures her that vengeance will soon overtake Nahusha for his presumption; and promises that he will himself perform a sacrifice with a view to the destruction of the oppressor, and the discovery of Indra’s lurking place. Agni is then sent to discover and bring Indra to Vṛihapati; and the latter, on Indra’s arrival, informs him of all that had occurred during his absence. While Indra, with Kuvera, Yama, Soma, and Varuṇa, was devising means for the destruction of Nahusha, the sage Agastyā came up, congratulated Indra on the fall of his rival, and proceeded to relate how it had occurred: 527. Sramārttāśca vahantas tam Nahusham pāpakāriṇam | devarśayo mahābhāgas tathā brahmārśayo ‘maḷaḥ | papracchur Nahusham devam saṁśayaṁ jayataṁ eva | ye ime brāhmaṇāḥ proktāḥ mantrāḥ vai prokṣhane gāvām | ete pramāṇam bhavataḥ utāho neti Vāsava | Nahusho neti tān āha tamāsā muḍha-che- | tanaḥ | rishyaḥ uchuh | adharme sampuṣprīttas tvam dharmaṁ na pratipadyase | pramāṇam etad asmākam pūrṇam proktam maharshhibhiḥ | Agastyaḥ uvačah | Tato vivadamanah sa munibhiḥ saha Vāsava | atha mām asprīṣad mārdhni pādenādharma-yojitaḥ | tenabhūd kata-tejūṣ cha | niḥśrīkaḥ cha mahāpatiḥ | tatas taṁ sahasā vīgnam avocham bhaya-pid- | tam | “yasmat pūrvaiḥ kriṭam brahma brahmarshibhir anushūṁhitam | adushtaṁ dūṣhayasi vai yach cha mārdhny asprīṣah pada | yach oḥpi tvam rishin muḍha brahma-kalpān durāsadān | vāhān kriṭvā vāhayasi tena svargad kata-prabhah | āhvaṁsa pāpa paribhrashtatśa kṣiṇa-punyo | mahitalam | daśa-varṣha-sahasrāṇi sarpa-rūpa-dharo mahān | vichari- | shyasi pūrṇeshu punah svargam avāpyasya” | ovaṁ bhraśṭo durātmā sa | deva-rūjyūd arindama | dīṣṭyaḥ varūḍhāmane śakra hato brāhmaṇa-kaya-
fakal̥ | tripīṣṭapam propadyasva pahi lokān śacīpatē | jetendriyo jita-
mitraḥ stūyamāṇo maharṣibhiḥ | “Weared with carrying the sinner
Nahusha, the eminent divine-rishi, and the spotless brāhman-rishi,
asked that divine personage Nahusha [to solve] a difficulty: ‘Dost
thou, o Vāsava, most excellent of conquerors, regard as authoritative or
not those Brāhmaṇa texts which are recited at the immolation of kine?’
‘No,’ replied Nahusha, whose understanding was enveloped in darkness.
The rishis rejoined: ‘Engaged in unrighteousness, thou attainest not
unto righteousness: these texts, which were formerly uttered by great
rishis, are regarded by us as authoritative.’ Then (proceeds Agastya)
disputing with the munis, Nahusha, impelled by unrighteousness,
touched me on the head with his foot. In consequence of this the
king’s glory was smitten and his prosperity departed. When he had
instantly become agitated and oppressed with fear, I said to him,
‘Since thou, o fool, contemnest that sacred text, always held in honour,
which has been composed by former sages, and employed by brāhman-
rishis, and hast touched my head with thy foot, and employest the
Brahmā-like and irresistible rishi as bearers to carry thee,—therefore,
shorn of thy lustre, and all thy merit exhausted, sink down, sinner,
degraded from heaven to earth. For ten thousand years thou shalt
crawl in the form of a huge serpent. When that period is completed,
thou shalt again ascend to heaven.’ So fell that wicked wretch from
the sovereignty of the gods. Happily, o Indra, we shall now prosper,
for the enemy of the Brāhmans has been smitten. Take possession of
the three worlds, and protect their inhabitants, o husband of Sachī
(Indrāṇī), subduing thy senses, overcoming thine enemies, and cele-
brated by the great rishis.”

Indra, as we have seen above, was noted for his dissolute character.
The epithet “subduing thy senses,” assigned to him in the last sen-
tence by Agastya, is at variance with this indifferent reputation. Is
it to be regarded as a piece of flattery, or as a delicate hint that the
god would do well to practise a purer morality in future?

This legend appears, like some others, to have been a favourite with
the compilers of the Mahābhārata; for we find it once more related,
though with some variety of detail, (which may justify its repeti

Further on, in verse 556, Nahusha is called “the depraved, the hater of brah-
man, the sinful-minded (durāchāraś cha Nāhusa brahma-āvij pūpachetanah).
a condensed form), in the Anuśāsanaparvan, verses 4745–4810. We are there told that Nahusha, in recompense for his good deeds, was exalted to heaven; where he continued to perform all divine and human ceremonies, and to worship the gods as before. At length he became puffed up with pride at the idea that he was Indra, and all his good works in consequence were neutralized. For a great length of time he compelled the rishis to carry him about. At last it came to Agastya’s turn to perform the servile office. Bharigu then came and said to Agastya, ‘Why do we submit to the insults of this wicked king of the gods?’ Agastya answered that none of the rishis had ventured to curse Nahusha, because he had obtained the power of subduing his service everyone upon whom he fixed his eyes; and that he had amrita (nectar) for his beverage. However, Agastya said he was prepared to do anything that Bharigu might suggest. Bharigu said he had been sent by Brāhmaṇa to take vengeance on Nahusha, who was that day about to attach Agastya to his car, and would spurn him with his foot; and that he himself (Bharigu), “incensed at this insult, would by a curse condemn the transgressor and hater of Brāhmaṇas to become a serpent” (vyutkṛanta-dharmāṃ tam ahaṁ dharaṇaṁamarshito bhṛśam | ahir bha vasvete rushā šapsye pāpaṁ dvija-druham). All this accordingly happened as follows:

Aṭṭhāgastyām rishi-śreshṭham vāhanāyājuhāva ha | drutāṁ Sarasvati-kalāt smayann iva mahābalaḥ | tato Bhṛgur mahātejāḥ Maitrāعارुṇim abraśāt | “nimilayasa nayane jataṁ yāvad viśāṁ te” | sthāṇubhātasya tasyātha jataṁ prāviśad achyutaḥ | Bhṛguḥ sa sumahātejāḥ pātanāya nṛpasya cha | tataḥ sa deva-rāt prāptas tam rishiṁ vāhanāya vai | tato ‘gastyaḥ surapatiṁ vākyam āha viśāmpate | “yojayasveti māṁ kṣhipraṁ kaṁ cha desaṁ vahāmi te | yatra vaktbhīṣati tatra tvām nayishyāmi surādhipa” | ity uktā Nahushas tena yojaśyāmo na mūnīm | Bhṛgus tasya jājāntaḥ-stho babhuvā hrishito bhṛśam | na chāpi darśanaṁ tasya chakāra sa Bhṛgus tada | varā-dāna-prabhāva-jno Nahushasya mahātmano | na chukopa tada ‘gastyo yuktī pi Nahushena vai | taṁ tu rāja pratidena chodayāmāsa Bhārata | na chukopa sa dharmātmā tataḥ pādena deva-rāṣ | Agastyaśa tada krūddho vāmenādhyaḥam cchhiraḥ | tasmin śiras abhihate sa jājanārgato Bhṛguḥ | śaśīpa balavek krūddho Nahusham pāpachetasaṁ | “yasyāt padāḥ hanaḥ kroḍhāt śiraśīmam mahāmūnīm | tasmād aṣu mahīṁ gachha sarpo bhūtvā sudūrmate” | ity uktāḥ sa tadaḥ tena
sarpo bhūtvā papāta ha | adrishtenātha Bhriguṇā bhūtalo Bharataraśha-
ha | Bhriguṇā hi yādy so 'draksheyadh Nauhaśaḥ prithivotpate | sa na śakto
'bhaveśyaḥ vai pātane tasya tejasā |

"The mighty Nahusha, as it were smiling, straightway summoned
the eminent rishi Agastya from the banks of the Sarasvatī to carry him.
The glorious Bṛigu then said to Maitrāvaruṇī (Agastya), 'Close thy
eyes whilst I enter into the knot of thy hair.' With the view of over-
throwing the king, Bṛigu then entered into the hair of Agastya who
stood motionless as a stock. Nahusha then came to be carried by
Agastya, who desired to be attached to the vehicle and agreed to carry
the king of the gods whithersoever he pleased. Nahusha in consequence
attached him. Bṛigu, who was lodged in the knot of Agastya's hair,
was greatly delighted, but did not venture to look at Nahusha, as he
knew the potency of the boon which had been accorded to him (of sub-
duing to his will everyone on whom he fixed his eyes). Agastya did not
lose his temper when attached to the vehicle, and even when urged by
a god the holy man remained unmoved. The king of the gods, incensed,
next struck the rishi's head with his left foot, when Bṛigu, invisible
within the knot of hair, became enraged, and violently cursed the
wicked Nahusha: 'Since, fool, thou hast in thine anger smitten this
great muni on the head with thy foot, therefore become a serpent, and
fall down swiftly to the earth.' Being thus addressed, Nahusha be-
came a serpent, and fell to the earth, through the agency of Bṛigu,
who remained invisible. For if he had been seen by Nahusha, the
saint would have been unable, in consequence of the power possessed
by the oppressor, to hurl him to the ground."

Bṛigu, on Nahusha's solicitation, and the intercession of Agastya,
placed a period to the effects of the curse, which, as in the other version
of the legend, Yudhishṭhīra was to be the instrument of terminating.

From several phrases which I have quoted from the version of this
legend given in the Udyogaparvan, as well as the tenor of the whole,
it appears to be the intention of the writers to hold up the case of
Nahusha as an example of the nemesis awaiting not merely any gross
display of presumption, but all resistance to the pretensions of the
priesthood, and contempt of their persons or authority.
Sect. V.—Story of Nimi.

Nimi (one of Ikshvāku's sons) is another of the princes who are stigmatized by Manu, in the passage above quoted, for their want of deference to the Brāhmans. The Vishṇu P. (Wilson, 4to ed. p. 388) relates the story as follows: Nimi had requested the Brāhmaṇa-rishi Vāsiṣṭha to officiate at a sacrifice, which was to last a thousand years. Vāsiṣṭha in reply pleaded a pre-engagement to Indra for five hundred years, but promised to return at the end of that period. The king made no remark, and Vāsiṣṭha went away, supposing that he had assented to this arrangement. On his return, however, the priest discovered that Nimi had retained Gautama (who was, equally with Vāsiṣṭha, a Brāhmaṇa-rishi) and others to perform the sacrifice; and being incensed at the neglect to give him notice of what was intended, he cursed the king, who was then asleep, to lose his corporeal form. When Nimi awoke and learnt that he had been cursed without any previous warning, he retorted, by uttering a similar curse on Vāsiṣṭha, and then died. "In consequence of this curse" (proceeds the Vishṇu Purāṇa, iv. 5, 6) "the vigour of Vāsiṣṭha entered into the vigour of Mītra and Varuṇa. Vāsiṣṭha, however, received from them another body when their seed had fallen from them at the sight of Urvāśī." (tach-chhāpāche cha Mitrā-varuṇayos tejasi Vāsiṣṭha-tejāḥ praviṣṭam | Urvāśī-darsanād vabhūta-viryya-prapātayoh sakāśād Vāsiṣṭho deham aparam lekhau). 57 Nimi's body was embalmed. At the close of the sacrifice which he had begun, the gods were willing, on the intercession of the priests, to restore him to life, but he declined the offer; and was placed by the deities, according to his desire, in the eyes of all living creatures. It is in consequence of this that they are always opening and shutting (nimîśha means "the twinkling of the eye").

The story is similarly related in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, ix. 13, 1–13. A portion of the passage is as follows:

3. Nimiś cha laṁ idaṁvidevān sattram arābhatātmavān | rītvibhir aparais tavaṇa nāgamad yāvatā gurūḥ | śishyas-vyatikramaṁ víkṣhya nir-varttya gurur ayataḥ | aśapat, "patatād deho Nimeḥ pāṇḍita-māninaḥ" | Nimiḥ pratidādasu śāpaṁ guruvē 'dharma-varttine | "tavāpi patatād deho

57 This story will be further illustrated in the next section.
lobhād dharmam ajānataḥ | ity utsvarjja svām dehaṁ Nimir adhyātma-kovidaḥ | Mitrā-varuṇayar jāne Urvāṣyāṁ propitāmahāḥ |

"Nimi, who was self-controlled, knowing the world to be fleeting, commenced the sacrifice with other priests until his own spiritual instructor should come back. The latter, on his return, discovering the transgression of his disciple, cursed him thus: 'Let the body of Nimi, who fancies himself learned, fall from him.' Nimi retorted the curse on his preceptor, who was acting unrighteously: 'Let thy body also fall from thee, since thou, through covetousness, art ignorant of duty.' Having so spoken, Nimi, who knew the supreme spirit, abandoned his body: and the patriarch (Vāsiṣṭha) was born of Urvāṣī to Mitra and Varuṇa."

The offence of Nimi, as declared in these passages, is not that of contemning the sacerdotal order in general, or of usurping their functions; but merely of presuming to consult his own convenience by proceeding to celebrate a sacrifice with the assistance of another Brāhman (for Gautama also was a man of priestly descent) when his own spiritual preceptor was otherwise engaged, without giving the latter any notice of his intention. The Bhāgavata, as we have seen, awards blame impartially to both parties, and relates (as does also the Viṣṇu Purāṇa) that the king's curse took effect on the Brāhman, as well as on the Brāhman's on the king.

Sect. VI.—Vāsiṣṭha

One of the most remarkable and renowned of the struggles between Brāhmans and Kshatriyas which occur in the legendary history of India is that which is said to have taken place between Vāsiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra. I propose to furnish full details of this conflict with its fabulous accompaniments from the Rāmāyaṇa, which dwells upon it at considerable length, as well as from the Mahābhārata, where it is repeatedly

68 On the last verse the commentator Sūrdhara has the following note: Urvāṣī-darsanāt skannāṁ retas tābhyaṁ kumbhe nishaktam | tasmāt propitāmahā Vāsiṣṭho jāne | tathā cha śrutīḥ "kumbhe retāḥ sishchītuḥ samānam" iti | "Seed fell from them at the sight of Urvāṣī and was shed into a jar: from it the patriarch, Vāsiṣṭha, was born. And so says the śrutī" (R.V. vii. 33, 13, which will be quoted in the next section).
introduced; but before doing so, I shall quote the passages of the Rigveda which appear to throw a faint light on the real history of the two rivals. It is clear from what has been said in the Introduction to this volume, pp. 1–6, as well as from the remarks I have made in pp. 139 f., that the Vedic hymns, being far more ancient than the Epic and Puranic compilations, must be more trustworthy guides to a knowledge of the remotest Indian antiquity. While the Epic poems and Puranas no doubt embody numerous ancient traditions, yet these have been freely altered according to the varying or dogmatic views of later writers, and have received many purely fictitious additions. The Vedic hymns, on the contrary, have been preserved unchanged from a very remote period, and exhibit a faithful reflection of the social, religious, and ecclesiastical condition of the age in which they were composed, and of the feelings which were awakened by contemporary occurrences. As yet there was no conscious perversion or colouring of facts for dogmatic or sectarian purposes; and much of the information which we derive from these naïve compositions is the more trustworthy that it is deduced from hints and allusions, and from the comparison of isolated particulars, and not from direct and connected statements or descriptions. It is here therefore, if anywhere, that we may look for some light on the real relations between Vāsiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra. After quoting the hymns regarding these two personages, I shall adduce from the Brāhmaṇas, or other later works, any particulars regarding their birth and history which I have discovered. The conflict between Vāsiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra has been already discussed at length in the third of Dr. Rudolf Roth's "Dissertations on the literature and history of the Veda," where the most important parts of the hymns bearing upon the subject are translated. The first hymn which I shall adduce is intended for the glorification of Vāsiṣṭha and his family. The latter part relates the birth of the sage, while the earlier verses refer to his connection with king Sudās. Much of this hymn is very obscure.


THE BRAHMANS AND KSHATRIYAS.

Bhedam ebhir jaghāna | eva in nu kaṁ dāsarājya Sudāsam pravād Indro brahmaṇaḥ vo Vasīṣṭhāḥ | 4. Jushṭi naro brahmaṇaḥ vah pitṛīnām akham avyayaṁ na kila rishātha | yat sakvarishu bhīhatā ravena Indre śuṣ- 

mam adadhāta Vasīṣṭhāḥ | 5. Udbhāy āma iṣṭitaṁ nāthītāo adī- 
hayut dāsarājya vritīsaḥ | Vasīṣṭhāsya stvataḥ Indro aśraṁ uruṁ 

Tritubhyyo aṅkṛṇo u lokam | 6. Dandā āva gojanāsah āsan parīchhinnāḥ 

Bharatāḥ arbhakasah | abhavach cha pura-eta Vasīṣṭhāḥ ad it 

Tritūnām viśo aprathanta | 7. Trayāḥ krīdvantī bhuvanesu retas 

tisaḥ prajāḥ āryāḥ jyotir-agrāḥ | trayo gharmāsah ushasam sachante 

sarvān it tān anu vidur Vasīṣṭhāḥ | 8. Sūryasya āva vakshatho jyotir 

eshām samudrāsya āva mahīmā gabhirāḥ | vātasya āva prajavo na anyena 

stomo Vasīṣṭhāḥ anu etave vah | 9. Te in ninyaṁ hridayasya praketai sa- 

hasra-vālām abhi samā charanti | yamena tataṁ parīdhiṁ vayanto apsaraśaḥ 

upadūrd Vasīṣṭhāḥ | 10. Vidvuto jyotiḥ pari saṁ jihānam Mitrā-varunā 

yād apāṣyataṁ tvā | tat te janaṁ uta ekāṁ Vasīṣṭhā ṛgasto yat tvā viśaṁ 

ajabāra | 11. Uta asi Maitrāvaruṇo Vasīṣṭhā Urvaśyāḥ brahmaṇ man- 

naso 'dhi jātaḥ | dr̥paṁ skannam brahmaṇaṁ daivyena viśve devaḥ push- 

kare tvā 'daddanta | 12. Sa praketai ubhayasya pravidvān sahasra- 

dānaḥ uta vā sadānaḥ | yamena tataṁ parīdhiṁ vayishyantī apsaraśaḥ 

pari jajna Vasīṣṭhāḥ | 13. Sattre ha jātav ishiṁ namobhiṁ kumbhe 

retaḥ sishiohatuḥ samānam | tato ha Mānaḥ uḍ iyāya madhyāt tato 

jātaṁ rishīṁ āhur Vasīṣṭhām |

"1. The white-robed (priests) with hair-knots on the right, stimu- 

lating to devotion, have filled me with delight. Rising from the sacri- 

ficial grass, I call to the men, ‘Let not the Vasīṣṭhās (stand too) far 

off to suocour [or gladden] me.’ 2. By their libation they brought 

Indra hither from afar across the Vaiśānta away from the powerful 

draught. 3. Indra preferred the Vasīṣṭhās to the soma offered by 

Pāśadyumna, the son of Vayata. 3. So too with them he crossed the 

river; so too with them he slew Bheṣa; so too in the battle of the 

ten kings Indra delivered Sudās through your prayer, o Vasīṣṭhās.

Sāyana thinks that Vasīṣṭhā is the speaker, and refers here to his own sons. Profes- 

sor Roth (under the word se) regards Indra as the speaker. May it not be 

Sudās?

This is the interpretation of this clause suggested by Professor Aufrecht, who 

thinks Vaiśānta is probably the name of a river.

According to Sāyana, another king who was sacrificing at the same time as Sudās.

See verses 6–8 of R.V. vii. 83, to be next quoted.
4. Through gratification caused by the prayer of your fathers, o men, ye do not obstruct the undecaying axle (?), since at (the recitation of the) Sakvarī verses with a loud voice ye have infused energy into Indra, o Vaisishṭhas. 5. Distressed, when surrounded in the fight of the ten kings, they looked up, like thirsty men, to the sky. Indra heard Vaisishṭha when he uttered praise, and opened up a wide space for the Tritisus. 6. Like staves for driving cattle, the contemptible Bharatas were lopped all round. Vaisishṭha marched in front, and then the tribes of the Tritisus were deployed. 7. Three deities create a fertilizing fluid in the worlds. Three are the noble creatures whom light precedes. Three fires attend the dawn. All these the Vaisishṭhas know. 8. Their lustre is like the full radiance of the sun; their greatness is like the depth of the ocean; like the swiftness of the wind, your hymn, o Vaisishṭha, can be followed by no one else. 9. By the intuitions of their heart they seek out the mystery with a thousand branches. Weaving the envelopment stretched out by Yama, the Vaisishṭhas sat down by the Aopersas. 10. When Mitra and Varuṇa saw thee quitting the flame of the lightning, that was thy birth; and thou hadst one (other birth), o Vaisishṭha, when Agastya brought thee to the people. 11. And thou art also a son of Mitra and Varuṇa, o Vaisishṭha, born, o priest, from the soul of Urvasī. All the gods placed thee—a drop which fell through divine contemplation—in the vessel. 12. He, the intelligent, knowing both (worlds?), with a thousand gifts, or with gifts—he who was to weave the envelopment stretched out by Yama—he, Vaisishṭha, was born of the Aopersas. 13. They, two (Mitra and Varuṇa ?), born at the sacrifice, and impelled by adorations, dropped into the jar the same amount of seed. From the

54 See R.V. x. 71, 11, above, p. 256.
55 This is evidently the name of the tribe which the Vaisishṭhas favoured, and to which they themselves must have belonged. See viit. 83, 4. The Bharatas in the next verse appear to be the hostile tribe.
56 In explanation of this Sāyaṇa quotes a passage from the Śātyāyana Brāhmaṇa, as follows: "Trayāṅ kriyantī bhuvaneṣu retaḥ ity Agniḥ prithivyaśaḥ retaḥ kriyate Vāyur antarikṣaḥ Ādityo dīvi | "ties praśāṭ āryyaḥ jyotir-agṛḥ" iti Vasavo Rudrāḥ Ādityāḥ tāsanti jyotir yad asaṃ Ādityāḥ | "trayo gharmaśaḥ uṣhasāṃ sashante" ity Agniḥ Uṣhasāṃ sashate Vāyur Uṣhasāṃ sashate Ādityāḥ Uṣhasāṃ sashate | (1) "Agni produces a fertilizing fluid on the earth, Vāyu in the air, the Sun in the sky.
(2) The 'three noble creatures' are the Vasus, Rudras, and Ādityas. The Sun is their light. (3) Agni, Vāyu, and the Sun each attend the Dawn."
midst of that arose Māna (Agastya?); and from that they say that the rishi Vasishṭha sprang.”

There is another hymn (R.V. vii. 18) which relates to the connection between Vasishṭha and Sudās (verses 4, 5, 21–25) and the conflict between the latter and the Trīṣus with their enemies (verses 6–18); but as it is long and obscure I shall content myself with quoting a few verses.

R.V. vii. 18, 4. Dhenuṁ na tvā suyavase dudhuksham upa brahmāṇi
sasrjo Vasishṭhaḥ | tvām id me gopatiṁ viśvaḥ āha ā naḥ Indraḥ suva-
tiṁ gantu acoh | 5. Arṇāṇi cīṁ paprathānā Sudāsa Indro gādhāṁi

97 Whatever may be the sense of verses 11 and 13, the Nirukta states plainly enough v. 13; Tasyāḥ darśanād Mitra-vraṇjayoḥ retaś chaskanda | tad-abhīvīduny
ehā śīg bhavaś: “On seeing her (Urvāśī) the seed of Mitra and Varuṇa fell from them. To this the following verse (R.V. vii. 33, 11) refers.” And Sāyaṇa on the same verse quotes a passage from the Bṛhaddevatā: Tāyor aditīyayoh sattre dṛṣṭiṁ
pṛasarasam Urvāśīṁ | retaś chaskanda tat kumbhaṃ nyapataḥ vāsatīvare | tennai tu
mukérttena viryavantau tapasvināḥ | Agastyaḥ cha Vasishṭhaḥ cha tatravṛṣiṃ samabhūva-
vatuḥ | bahuḥkā potitaṁ retaḥ kalāśe cha jale sthale | sthale Vasishṭhas tu maniḥ samba-
bhūvṛṣṇi-sattamaḥ | kumbhe tv Agastyaḥ sambhūto jale matsyo mahādyuthaḥ | udāyīya
tato 'gastyo sāmya-mātṛo mahatupāḥ | mūṇena sanmīto yasūt tasmād Mānyaḥ
ihochyate yadvā kumbhād rishir jātaḥ kumbhāṇiḥ hi miyate | kumbhāḥ ity abhādā-
nāṁ cha parimānasya lakṣyate | tato 'pau grihyamāṇāṁ Vasishṭhaḥ pushkare sthī-
taḥ | sarvataḥ pushkare tau hi viśe devaḥ adhārayan | “When these two Adīyas (Mitra and Varuṇa) beheld the Apsaras Urvāśī at a sacrifice their seed fell from them into the sacrificial jar called vāsatīvara... At that very moment the two energetic and austere rishis Agastya and Vasishṭha were produced there. The seed fell on many places, into the jar, into water, and on the ground. The muni Vasishṭha, most excellent of rishis, was produced on the ground; while Agastya was born in the jar, a fish of great lustre. The austere Agastya sprang thence of the size of a sāmya (i.e. the pin of a yoke; see Wilson, s.v., and Professor Roth, s.v. māṇa). Since he was measured by a certain standard (māṇa) he is called the ‘measurable’ (mānya). Or, the rishi, having sprung from a jar (kumbhaḥ), is also measured by a jar, as the word kumbha is also designated as the name of a measure. Then when the waters were taken, Vasishṭha remained in the vessel (pushkara); for all the gods held him in it on all sides.” In his Illustrations of the Nirukta, p. 64, Prof. Roth speaks of the verses of the hymn which relate to Vasishṭha’s origin as being a more modern addition to an older composition, and as describing the miraculous birth of the sage in the taste and style of the Epic mythology. ‘Professor Max Müller (Oxford Essays for 1866, pp. 61 f.) says that Vasishṭha is a name of the Sun; and that the ancient poet is also “called the son of Mitra and Varuṇa, night and day, an expression which has a meaning only in regard to Vasishṭha, the sun; and as the sun is frequently called the offspring of the dawn, Vasishṭha, the poet, is said to owe his birth to Urvāśī” (whom Müller identifies with Ushas). For M. Langlois’s view of the passage, see his French version of the R.V. vol. iii. pp. 79 f. and his note, p. 234.

98 See Roth’s Litt. u. Gesch. des Weda, pp. 87 ff. where it is translated into German.
EARLY CONTESTS BETWEEN


"4. Seeking to milk thee (Indra), like a cow in a rich meadow, Vasishṭha sent forth his prayers to thee; for every one tells me that thou art a lord of cows; may Indra come to our hymn. 5. However the waters swelled, Indra made them shallow and fordable to Sudās. . . . . 21. Parāśara, Satayātu, and Vasishṭha, devoted to thee, who from indifference have left their home, have not forgotten the friendship of thee the bountiful;—therefore let prosperous days dawn for these sages. 22. Earning two hundred cows and two chariots with mares, the gift of Sudās the son of Pijavana, and grandson of Devavat, I walk round the house, o Agni, uttering praises, like a hotri priest. 23. The four brown steeds, bestowed by Sudās the son of Pijavana, vigorous, decked with pearls, standing on the ground, carry me on securely to renown from generation to generation. 24. That donor, whose name pervades both worlds, has distributed gifts to every person. They prize him as the seven rivers praise Indra; he has slain Yuddhyāmadhi in battle. 25. Befriend him (Sudās), ye heroic Maruts, as

99 Parāśara is said in Nir. vi. 30, which refers to this passage, to have been a son of Vasishṭha born in his old age (Parāśaraḥ parāśirvasya Vasishṭhasya sthavirasya jajne); or he was a son of S'akti and grandson of Vasishṭha (Roth s.v.)
100 Devavat is said by Sāyana to be a proper name. He may be the same as Divodāsa in verse 25. Or Divodāsa may be the father, and Pijavana and Devavat among the forefathers of Sudās. In the Vishṇu Purāṇa Sarvakāma is said to have been the father and Ritusarna the grandfather of Sudās, Wilson's V.P. 4to. ed. p. 380. At p. 454 f. a Sudāsa is mentioned who was son of Chyavana, grandson of Mitrāyu and great-grandson of Divodāsa.
101 Professor Roth (Litt. u. Gesch. des Weda, p. 100) compares R.V. i. 102, 2, asya śravo nadyāḥ septa bibhṛati, "the seven rivers exalt his (Indra's) renown." These rivers are, as Roth explains, the streams freest by Indra from Vṛitra's power.
ye did Divodāsa the (fore)father of Sudās; fulfil the desire of the son of Pijavana (by granting him) imperishable, undecaying power, worthy of reverence (?)\)."

Although the Vasishṭhas are not named in the next hymn, it must refer to the same persons and circumstances as are alluded to in the first portion of R.V. vii. 33, quoted above.


"Looking to you, o heroes, to your friendship, the men with broad axes advanced to fight. Slay our Dāsa and our Arya enemies, and deliver Sudās by your succour, o Indra and Varuṇa. 2. In the battle where men clash with elevated banners, where something which we desire\(^\text{102}\) is to be found, where all beings and creatures tremble, there, o Indra and Varuṇa, take our part. 3. The ends of the earth were seen to be darkened, o Indra and Varuṇa, a shout ascended to the sky; the foes of my warriors came close up to me; come hither with your help, ye hearers of our invocations. 4. Indra and Varuṇa, unequalled with your weapons, ye have slain Bheda, and delivered Sudās; ye heard the prayers of these men in their invocation; the priestly agency

\(^{102}\) Sāyaṇa divides the kincchana of the Pada-text into kinccha na, which gives the sense "where nothing is desired, but everything is difficult.""
of the Trītus was efficacious. 5. O Indra and Varuṇa, the injurious acts of the enemy, the hostilities of the murderous, afflict me on every side. Ye are lords of the resources of both worlds: protect us therefore (where ye live) in the remotest heavens. 6. Both parties invoke you, both Indra and Varuṇa, in the battles, in order that ye may bestow riches. (They did so in the fight) in which ye delivered Sudās—when harassed by the ten kings—together with the Trītus. 7. The ten kings, who were no sacrificers, united, did not vanquish Sudās, o Indra and Varuṇa. The praises of the men who officiated at the sacrifice were effectual; the gods were present at their invocations. 8. Ye, o Indra and Varuṇa, granted succour to Sudās, hemmed in on every side in the battle of the ten kings, where the white-robed Trītus, with hair-knots, reverentially praying, adored you with a hymn."

From these hymns it appears that Vasishṭha, or a Vasishṭha and his family were the priests of king Sudās (vii. 18, 4 f., 21 ff.; vii. 33, 3 f.); that, in their own opinion, these priests were the objects of Indru's preference (vii. 33, 2), and had by the efficacy of their intercessions been the instruments of the victory gained by Sudās over his enemies in the battle of the ten kings. It seems also to result from some of the verses (vii. 33, 6; vii. 83, 4, 6; and vii. 33, 1, compared with vii. 83, 8) that both the king and the priests belonged to the tribe of the Trītus. Professor Roth remarks that in none of the hymns which

103 Compare verses 7 and 8. Sāyaṇa, however, translates the clause differently: "The act of the Trītus for whom I sacrifice, and who put me forward as their priest, was effectual: my priestly function on their behalf was successful." (Trītūnām etat-sanjñānam mama yajñānam purohitār mama purodhānām satyā satya-phaalam abhavat | teshu yaḥ mama paurohityam tat sapahalāṁ jālam |)

104 According to Sāyaṇa the two parties were Sudās and the Trītus his allies (ubhaya-vidhāḥ Sudāḥ-sanjñao rājā tat-sahāya-bhūtāḥ Trītavā un ca evaṁ dei-prakārāḥ janāḥ). It might have been supposed that one of the parties meant was the hostile kings; but they are said in the next verse to be ayujyāraḥ, "persons who did not sacrifice to the gods."

105 Dīvāraṁṇe. This word is explained by Sāyaṇa in his note on vii. 33, 3, uṣa-bhī rūjabhiḥ saha yuddhe pravritte, "battle having been joined with ten kings." In the verse before us he says "the lengthening of the first syllable is a Vedic peculiarity, and that the case-ending is altered, and that the word merely means 'by the ten kings.'" (daśa-sabdasya chhāndasa dirghaḥ | viḍhakti-nyatavyah | daśabhī rūjabhīḥ . . . pariśevasmitaṁ).

106 Here Sāyaṇa says the Trītus are "the priests so called who were Vasishṇu's disciples." (Trītavā Vasishṭha-sishyāḥ etat-sanjñāḥ rītvijāḥ).

107 See Roth, Litt. u. Gesch. des Weda, p. 120.
he quotes is any allusion made to the Vaisishthas being members of any particular caste; but that their connection with Sudās is ascribed to their knowledge of the gods, and their unequalled power of invocation (vii. 33, 7 f.)

In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, viii. 21, we have another testimony to the connection of Vaisishtha with Sudās, as he is there stated to have "consecrated Sudās son of Pijavana by a great inauguration similar to Indra's;" in consequence of which Sudās went round the earth in every direction conquering, and performed an aṣvamedha sacrifice" (etena ha vai aindreṇa mahābhishkekena VaisISRthaḥ Sudāsam Pijavanan abhishikshecha | tasmād u Sudāḥ Pijavanaḥ samantaṁ sarvataḥ prithivīṁ jayan parīyāya aśvena cha medhyena īje).

The following passages refer to Vaisishtha having received a revelation from the god Varuṇa, or to his being the object of that god's special favour:

vii. 87, 4. Īvācha mē Varunō medhirāya triḥ sapta nāma aghnya bi-bhārtī | vidvān pādasya guhyā na voched yugāya viprāh upāraya bikshan |

"Varuṇa has declared to me who am intelligent, 'The Cow' possesses thrice seven names. The wise god, though he knows them, has not revealed the mysteries of (her) place, which he desires to grant to a future generation."


108 Colebrooke's Misc. Essays, i. 40.

109 Vaisisṛtha is not named in this hymn, but he is its traditional author.

110 Saṁjaya says that either (1) Vāch is here meant under the figure of a cow having the names of 21 metres, the Gāyatrī, etc., attached to her breast, throat, and head, or (2) that Vāch in the form of the Veda holds the names of 21 sacrifices; but that (3) another authority says the earth is meant, which (in the Nīghanṭu, i. 1) has 21 names, go, gmā, jmā, etc. (Vāg atra gaur uchyate | su cha swasi kāntyē śivaśri cha baddhānī gāyatrī-nāṁi sapta chhandasāṁ nāmāṁ bibhārtī | yadvā vedātmanā vāg ekaviṁsiati-saṁsthānāṁ yajñānāṁ nāmāṁ bibhārtī | āhārayati | aparāh ōha "gaur prithvī" | tasyā ca 'gaur gmā jmā' iti paṭhitāy ekaviṁsiati-nāmnāṁ' uśī). I have, in translating the second clause of the verse, followed for the most part a rendering suggested by Professor Aufrecht.
“When Varuṇa and I embark on the boat, when we propel it into the midst of the ocean, when we advance over the surface of the waters, may we rock upon the undulating element till we become brilliant. 4. Varuṇa took Vasishṭha into the boat; by his mighty acts working skilfully he (Varuṇa) has made him a rishi; the wise (god has made) him an utterer of praises in an auspicious time, that his days and dawns may be prolonged. 5. Where are (now) our friendships, the tranquillity which we enjoyed of old? We have come, o self-sustaining Varuṇa, to thy vast abode, to thy house with a thousand gates. 6. Whatever friend of thine, being a kinsman constant and beloved, may commit offences against thee;—may we not, though sinful, suffer (punishment), o adorable being; do thou, o wise god, grant us protection.”

R.V. vii. 86 is a sort of penitential hymn in which Vasishṭha refers to the anger of Varuṇa against his old friend (verse 4) and entreats forgiveness of his offences. This hymn, which appears to be an earnest and genuine effusion of natural feeling, is translated in Professor Müller’s Anc. Sansk. Lit. p. 540.

The passage which follows is part of a long hymn, consisting chiefly of imprecations directed against Rākshāses and Yātudhānas, and said in the Brihaddevatā (as quoted by Śāyaṇa in his introductory remarks) to have “been seen” by the rishi (Vasishṭha) when he was overwhelmed with grief and anger for the loss of his hundred sons who had been slain by the sons of Sudās” (rishir dādaṛsa raksha-ghnam puttra-soka-pariplutaḥ | hate puttra-śate krudbhāḥ Saudāsair duḥkhitas tadā). I shall cite only the verses in which Vasishṭha repels the imputation (by whomsoever it may have been made) that he was a demon (Rakshas or Yātudhana).


111 Professor Aufrecht renders the last clause, “As long as days and dawns shall continue.”
dhārayantam | hanti raksha hanti asad vadantam ubhāv Indraśya prasītāu
sayāte | 14. Yadi vā aham anṛita-devah āsa moghaṁ vā devān api uhe
Agnie | kim asmabhyāṁ Jātavedo hṛṇiśhe droghavāchas te nirṛithaṁ
sachantāṁ | 15. Adya muriya yadi yātudhāna asmi yadi vā āyus tatapā
pūrushasyā | adha sa virair dasabhir vi yuyāḥ yo mā moghaṁ "Yatu-
dhānaṁ" ity āha | 16. Yo mā ayaśum "yātudhānaṁ" ity āha yo vā
rakṣāḥ "suchir asmi" ity āha | Indras taṁ hantu mahatā vadhena viś-
vasya jantor adhamas padishṭa |

"The intelligent man is well able to discriminate (when) true and
false words contend together. Soma favours that one of them which
is true and right, and annihilates falsehood. 13. Soma does not prosper
the wicked, nor the man who wields power unjustly. He slays the
Rakshas; he slays the liar: they both lie (bound) in the fetters of Indra.
14. If I were either a follower of false gods, or if I erroneously con-
ceived of the gods, o Agni:—Why, o Jātavedas, art thou incensed
against us? Let injurious speakers fall into thy destruction. 15. May
I die this very day, if I be a Yātudhāna, or if I have destroyed any
man's life. May he be severed from his ten sons who falsely says to
me, 'o Yātudhāna.' 16. He who says to me, who am no Yātu, 'o
Yātudhāna,' or who (being himself) a Rakshas, says, 'I am pure,'—
may Indra smite him with his great weapon; may he sink down the
lowest of all creatures.

In elucidation of this passage Sāyāna quotes the following lines:
Hatvā puttra-śatam pūrvam Vasishṭhasya mahatmanāḥ | Vasishṭhaṁ
"rākṣaso 'si tvam" Vāsishṭham rāpam āśūtaḥ | "aham Vasishṭhaṁ"
ity evaṁ jighāṁ suḥ rākṣaso 'bravit | atroṭtaraṁ risho āśiṁ
Vasishṭheneti naṁ śrutam |

"Having slain the hundred sons of the great Vasishṭha, a murderous
Rākṣasa, assuming the form of that rishi, formerly said to him, 'Thou
art a Rākṣasa, and I am Vasishṭha.' In allusion to this the latter
verses were seen by Vasishṭha, as we have heard."

We may, however, safely dismiss this explanation resting on fabu-
lous grounds.

The verses may, as Professor Max Müller supposes,113 have arisen out

113 "Vasishṭha himself, the very type of the Aryan Brahman, when in feud with
Visvāmitra, is called not only an enemy, but a 'Yātudhāna,' and other names which
in common parlance are only bestowed on barbarian savages and evil spirits. We
of Vasishṭha’s contest with Viśvāmitra, and it may have been the latter personage who brought these charges of heresy, and of murderous and demoniacal character against his rival.113

Allusion is made both in the Taittirīya Sanhitā and in the Kaushitaki Brāhmaṇa to the slaughter of a son of Vasishṭha by the sons or descendants of Sudās. The former work states, Āṣṭaka vii. (p. 47 of the India Office MS. No. 1702):

Vasishṭha hataputro ‘kāmayata “vindaya prajām abhi Saudāsān bhaveyam” iti | sa etam ekasmānnapanchāsam apaśyat tam āharat tenāya-jata | tato vai so ‘vindata prajām abhi Saudāsān abhavat |

“Vasishṭha, when his son had been slain, desired, ‘May I obtain offspring; may I overcome the Saudāsas.’ He beheld this ekasmāna-panchāsa (?), he took it, and sacrificed with it. In consequence he obtained offspring, and overcame the Saudāsas.”

The passage of the Kaushitaki Brāhmaṇa, 4th adhyāya, as quoted by Professor Weber (Ind. St. ii. 299) is very similar:

Vasishṭha ‘kāmayata hatā-putraḥ “prajāyeyā prajayaḥ paśubhir-abhi Saudāsān bhaveyam” iti | sa etat yajna-kratum apaśyad Vasishṭha-yajnam . . . tena ishtvā . . . abhi Saudāsān abhavat |

“Vasishṭha, when his son had been slain, desired, ‘May I be fruitful in offspring and cattle, and overcome the Saudāsas.’ He beheld this form of offering, the Vasishṭha-sacrifice; and having performed it, he overcame the Saudāsas.”

In his introduction to Rig-veda, vii. 32, Sāyaṇa has the following notice from the Anukramanikā:

“Saudāsair agnau prakshipyamāṇah S’aktir antyam pragātham ālebhā so ‘rdharche ukto ‘dahyata | tam putroktam Vasishṭhaḥ samāpayata” iti Sātyāyanakam | “Vasishṭhasya eva hatā-putrasya örsham” iti Tāṇḍakam |

“The Sātyayana Brāhmaṇa says that ‘Sakti (son of Vasishṭha), when being thrown into the fire by the Saudāsas, received (by inspiration) the concluding pragātha of the hymn. He was burnt after he had spoken half a rīch; and Vasishṭha completed what his son was have still the very hymn in which Vasishṭha deprecates such charges with powerful indignation.” Prof. Müller then quotes verses 14–16 of the hymn before us (“Last Results of the Turanian Researches,” in Bunsen’s “Outlines of the Philosophy of Univ. History,” i. 344.

113 See my article “On the relations of the priests to the other classes of Indian society in the Vedic age,” in the Journal Roy. As. Soc. for 1886, pp. 295 ff.
uttering. The Tāṇḍaka says that ‘it was Vasīṣṭha himself who spoke the whole when his son was slain.’"

The words supposed to have been spoken by Sākti, viz. “O Indra, grant to us strength as a father to his sons” (Indra kratuṁ naḥ ā bhara pitā putrebhyo yathā) do not seem to be appropriate to the situation in which he is said to have been placed; and nothing in the hymn appears to allude to any circumstances of the kind imagined in the two Brāhmaṇas.

Manu says of Vasīṣṭha (viii. 110): Maharshibhiṣ cha devaiṣ cha kāryyārthaṁ śapathaḥ kritāḥ | Vasīṣṭhaḥ chaḥ śapathaṁ śope Priyavan vane nripe | “Great rishis and gods too have taken oaths for particular objects. Vasīṣṭha also swore an oath to king Priyavana.” The occasion on which this was done is stated by the Commentator Kullūka: Vasīṣṭhaḥ ‘py anena puttra-śatam bhakshitam iti Viśvāmitreṇa ākruṣhṭo sva-parisuddhaye Priyavanāpatye Sudāmni rājani śapathaṁ chakāra | “Vasīṣṭha being angrily accused by Viśvāmitra of having eaten (his) hundred sons, took an oath before king Sudāma (Sudās, no doubt, is meant) the son of Priyavana in order to clear himself.” This seems to refer to the same story which is alluded to in the passage quoted by the Commentator on Rig-veda vii. 104, 12.

In the Rāmāyaṇa, i. 55, 5 f., a hundred sons of Viśvāmitra are said to have been burnt up by the blast of Vasīṣṭha’s mouth when they rushed upon him armed with various weapons (Viśvāmitra-sudānāṁ tu śataṁ nānā-vidhāyudham | abhyadhāvat susankṛuddhāṁ Vasīṣṭham japa- tāṁ varam | hunkareṇaiva tān sarvāṁ nirdādhaṁ mahāṁ rishiḥ). Vasīṣṭha is also mentioned in Rig-veda, i. 112, 9, as having received succour from the Āśvins (—Vasīṣṭhaṁ yābhir ajārāv ajīvatam).

Vasīṣṭha, or the Vasīṣṭhas, are also referred to by name in the following verses of the seventh Mandala of the Rig-veda: 7, 7; 9, 6; 12, 3; 23, 1, 6; 26, 5; 37, 4; 39, 7; 42, 6; 59, 3; 70, 6; 73, 3; 76, 6, 7; 77, 6; 80, 1; 90, 7; 96, 6; 96, 1, 3; but as no information is derivable from these texts, except that the persons alluded to were the authors or reciters of the hymns, it is needless to quote them.114

114 Another verse of a hymn in which the author is not referred to (vii. 72, 2) is as follows: A no devebhīr upa yatam arvīk se ṣojashāḥ nāsatya rathena | yeṣv hi naḥ sakhyāḥ pitṛyāṁ samāṇo bandhur uta tasya vittam | “Come near to us, Āśvins, on the same car with the gods: for we have ancestral friendships with you, a common relation; do ye recognize it.” Although this has probably no mythological
In the Atharva-veda, iv. 29, 3 and 5, Vasishthā and Viśvāmitra are mentioned among other personages, Angiras, Agasti, Jamadagni, Atri, Kaśyapa, Bharadvāja, Gavishṭhira, and Kutsa, as being succoured by Mitra and Varuṇa (... yāv Angirasam avatōḥ yāv Agastim Mitra-Varuṇā Jamadagnim Atrim | yau Kaśyapam avatōḥ yau Viśvātham ... yau Bharadvājam avatōḥ yau Gavishṭhirāṃ Viśvāmitram Varuṇa Mitra Kutsam). And in the same Veda, xviii. 3, 15 f., they are invoked as deliverers: Viśvāmitra 'yaṃ Jamadagnir Atrir avantu naḥ Kaśyapo Vāmadevaḥ | Viśvāmitra Jamadagnṛ Vasishṭha Bharadvāja Gotama Vāmadeva ... | "15. May this Viśvāmitra, may Jamadagni, Atri, Kaśyapa, Vāmadeva preserve us. 16. O Viśvāmitra, o Jamadagni, o Vasishṭha, o Bharadvāja, o Gotama, o Vāmadeva." The second passage at least must be a good deal more recent than the most of the hymns of the Rig-veda.

Sudās is mentioned in other parts of the Rig-veda without any reference either to Vasishṭha or to Viśvāmitra. In some cases his name is coupled with that of other kings or sages, which appears to shew that in some of these passages at least a person, and not a mere epithet, "the liberal man," is denoted by the word Sudās.

R.V. i. 47, 6. (The traditional rishi is Praskaṇva.) Sudāse dasrā vasu bibhratā rathe prikho vahatam Āsvīna | rayiṁ samudrād uta va divas pari asme dhattam puru-spriham |

"O impetuous Āsvins, possessing wealth in your car, bring sustenance to Sudās. Send to us from the (aerial) ocean, or the sky, the riches which are much coveted."

Sāyaṇa says the person here meant is "king Sudās, son of Pijavana" (Sudāse . . . rājne Pijavana-putṛya).

i. 63, 7. (The rishi is Nodhas, of the family of Gotama.) Tvaṁ ha tyad Indra sapta yudhyan puru vajrin Purukutsāya dardāḥ | barrhir na gat Sudāse vyāthā varg anho rājan varicāḥ Puraṇe kaḥ |

"Thou didst then, o thundering Indra, war against, and shatter, the seven cities for Purukutsa, when thou, o king, didst without effort hurl reference, Sāyaṇa explains it as follows: Vivasvān Varuṇaḥ cēa ubhāv api Kaśyopād Aditir jītāu | Vivasvān Āsvins janaka Varuṇa Vasishṭhasya uts evam samāna-bandhutosam | "Vivasvat and Varuṇa were both sons of Kaśyapa and Aditi. Vivasvat was the father of the Āsvins and Varuṇa of Vasishṭha; such is the affinity." Sāyaṇa then quotes the Brihaddevatā to prove the descent of the Āsvins from Vivasvat. Compare R.V. x. 17, 1, 2, and Nirukta, xii. 10, 11.
away distress from Sudās like a bunch of grass, and bestow wealth on Puru.\textsuperscript{115}

i. 112, 19. (The rishi is Kutsa.) ... yābhīr Sudāsə uḥathuḥ sud evyāṁ tābhīr u shu utībhīr Āsvīnā gatam |

"Come, o Āsvins, with those succours whereby ye brought glorious power to Sudās" [‘son of Pijavana’—Sāyaña].\textsuperscript{116}

The further texts which follow are all from the seventh Mandala, of which the rishis, with scarcely any exception, are said to be Vasishṭha and his descendants:

vii. 19, 3. Tvāṁ dhrishno dhrishatā vitahavyam prāvo viśvābhīr utībhīḥ Sudāsam | pra Paurukutsim Trasadayum āvah kṣettrasatā vṛtrahat yeshu Purum |

"Thou, o fierce Indra, hast impetuously protected Sudās, who offered oblations, with every kind of succour. Thou hast preserved Trasadasyu the son of Purukutsa, and Puru in his conquest of land and in his slaughter of enemies."

vii. 20, 2. Hantā Vṛittram Indraḥ kuśwavānaḥ prāvīḍ nu viro jari tāram uṭi | kartā Sudāsə aha vai u lokaṁ dāta vasu muhur u dāsuske bhūti |

"Indra growing in force slays Vṛitra; the hero protects him who praises him; he makes room for Sudās [or the liberal sacrificer—kal yāna-dānāya yajamānāya. Sāyaña]; he gives riches repeatedly to his worshipper."

vii. 25, 3. Sataṁ te siprinn utayaḥ Sudāsə sahasraṁ saṁsaḥ uta rātir astu | jahi vadhar vanusho marttyasya asmo dyumnam adhi ratnam cha dhēhi |

"Let a hundred succours come to Sudās, a thousand desirable (gifts) and prosperity. Destroy the weapon of the murderous. Confer renown and wealth on us."

(Sāyaña takes sudās here and in all the following citations to signify a "liberal man.")

\textsuperscript{115} Professor Roth renders this passage differently in his Litt. u. Gesch. des Weda, p. 132; as does also Prof. Benfey, Orient und Occident, i. p. 590.

\textsuperscript{116} In R.V. i. 185, 2, we find the word sudās in the comparative degree sudāstara, where it must have the sense of "very liberal": ḍhūri chūd aryāḥ sudāstaraḥya | "(give the wealth) of my enemy, though it be abundant to (me who am) most liberal."

In v. 55, 2, the term sudās appears to be an adjective: a etāṁ ratheṣhu tasthuḥah kaḥ śuśrūva kathā yayaḥ | kauśmai saṃraḥ sudāse anus āpayah tābhīr vrīṣṭayah saha |

"Who has heard them (the Maruts) mounted on their cars, how they have gone? To what liberal man have they resorted as friends, (in the form of) showers with blessings?"
vii. 32. 10. Nakiḥ Sudāso ratham pari āsa na viraman | Indro yasya avitā yasya Maruto gamat sa gomati vraja |

“No one can oppose or stop the chariot of Sudās. He whom Indra, whom the Maruts, protect, walks in a pasture filled with cattle.”

vii. 53, 3: Uto hi vaṁ ratnadheyānī santi purūṇi dyāvā -prithivi Sudāso |

“And ye, o Heaven and Earth, have many gifts of wealth for Sudās [or the liberal man].”

vii. 60, 8. Yad gopāvad Aditiḥ īśara bhadram Mitra yachhanti Varaṅaḥ Sudāse | tasminn ā tokāṁ tanayaṁ dadhānāḥ mā karma deva- helanāṁ turāsaḥ | 9. . . . pari dveṣhobhir Aryamā vṛiṇaktu uruṁ Sudāse vṛiṣṭhamau u tokam |

“Since Aditi, Mitra, and Varuṇa afford secure protection to Sudās (or the liberal man), bestowing on him offspring;—may we not, o mighty deities, commit any offence against the gods. 9. . . . May Aryaman rid us of our enemies. (Grant) ye vigorous gods, a wide space to Sudās.”

There is another passage, vii. 64, 3 (bravaḥ yathā naḥ āḥ ariḥ Sudāse), to which I find it difficult to assign the proper sense.

Vasisṭṭha is referred to in the following passages of the Brāhmaṇas:

Kāṭhaka 37, 17.117 Rishayo vai Indram pratyakṣaṁ na apaśyāṁ taṁ Vasisṭṭhaṁ eva pratyakṣham apaśyat | so 'bhīhed “itarebhya mā rishi-bhyāḥ pravakyati” iti118 | so 'bravid ‘brāhmaṇaṁ te vakṣhyāmi yathā tvat-purohitāḥ praṇāḥ prajāniṣhyante | aha mā itarebhyaḥ rishibhyo mā pravocahā” iti | tasmai etāṁ stoma-bhāgān abravit tato Vasisṭṭha-puro- hitāḥ praṇāḥ prajāyaṁta |

“The rishis did not behold Indra face to face; it was only Vasisṭṭha who so beheld him. He (Indra) was afraid lest Vasisṭṭha should reveal him to the other rishis; and said to him, ‘I shall declare to thee a Brāhmaṇa in order that men may be born who shall take thee for their purohita. Do not reveal me to the other rishis.’ Accordingly he declared to

117 Quoted by Professor Weber, Indische Studien, iii. 478.

118 The words from so 'bhīhet down to iti are omitted in the Taitt. Sanhīti, iii. 5, 2, 2, where this passage is also found. Weber refers in Ind. St. ii. to another part of the Kāṭhaka, ii. 9, where Vasisṭṭha is alluded to as having “soen” a text beginning with the word purovāta during a time of drought (“Purovāta” iti vṛiṣṭi-apete bhūta-grāme Vasisṭṭho dadus’ā).
him these parts of the hymn. In consequence men were born who took Vasishṭha for their purohita.”

Professor Weber refers in the same place to a passage of the Sāta-patha Brāhmaṇa relating to the former superiority of Vasishṭha’s family in sacred knowledge and priestly functions:

xii. 6, 1, 38. Vasishṭha ha virājaṃ vidānchakāra tāṁ ha Indro ‘bhīdā-
dhyau | sa ha uvācha “rishe virājam ha vai vettha tām me brāhī” iti | sa ha uvācha “kim mama tataḥ syād” iti | “sarvasya cha te yajnasya
prāyaschittim brāyāṁ rūpaṁ cha tvā dārsayeya” iti | sa ha uvācha
“yad nu me sarvasya yajnasya prāyaschittim brāyāḥ kim u sa syād yaṁ
tvāṁ rūpaṁ dārsayothāḥ” iti | jīva-svarga eva asmāḥ lokāt preyād”
iti | tato ha etām rishir Indrāya virājaṃ uvācha “iyāṁ vai virāḍ” iti |
tasmād yo ‘syai bhūyishṭhaṁ labhate sa eva śresṭhṛḥ bhavati | atha ha
etām Indraḥ rishaye prāyaschittim uvācha agnihotrād agre a mahataḥ
ukthāt | tāḥ ha sma etāḥ purā vyākṛtir Vasishṭhaḥ eva viduḥ | tasmād
ha sma purā Vasishṭhaḥ eva brahmā bhavati |

“Vasishṭha was acquainted with the Virāj (a particular Vedic metre). Indra desired it; and said, ‘O rishi, thou knowest the Virāj: declare it to me.’ Vasishṭha asked: ‘What (advantage) will result to me from doing so?’ (Indra replied) ‘I shall both explain to thee the forms for rectifying anything amiss (prāyaschitti)119 in the entire sacrifice, and show thee its form.’ Vasishṭha further enquired, ‘If thou declarest to me the remedial rites for the entire sacrifice, what shall he become to whom thou wilt show the form?’ (Indra answered) ‘He shall ascend from this world to the heaven of life.’ The rishi then declared this Virāj to Indra, saying, ‘this is the Virāj.’ Wherefore it is he who obtains the most of this (Virāj) that becomes the most eminent. Then Indra explained to the rishi this remedial formula from the agnihotra to the great uktha. Formerly the Vasishṭhas alone knew these sacred syllables (vyāhṛtis). Hence in former times a Vasishṭha only was a (priest of the kind called) brāhman.”

Professor Weber quotes also the following from the Kāṭhaka 32, 2.
Yām abrahmanaḥ prāṣnāti sā skannā abhutis tasyā vai Vasishṭhaḥ eva
prāyaschittam vidānchakāra | “The oblation of which a person not a
brāhman partakes is vitiated. Vasishṭha alone knew the remedial rite
for such a case.”

119 See above, p. 294.
In the Sāma-veda, quoted by the same writer (Ibid. i. 39, and described p. 37, as possessing a distinctly formed Brahmanical character indicating a not very early date), we have the following passage:

i. 5. Indra ha Viśvāmitraḥ uktham uvācha Vasishṭhāya brahma vāg uktham ity eva Viśvāmitraḥ mano brahma Vasishṭhāya | tād vai etad Vasishṭham brahma | api ha evaṃvidhaṁ vā Vasishṭham vā brahmānam kurvita |

"Indra declared the uktha (hymn) to Viśvāmitra, and the brāhma (devotion) to Vasishṭha. The uktha is expression (vāk); that (he made known) to Viśvāmitra; and the brāhma is the soul; that (he made known) to Vasishṭha. Hence this brāhma (devotional power) belongs to the Vasishṭhas. Moreover, let either a person of this description, or a man of the family of Vasishṭha, be appointed a brāhma-priest."

Here the superiority of Vasishṭha over Viśvāmitra is clearly asserted.\(^{130}\)

Vasishṭha is mentioned in the Mahābharata, Santip. verses 11221 ff., as having communicated divine knowledge to king Janaka, and as referring (see verses 11232, 11347, 11409, 11418, 11461, etc.) to the Śāṅkhya and Yoga systems. The sage is thus characterized:

11221. Vasishṭham ṭreshṭham āśinam rishīṇām bhāskara-dyutim | parprachha Janako rājā jñānaṁ naiśśreyasam param | param adhyātmakaṇalam adḥaṭma-gati-niśchayam | Maitrāvarunim āśinam abhīvādyā kṛitāṇjaliḥ |

"King Janaka with joined hands saluted Vasishṭha the son of Mitra and Varuṇa, the highest and most excellent of rishis, resplendent as the sun, who was acquainted with the Supreme Spirit, who had ascertained the means of attaining to the Supreme Spirit; and asked him after that Highest knowledge which leads to final beatitude."

The doctrine which the saint imparts to the king he professes to have derived from the eternal Hiranyagarbha, i.e. Brahmā (avāptam etad hi mayā sanātanaḥ Hiranyagarbhad gadato narādhipa).

I have already in former parts of this volume quoted passages from Manu, the Vishṇu Purāṇa, and the Mahābhārata, regarding the creation

\(^{130}\) Professor Weber mentions (Ind. St. i. 53) that in the commentary of Rāmacṛṣṇa on the Pāraskara Grihya Sūtras allusion is made to the “Chandogas who follow the Sūtras of the Vasishṭha family” Viśeṣṭha-sūtrānuchārinās (chhandogāh).
of Vasishṭha. The first-named work (see above, p. 36) makes him one of ten Maharshis created by Manu Svāyambhuva in the first (or Svāyambhuva) Manvantara. The Vishṇu Purāṇa (p. 65) declares him to have been one of nine mind-born sons or Brahmas created by Brahmā in the Manvantara just mentioned. The same Purāṇa, however, iii. 1. 14, makes him also one of the seven rishis of the existing or Vaivasvata Manvantara, of which the son of Vivasvat, Srāddhadeva,\textsuperscript{121} is the Manu (Śivasvataḥ suto viṃśa Īśāndādevo mahādyutih | Manuḥ saṁvardtate dhīmān sāmpratāṁ saptame'ntare . . . Vasishṭhaḥ Ka-ñyapo 'thagiri Jamadagnīṁ sa-Gautamaḥ | Viśvāmitra-Bharadvājavu saptā saptarṣayaḥ 'bhavan). The Mahābhārata (see p. 122) varies in its accounts, as in one place it does not include Vasishṭha among Brahmā’s six mind-born sons, whilst in a second passage it adds him to the number which is there raised to seven,\textsuperscript{122} and in a third text describes him as one of twenty-one Prajāpatīs.

According to the Vishṇu Purāṇa, i. 10, 10, “Vasishṭha had by his wife Úrijjā” (one of the daughters of Daksha, and an allegorical personage, see V. P. i. 7, 18), seven sons called Rajas, Gātra, Urddhva-bāhu, Savana, Anagha, Sutapās, and Sukra, who were all spotless rishis” (Ūrijjāyāṁ cha Vasishṭhasya saptājyanta vai sutāḥ | Rajo-Gātrorūddhavāhās Śavanaḥ Anaghas tathā | Sutapāḥ Sukrāḥ idy ete sarve saptarṣayaḥ "maḷāḥ). This must be understood as referring to the Svāyambhuva Manvantara. The Commentator says these sons were the seven rishis in the third Manvantara (saptarṣayān tritiya-manvantare). In the description of that period the V. P. merely says, without naming them (iii. 1, 9) that “the seven sons of Vasishṭha were the seven rishis” (Vasishṭha-tanayās tatra saptā saptarṣayaḥ "bhavan).\textsuperscript{123} The Bhāgavata Purāṇa (iv. 1, 40 f.) gives the names of Vasishṭha’s sons differently; and also specifies Saktṛi and others as the offspring of a different marriage. (Compare Professor Wilson’s notes on these passages of the Vishṇu Purāṇa.)

\textsuperscript{121} See above p. 209, note 63, and pp. 188 ff.
\textsuperscript{122} In another verse also (Ādip. 6638, which will be quoted below in a future section) he is said to be a mind-born son of Brahmā.
\textsuperscript{123} Úrijja, who in the Vishṇu P. iii. 1, 6, is stated to be one of the rishis of the second or Svārochisha Manvantara, is said in the Vāyu P. to be a son of Vasishṭha. See Professor Wilson’s note (vol. iii. p. 3) on Vishṇu P. iii. 1, 6. The Vāyu P. also declares that one of the rishis in each of the fourth and fifth Manvantaras was a son of Vasishṭha. (See Prof. Wilson’s notes (vol. iii. pp. 8 and 11) on Vishṇu P. iii. 1.)
In Manu, ix. 22 f., it is said that "a wife acquires the qualities of the husband with whom she is duly united, as a river does when blended with the ocean. 23. Akshamālā, though of the lowest origin, became honourable through her union with Vasishṭha, as did also Sārangī through her marriage with Mandapāla" (Yadṛg-guṇena bhārtṛā stṛi saṁyujyate yathāviśhi | tādṛg-guṇā sā bhavati samudreṇeva nimnaṁ | 23. Akshamālā Vasishṭheṇa saṁyukta 'dhamo-yoni-jā | Sārangī Mandāpalena jagāṁbhirhaṁvyaṁyatām).

Vasishṭha's wife receives the same name (Vasishṭhas chākshamālayā) in a verse of the Mahābhārata (Udyogaparvan, v. 3970);^{124} but in two other passages of the same work, which will be adduced further on, she is called Arundhati.^{125}

According to the Vishṇu Purāṇa (ii. 10, 8) Vasishṭha is one of the superintendents who in the month of Āśadhā abide in the Sun's chariot, the others being Varuṇa, Rambha, Sahajanyā, Huhu, Budha, and Rathachitra (Vasishthe Varuṇa Rambha Sahajanyā Huhur Budhaḥ | Rathachitras tatha S'ukre vasanty Āśadhā-sanjanīte); whilst in the month of Phalguna (ibid. v. 16) the rival sage Viśvāmitra exercises the same function along with Vishṇu, Aśvatar, Rambha, Sūryavarchas, Satyajit, and the Rākshasa Yajnāpeta (śrūyatāṁ cāpare sūrye phalgune nivasantī ye | Vishṇur Aśvataro Rambha Sūryavarchās cā Satyaḥ | Viśvāmitras tatha raksho Yajnāpeto mahātmanāḥ).

At the commencement of the Vāyu Purāṇa Vasishṭha is characterized as being the most excellent of the rishis (risiṁnāṁ ca varishṭhāya Vasishṭhāya mahātmane).

It is stated in the Vishṇu Purāṇa, iii. 3, 9, that the Vēdas have been already divided twenty-eight times in the course of the present or Vaivasvata Manvantara; and that this division has always taken place in the Dvāpara age of each system of four yugas. In the first Dvāpara Brahmā Svaayambhū himself divided them; in the sixth Mrītyu (Death, or Yama); whilst in the eighth Dvāpara it was Vasishṭha who was the Vyāsa or divider (Asṝaviṁśatikrīte vai vedāḥ vyastāḥ maharshibhiḥ | Vaivasvate 'nte tasmin dvāparesu punah punah | . . . . 10. Dvāpara prathame vyastāḥ svayāṁ vedāḥ Svayambhūtā | . . . . 11. . . Mrītyuḥ shasṭhe smritaḥ prabhubh | . . . . Vasishṭhaś cāḥaṁśtame smritaḥ).

^{124} Two lines below Haimavati is mentioned as the wife of Viśvāmitra (Haimavatīyā cha Kauśikāh).

^{125} In the St. Petersburg Lexicon akshamālā is taken for an epithet of Arundhatī.
Vasishṭha was, as we have seen above, the family-priest of Nimi, son of Ikshvāku, who was the son of Manu Vaivasvata, and the first prince of the solar race of kings; and in a passage of the Mahābhārata, Ādip. (6643 f.), which will be quoted in a future section, he is stated to have been the purohita of all the kings of that family. He is accordingly mentioned in Viśnū Purāṇa, iv. 3, 18, as the religious teacher of Sagara, the thirty-seventh in descent from Ikshvāku (tāṭ-kula-guruḥ Vasishṭham saraṇaṁ jagmuḥ); and as conducting a sacrifice for Saudāsa or Mitrasaha, a descendant in the fiftieth generation of the same prince (Viśnū P. iv. 4, 25, Kālena gachhatā sa Saudāso yajnam ayajat | parinīṣṭhitā-yañe cha ēchāryya Vasishṭhe nishkrānto ityādi).

Vasishṭha is also spoken of in the Rāmāyaṇa, ii. 110, 1 (see above, p. 115), and elsewhere (ii. 111, 1, etc.), as the priest of Rāma, who appears from the Viśnū Purāṇa, (iv. 4, 40, and the preceding narrative), to have been a descendant of Ikshvāku in the sixty-first generation.128

Vasishṭha, according to all these accounts, must have been possessed of a vitality altogether superhuman; for it does not appear that any of the accounts to which I have referred intend under the name of Vasishṭha to denote merely a person belonging to the family so called, but to represent the founder of the family himself as taking part in the transactions of many successive ages.

It is clear that Vasishṭha, although, as we shall see, he is frequently designated in post-vedic writings as a Brāhman, was, according to some other authorities I have quoted, not really such in any proper sense of the word, as in the accounts which are there given of his birth he is declared to have been either a mind-born son of Brahmā, or the son of Mitra, Varuṇa, and the Apsaras Urvasī, or to have had some other supernatural origin.

Sect. VII.—Viśvāmitra.

Viśvāmitra is stated in the Anukramaṇīkā, as quoted by Sāyaṇa at the commencement of the third Maṇḍala of the Rig-veda, to be the rishi, or “seer,” of that book of the collection: Asya maṇḍala-drashṭā

128 Rāma’s genealogy is also given in the Rāmāyaṇa, i. 70, and ii. 110, 6 ff., where, however, he is said to be only the thirty-third or thirty-fourth from Ikshvāku.
Viśvāmitraḥ rishiḥ | "The rishi of this (the first hymn) was Viśvāmitra, the 'seer' of the Maṇḍala." This, however, is to be understood with some exceptions, as other persons, almost exclusively his descendants, are said to be the rishis of some of the hymns.

I shall quote such passages as refer, or are traditionally declared to refer, to Viśvāmitra or his family.

In reference to the thirty-third hymn the Nirukta states as follows:

ii. 24. Tatra itihāsam āchakshate | Viśvāmitraḥ rishiḥ Sudāsaḥ Paijavanaśya purohito babhūva ... | sa vittaṁ grihitva Vipāt-çhuttudryoh sambhedam āyayau | anuyayur itare | sa Viśvāmitro naḍīs tushṭāva "gādhāḥ bhavata" iti |

"They there relate a story. The rishi Viśvāmitra was the purohita of Sudāś, the son of Pijavana. (Here the etymologies of the names Viśvāmitra, Sudāś, and Pijavana are given.) Taking his property, he came to the confluence of the Vipās and Sutudrī (Sutlej); others followed. Viśvāmitra landed the rivers (praying them to) become fordable."

Sāyaṇa expands the legend a little as follows:

Pūrā kīla Viśvāmitraḥ Paijavanaśya Sudāsa rājñaḥ purohito babhūva | sa cha pauruḥityena labdha-dhanah sarvam dhanam ādāya Vipāt-çhuttudryoh sambhedam āyayau | anuyayur itare | athottitirēḥr Vīśvāmitro 'gādha-jale to nadyau dṛṣṭaḥvā uttaranārtham adyābhīs tisrībhīs tushṭāva |

"Formerly Viśvāmitra was the purohita of king Sudāś, the son of Pijavana. He, having obtained wealth by means of his office as purohita, took the whole of it, and came to the confluence of the Vipās and the Sutudrī. Others followed. Being then desirous to cross, but perceiving that the waters of the rivers were not fordable, Viśvāmitra, with the view of getting across landed them with the first three verses of the hymn."

The hymn makes no allusion whatever to Sudāś, but mentions the son of Kuśika (Viśvāmitra) and the Bharatas. It is not devoid of poetical beauty, and is as follows:

R.V. iii. 33, 1 (= Nirukta, ix. 39). Pra parvatānām uṣāti upaśhād asve iva viśhite hāsamāne | gāveva śubhre mātarā rihāne Vipāt Chuttudrī payasad jave | 2. Indreshito prasavam bhikshamāne achha samudraṁ rathyā iva yāṭhaḥ | samāraṇe ārmībhīḥ pinvamāne anyā vām anyām api eti śubhre | 3. Achha sindhum māṭritamām ayāsam Vipāsam ūrvīṁ
subhañām aganma | vatsam iva mātara samrihāne samānaḥ yonim anu sancharantī | 4. Enā vayam payasā pinvamānā anu yoniaṁ deva-kritoṁ charantīḥ | na varttave prasavaḥ sarga-taktaḥ kiñyur vipro nadyo johati | 5 (= Nirukta, ii. 25). Ramadhvam me vachasayā ritaṁvarīr upa muhurttam evaś | pra sindhum aichha thishī manīshā avasyār ahve Kuśikasya sūrī | 6 (= Nir. ii. 26). Indro asmān aradat vajra-bāhur apāhan Vrittaram paridhiṁ nadinām | devo 'nayat Savitā supānīs tasya vayam prasave yamaḥ ārvīḥ | 7. Pravācyāṁ śāvadāṁ vīryaṁ tad Indrasya karma yaś Ahiṁ vivriśchat | vi vajrena parishado jaghāna āyann āpo ayanam ichhamānaḥ | 8. Etad vacho jardo rāmā 'pi mṛkṣṭāṁ ā yat te ghotśān uttarā yugāni | uktheshu kāro prati no jushasa mā no ni kah purushatra namas te | 9. O su vasaśāraḥ kārahe śrīnata yaya yo darad anasaḥ ratheṇa | ni su namadhvam bhavata supārā adhoakshaḥ sindhavaḥ srotāḥbhīḥ | 10 (= Nir. ii. 27). Ā te kāro śrīnavāma vachānsi yayātha durād anasaḥ ratheṇa | ni te naṁsaṁ pīpyānā iva yoshā māryāya iva kanyā śāvachais te | 11. Yad anga tvā Bharataḥ santahe ruyāvan grāmaḥ iṣitaḥ Indra-jūtaḥ | arshād aha prasavaḥ sarga-taktaḥ ā vo vriṣe suṣatiṁ yaṇiṇyānām | 12. Atārishur Bharataḥ gavyavaḥ sam abhakta vipraḥ suṣatiṁ nadinām | pra pinvadhvam ishayantīḥ surāḍhaḥ ā vakhshayāḥ prinadhvam yata śibham | 11 “1. (Vīśvāmitra speaks): Hastening eagerly from the heart of the mountains, contending like two mares let loose, like two bright mother-cows licking127 (each her calf), the Vipāś and Sutudrī rush onward with their waters. 2. Impelled by Indra, seeking a rapid course, ye move towards the ocean, as if mounted on a car. Running together, as ye do, swelling with your waves, the one of you joins the other, ye bright streams. 3. I have come to the most motherly stream; we have arrived at the broad and beautiful Vipāś; proceeding, both of them, like two mother(-cows) licking each her calf, to a common receptacle. 4. (The rivers reply): Here swelling with our waters we move forward to the receptacle fashioned by the gods (the ocean); our headlong course cannot be arrested. What does the sage desire that he invokes the rivers? 5. (Vīśvāmitra says): Stay your course for a moment, ye pure streams, (yielding) to my pleasant words.128 With a powerful prayer, I, the son

127 Prof. Roth (Illustr. of Nirukta, p. 133) refers to vii. 2. 5 (pūreś śīśuṁ na mātara rihāṇe) as a parallel passage.
128 Prof. Roth (Litt. u. Gesch. des Weda, p. 103) renders: “Listen joyfully for a
of Kuśika, desiring succour, invoke the river. 6. (The rivers answer): Indra, the wielder of the thunderbolt, has hollowed out our channels; he has smitten Ahi who hemmed in the streams. Savitṛī the skilful-handed has led us hither; by his impulse we flow on in our breadth. 7. For ever to be celebrated is the heroic deed of Indra, that he has split Vṛitra in sunder. He smote the obstructions with his thunderbolt; and the waters desiring an outlet went on their way. 8. Do not, o utterer of praises, forget this word, which future ages will re-echo to thee. In hymns, o bard, show us thy devotion; do not humble us before men; reverence be paid to thee. 9. (Viśvāmitra says): Listen, o sisters, to the bard who has come to you from afar with waggon and chariot. Sink down; become fordable; reach not up to our chariot-axles with your streams. 10. (The rivers answer): We shall listen to thy words, o bard; thou hast come from far with waggon and chariot. I will bow down to thee like a woman with full breast (suckling her child); as a maid to a man will I throw myself open to thee. 11. (Viśvāmitra says): When the Bharatas, that war-loving tribe, sent forward, impelled by Indra, have crossed thee, then thy headlong current shall hold on its course. I seek the favour of you the adorable. 12. The war-loving Bharatas have crossed; the Sage has obtained the favour of the rivers. Swell on impetuous, and fertilizing; fill your channels; roll rapidly."

The next quotation is from the fifty-third hymn of the same third Maṇḍala, verses 6 ff.:

6. Apāḥ somam astam Indra pra yāhi kalyāṇir jayā sūraṇaṁ grihe

moment to my amiable speech, ye streams rich in water; stay your progress;” and adds in a note: “I do not connect the particle upa with ramadhvam, as the Nirukta and Sāyaṇa do; the fact that upa stands in another Pāda (quarter of the verse) requires a different explanation. The most of those interpretations of the Commentator which destroy the sense have their ultimate ground in the circumstance that he combines the words of different divisions of the verse; and any one may easily convince himself that every Pāda has commonly a separate sense, and is far more independent of the others than is the case in the sloka of later times.” In his Lexicon Roth renders rīśvarī in this passage by “regular,” “equally flowing.”

129 "Kuśika was a king" (Kuśika rājā babhūva. Nir. ii. 25). Sāyaṇa calls him a royal rishi.

130 This is the sense assigned by Prof. Roth, s.v. pī to pīpyānā. Sāyaṇa, following Yāśka, ii. 27, gives the sense “suckling her child.” Prof. Aufrecht considers that the word means “pregnant.” In the next clause saśvachai is rendered in the manner suggested by Prof. A., who compares R.V. x. 18, 11, 12.

131 “The men of the family of Bharata, my people” (Bharata-kula-fāh madiyāh sarve.” Sāyaṇa).
THE BRAHMANS AND KSHATTRIYAS.

341
mam| ā no bhara Pramogandasya vedo Naichāsachham maghaeṇa ranadhaya naḥ | 15. Sasarpārī amatiṣm bādhāmānā bṛihād mīmāya Jamadagni- 
dattā | a Śuryasya duhītā tatāna śravo deveshu amṛtam ajuryam | 16. Sasarpārī adharat tṝayam ebhya adhi śravaṃ panchajanyāsā kriṣṭiṣaḥ | 
sā paksyā navyam āyur dadhānā yām me palasti-jamadagnayo daduḥ | 17. 21. Indra atibhir bahulābibh nir adya yācholhrekṣthābhib mah-
ghavan śrā jinva | yo no cēṣṭi adharaḥ sas padīṣṭha yam u dvīṣmas 
tam u prāgo jāhū | 22. paraśuṁ chid vi tapati simbalaṁ chid vi viś-
chati | ukhā chid Indra yoshanti prayastā phenam asyatī. 23. Na sāya-
kasya chikite janāso lodhaṃ nayanti paśu manyamānāḥ | nāvājinām 
vājināḥ ṣaṣṭayanti na gārdhaṃ phur oṣvān nayanti | 24. Ime Indra 
Bhārataśya putrāḥ apapitvaṁ chikitur na prapatvam | hinvantī aśvaṃ 
arāṇāḥ na nītyaṁ jyāvām pari nayanti ājau | 6. Thou hast drunk soma; depart, Indra, to thy abode: thou hast a handsome wife and pleasure in thy house. In whatever place thy great chariot rests, it is proper that the steed should be unyoked. 7. These bountiful Virūpas of the race of Angiras,132 heroic sons of the divine

132 Sāyaṇa says that the liberal men are the Kṣatṛiyas, sons of Sudās, that virūpāḥ means their different priests of the race of Angiras, Medhātithī, and others, and that the sons of the sky are the Maruts, the sons of Rudra (Ime yāgāṁ kurvāṇaḥ bhojaḥ Sudāsaḥ kṣatṛivyāḥ teṣaḥ yajāḥ virūpaḥ nāṁrūpaḥ Medhātithi-prabhā-
tayo nāpirasaḥ cha dino' surasya devebhyo'pi balatva Rudrasya putrāso . . . . Mar-
ruṭaḥ). The Virūpas are connected with Angiras in R.V. x. 62, 5; and a Virūpa is mentioned in i. 45, 3; and viii. 64, 6.
Dyaus (sky), bestowing wealth upon Viśvāmitra at the sacrifice with a thousand libations, prolong their lives. 8. The opulent god (Indra) constantly assumes various forms, exhibiting with his body illusive appearances; since he came from the sky thrice in a moment, drinking (soma) according to his own will, at other than the stated seasons, and yet observing the ceremonial. 9. The great rishi, god-born, god-impelled, leader of men, stayed the watery current; when Viśvāmitra conducted Sudās, Indra was propitiated through the Kuśikas. 10. Like swans, ye make a sound with the (soma-crushing) stones, exulting with your hymns when the libation is poured forth; ye Kuśikas, sage rishis, leaders of men, drink the honied soma with the gods. 11. Approach, ye Kuśikas, be alert; let loose the horse of Sudās to (conquer) riches; let the king smite strongly his enemy in the east, the west, and the north; and then let him sacrifice on the most excellent (spot) of the earth. 12. I Viśvāmitra have caused both heaven and earth to sing the praises of Indra; and my prayer protects the race of Bharata. 13. The Viśvāmitras have offered up prayer to Indra the thunderer. May he render us prosperous! 14. What are thy cows doing among the Kīkaṭas, who neither draw from them the milk (which is to be mixed with soma), nor heat the sacrificial kettle. Bring to us the wealth of Pramaganda; subdue to us to the son of Nīchāśākha. 15. Moving swiftly, removing poverty, brought by the Jamadagnis, she has mightily uttered her voice: this daughter of the sun has conveyed (our) renown, eternal and undecaying, (even) to the gods. 16. Moving swiftly she has speedily brought down (our) renown from them to the five races of men; this winged goddess whom the aged Jamadagnis brought to us, has conferred on us new life.”

133 Verses 9–13 are translated by Prof. Roth, Litt. u. Gesch. des Weda, p. 106 f.
134 Comp. M. Bh. Ādip. v. 6695. Apībaḥ cha tataḥ somam Indreṇa saha Kuśikāḥ | “And then the Kuśika drank soma with Indra.”
135 Compare R.V. i. 23, 4, which will be quoted below.
136 Compare R.V. iv. 17, 1.
137 Kīkaṭaḥ nāma deso’nāryya-nivūsaḥ | “Kīkaṭa is a country inhabited by people who are not Āryas.” See the second vol. of this work, p. 362, and Journ. Royal As. Soc. for 1866, p. 340.
138 Pakṣāya. This word is rendered by Sāyana “the daughter of the sun who causes the light and dark periods of the moon, etc.” (Pakṣasya pakṣādi-nirvāha-kasya śūryasya duḥśitaḥ). Prof. Roth s.v. thinks the word may mean “she who changes according to the (light and dark) fortnights.”
17–20 we have the following: “21. Prosper us to-day, o opulent Indra, by numerous and most excellent succours. May he who hates us fall down low; and may breath abandon him whom we hate.” This is succeeded by three obscure verses, of which a translation will be attempted further on.

Sāyaṇa prefaces verses 15 and 16 by a quotation from Śaṅgaguruśishya’s Commentary on the Anukramaṇīkā, which is given with an addition in Weber’s Indische Studien i. 119 f. as follows: Sasarpāri-dv-riche prāhur itihāsam purāvīdaḥḥ Sadās-a-nripater yajne Vasīṣṭhāt-majā-Saktinā Vasīvāmitrasābhībhūtām balaṁ vāk cha samantataḥ Vasīṣṭhēnābhībhūtāḥ sa hy avāśīdach cha Gādhi-jaḥ tasmāi Brāhmaṇī tu Saurīṁ vā nāmnā vāchaṁ Sasarpārim Sūrya-veśmanā uḥriya dadur vai Jamadagnayoḥ Kuśikānāṁ tataḥ sā vān manāk chintām aṭhānudat āpapreteti Kuśikān Viśvāmitro ‘nvachodayat labāhe vāchaṁ cha hṛṣṭātmā Jamadagnin apūjayaḥ “Sasarpāriḥ” iti dvābhyaṁ rigbhyaṁ Viṣcham stuvam evayam “Regarding the two verses beginning “Sasarpāriḥ” those acquainted with antiquity tell a story. At a sacrifice of king Saudāśa the power and speech of Viśvāmitra were completely vanquished by Śakti, son of Vasīṣṭhā; and the son of Gādhi (Viśvāmitra) being so overcome, became dejected. The Jamadagnis drew from the abode of the Sun a Voice called “Sasarpāriḥ,” the daughter of Brahmā, or of the Sun, and gave her to him. Then that voice somewhat dispelled the disquiet of the Jamadagnis [or, according to the reading of this line given by Sāyaṇa (Kuśikānāṁ matiḥ sā vāg amatīṁ tāṁ aṭānudat “that Voice, being intelligence, dispelled the unintelligence of the Kuśikas.”]. Viśvāmitra then incited the Kuśikas with the words āpapreta ‘approach’ (see verse 11). And being gladdened by receiving the Voice, he paid homage to the Jamadagnis; praising them with the two verses beginning ‘Sasarpāriḥ.’”

In regard to the verses 21–24 Sāyaṇa has the following remarks:

“Indra utībhīr ity ādyāṁ chatasro Vasīṣṭhā-dvēshinyahḥ purā khalu Viśvāmitra-sīshyāḥ Sudāḥ nāma rājarṣher āsīt sa cha kechāhit kāraṇena Vasīṣṭhā-dvēshyāḥ bhūt Viśvāmitras tu sīshyasya rakṣārthaṁ ābhīr riģbhīr Vasīṣṭhānam āsapat imāḥ abhiṣāpa-rāpāḥ tāḥ riĉo Vasīṣṭhāḥ na ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOP

129 The Brhaddevatā, which has some lines nearly to the same effect as these I have quoted (see Ind. Stud. i. 119), gives Sudās instead of Saudāśa.
Sudās, a disciple of Viśvāmitra; who for some reason had incurred the ill-will of Vasiṣṭha. For his disciple’s protection Viśvāmitra cursed Vasiṣṭha in these verses. They thus consist of curses, and the Vasiṣṭhas do not listen to them.”

In reference to the same passage the Brhaddēvātā iv. 23f., as quoted in Indische Studien, i. 120, has the following lines: *Pasāh chatasro yās tattve Vasīṣṭha-dveshinir vidūḥḥ | Viśvāmitreṇa tāh proktāh abhisāpāḥ iti smrītāh | dvesha-dveshās tu tāh proktāh vidyācch chāivābhicārikāḥ | Vasiṣṭhas tu na śrīṃvants tad ācāryaka-ṣaṃmatam | kṛtānād evahāvānāḥ | vā ’pi mahān dōṣah praṇaṣyate | sādāhā bhāyate mūrdhā kṛtyāt tāt̄tena sūtānā vā | teshām balaḥ ĩramyante tasmā tās tu na kārtīyat | “The other four verses of that hymn, which are regarded as expressing hatred to Vasiṣṭha, were uttered by Viśvāmitra, and are traditionally reported to contain imprecations. They are said to express hatred in return for (?) hatred, and should also be considered as incantations. The descendants of Vasiṣṭha do not listen to them, as this is the will of their preceptor. Great guilt is incurred by repeating or hearing them. The heads of those who do so are split into a hundred fragments; and their children die. Wherefore let no one recite them.”

Durga, the commentator on the Nirukta,⁴⁰ in accordance with this injunction and warning, says in reference to verse 23: *Viśmin niṃgama esha sabdaḥ (lodhaḥ) vā Vasiṣṭha-dveshīṇi rīk | ahaṁ cha Kāpiṣṭhalo Vasiṣṭhaḥ | atas tām na nirbrāvāmi | “The text in which this word (lodha) occurs is a verse expressing hatred of Vasiṣṭha. But I am a Kāpiṣṭhalo of the family of Vasiṣṭha; and therefore do not interpret it.”

The following text also may have reference to the personal history of Viśvāmitra: R.V. iii. 43, 4. Ā cha tvaṃ eta vrīṣaṇā vahato hari sakhāya sudhurā svangā | dhānāvad Indrāḥ savanaṁ jūshānaḥ sakhā sakhyaḥ śrīgavad vandanāni | 5. Kuidā mā gopān karase janaṣya kuidā rūjānam mahavann rīṣhīn | kuidā mā rīṣhīm paprīṣamām suṣaya kuidā me vasvo amṛitasya sīkṣhāḥ | “4. May these two vigorous brown steeds, friendly, well-yoked, stout-limbed, convey thee hither. May Indra gratified by our libation mingled with grain, hear (like) a friend, the praises of a friend. 5. Wilt thou make me a ruler of the people? wilt

⁴⁰ As quoted both by Prof. Roth, Litt. u. Gesch. des Weda, p. 108, note, and by Prof. Müller, Pref. to Rig-veda, vol. ii. p. lvi.
thou make me a king, 4. himetuous lord of riches? wilt thou make me a rishi a drinker of soma? wilt thou endow me with imperishable wealth?

The next passage refers to Devaśrasas and DeVavata, of the race of Bharata, who are called in the Anukramanikā, quoted by Sāyana, "sons of Bharata" (Bharatasya putrau); but one of whom at least is elsewhere, as we shall see, said to be a son of Viśvāmitra: R.V. iii. 23, 2. Amanthiśtaṃ Bhārata revād Agnim Devaśravah Devavataḥ sudaksham. | Agno vi pasya bṛihata' bhi rāyā iṣāāṃ no netā bhavatād anu dyān | 3. Daśa kṣihapā पूर्वयाम सम ajījanan sujātān mātrīsā priyam | Agnimaṃ stuti Daivavataṃ Devaśrasvavo yo janānām asad vaś | 4. Nī tvā dadehe vare ā prithivyāś ilāyā̄s pade suhāṅate ahānām | Driśadvatīyām mānushe Ayayāyāṃ Saravatīyāṃ revad Agne didhihi | "2. The two Bhāratas Devaśrasas and Devavata have brilliantly created by friction the powerful Agni. Look upon us, O Agni, manifesting thyself with much wealth; be a bringer of nourishment to us every day. 3. The ten fingers (of Devavata) have generated the ancient god, happily born and dear to his mothers. Praise, O Devaśrasas, Agni, the offspring of Devavata, who has become the lord of men. 4. I placed (or he placed) thee on the most excellent spot of earth on the place of worship,14 at an auspicious time. Shine, O Agni, brilliantly on the (banks of the) Drishadvatī, on (a site) auspicious for men, on (the banks of) the Ayā, of the Sarasvatī."

Viśvāmitra is mentioned along with Jamādagni in the fourth verse of the 167th hymn of the tenth Maṇḍala, which is ascribed to these two sages as its authors: Prasūta bhakṣham akaram charāv api stomaṃ chemam prathamaṃ sūrīr un mṛija | sute sātena yadi āgamaṃ vāṃ prati Viśvāmitra-Jamādagnī dama | "Impelled, I have quaffed this draught of soma when the oblation of boiled rice was presented; and I, the first bard, prepare this hymn, whilst I have come to you, O Viśvāmitra and Jamādagni in the house, with that which has been offered as a libation."

The family of the Viśvāmitras has, as we have seen, been already mentioned in R.V. iii. 53, 13. They are also named in the following passages:

"The undecaying Jātavedas (Agni) placed (on the hearth) is in every generation kindled by the Viśvāmitras."

iii. 18, 4. Uch chhothi sahasaputraḥ stuto brihad vayaḥ baśamāneshu dhīhe | revad Agne Viśvāmitreshu saṁ yor marmṛjma te tanvam bhūrī kriyāḥ |

"Son of strength, when lauded, do thou with thy upward flame inspire vigorous life into thy worshippers; (grant) o Agni, brilliant good fortune and prosperity to the Viśvāmitras; many a time have we given lustre to thy body."

x. 89, 17. Eko to vayam Indra bhunjatinaṁ vidyāma sumatinām navānāṁ | vidyāma vasant avasā griganto Viśvāmitrāh uṣta te Indra nūnam |

"Thus may we obtain from thee favours to delight us: and may we, Viśvāmitras, who praise thee, now obtain riches through thy help, o Indra."

This hymn is ascribed in the Anukramaṇī to Reṇū, the son or descendant of Viśvāmitra; and the 18th verse is identical with the 22nd of the 30th hymn of the third Maṇḍala, which is said to be Viśvāmitra's production.

In a verse already quoted (R.V. iii. 33, 11) Viśvāmitra is spoken of as the son of Kuśika; at least the Nirukta regards that passage as referring to him; and the Kuśikas, who no doubt belonged to the same family as Viśvāmitra, are mentioned in another hymn which I have cited (iii. 53, 9, 10). They are also alluded to in the following texts:

R.V. iii. 26, 1. Vaiśvānam manasā 'gniṁ nichāyya havishmanto anu- 
shatyaṁ svarvīdām | sudānuṁ devaṁ rathirāṁ vasāyavo gīrbhiḥ rayvaṁ 
Kuśikāso havāmahē | . . . . 3. Aśvo na krandan janibhiḥ sam idhyate 
Vaiśvānam Kuśikebhīr yugo yugo | sa no Agniḥ suvīryaṁ svuṣvyauṁ da 
dhātu ratnam amriteshu jaṅgrivioḥ |

"We, the Kuśikas, presenting oblations, and desiring riches, revering in our souls, as is meet,142 the divine Agni Vaiśvānara, the heavenly, the bountiful, the charioteer, the pleasant, invoke him with hymns.

. . . . 3. Vaiśvanara, who (crackles) like a neighing horse, is kindled by the Kuśikas with the mothers (i.e. their fingers) in every age. May

---

142 This is the sense of anuśatyam according to Prof. Aufrecht. Sāyaṇa makes it one of the epithets of Agni "he who is true to his promise in granting rewards according to works" (satyenōnugataṁ karmānurūpa-phala-pradāne satya-pratijñam).
this Agni, who is ever alive among the immortals, bestow on us wealth, with vigour and with horses."

iii. 29, 15. Amitrayudha Marutam iva prayah prathamajah brahma
viśvam id viduh | dyumvanadv brahma Kuśikāsaḥ a īrire ekaḥ eko damo
Agniṁ sam īdhire |

"Combating their enemies like the hosts of the Maruts, (the sages) the first-born of prayer know everything; the Kuśikas have sent forth an enthusiastic prayer; they have kindled Agni, each in his own house."

iii. 30, 20. Imaṁ kāmam mandaya gobhir aśvaiś chandrāvatā rādhasā
paprathāḥ cha | svaryavo matibhis tubhyam viprāḥ Indrāya vāhaḥ Kuśi-
kāśo akran |

"Gratify this (our) desire with kine and horses; and prosper us with brilliant wealth. The wise Kuśikas, desiring heaven, have with their minds composed for thee a hymn."

iii. 42, 9. Tvāṁ sutasya pītaye pratnam Indra havāmahe | Kuśikāso
avasyavaḥ |

"We, the Kuśikas, desiring succour, summon thee the ancient Indra
to drink the soma libation."

It will be seen from these passages that the Viśvāmitras and the Kuśikas assert themselves to have been ancient worshippers of Agni, and to be the composers of hymns, and the possessors of all divine knowledge.

In the eleventh verse of the tenth hymn of the first Maṇḍala of the R.V., of which the traditional author is Madhuchhandas of the family of Viśvāmitra, the epithet Kauśika is applied to Indra: Ā tu nah
Indra Kauśika mandasānah sutam pīda | navyam āyuḥ pra sutira krīḍhi
sahasra-sāṁ rishim | "Come, Indra, Kauśika, drink our oblation with delight. Grant me new and prolonged life; make the rishi the possessor of a thousand boons."

Sāyaṇa explains the epithet in question as follows: Kauśika Kuśi-
kasya putra ... yadāpi Viśvāmitra Kuśikasya putras tathāpi tad-
ṛūpeṇa Indrasya eva utpamavat Kuśika-putratvam aviruddham | ayah
vṛttānto 'nukramanīkāyāṁ uktaḥ | "Kuśikas to Aishārathir Indra-

143 Compare with this the epithet of devagāḥ, "god-born," applied to Viśvāmitra in iii. 53, 9 (above p. 342); and the claim of knowledge made for the Vasishṭhas in vii. 33, 7 (above p. 320).
tulyam putram ichhan brahmacharyaṁ chachāra | tasya Indraḥ eva Gāthī putro jāne” iti | “Kausīka means the son of Kusīka . . . Although Viśvāmitra was the son of Kusīka, yet, as it was Indra who was born in his form, there is nothing to hinder Indra being the son of Kusīka. This story is thus told in the Anukramanikā: ‘Kusīka, the son of Ishvāratha desiring a son like Indra, lived in the state of a Brahmacārin. It was Indra who was born to him as his son Gāthīn.’” To this the Anukramaṇī (as quoted by Prof. Müller, Rig-veda, vol. ii. pref. p. xl.) adds the words: Gāthino Viśvāmitraḥ | sa tritiyam maṇḍalam apasyat | “The son of Gāthīn was Viśvāmitra, who saw the third Maṇḍala.” In quoting this passage Professor Müller remarks: “According to Shadguruśiṣṭya this preamble was meant to vindicate the Rishitva of the family of Viśvāmitra:144 Saty apavāde svayam rishitvam anubhavato Viśvāmitra-gotrasya vivakshaya itihasam āha” | “Wishing to declare the rishihood of the family of Viśvāmitra which was controverted, although they were themselves aware of it, he tells a story.”

Professor Roth in his Lexicon (s.v. Kausīka) thinks that this term as originally applied to Indra meant merely that the god “belonged, was devoted to,” the Kusīkas; and Professor Benfey, in a note to his translation of R.V. i. 10, 11,145 remarks that “by this family-name Indra is designated as the sole or principal god of this tribe.”

144 Prof. Müller states that “Sāyaṇa passes over what Kātyāyana (the author of the Anukramaṇī) says about the race of Viśvāmitra;” and adds “This (the fact of the preamble being ‘meant to vindicate the Rishitva of the family of Viśvāmitra’) was probably the reason why Sāyaṇa left it out.” It is true that Sāyaṇa does not quote the words of the Anukramaṇī in his introductory remarks to the third Maṇḍala; but as we have seen he had previously adduced the greater part of them in his note on i. 10, 11.

145 Orient und Occident, vol. i. p. 18, note 60. We have seen above, p. 345, that in R.V. iii. 23, 3, another god, Agni, is called Daiśavāta, after the rishi Devavṛta, by whom he had been kindled. Compare also the expression Daiśoṣena Agniḥ in R.V. viii. 92, 2, which Sāyaṇa explains as = Daiśoṣena āḥiṃyamano ‘gniḥ, “Agni invoked by Daiśoda;” while Prof. Roth s.v. understands it to mean “Agni who stands in relation to Daiśoda.” In R.V. vi. 16, 19, Agni is called Divodāsaya satpatikāḥ, “the good lord of Divodāsa.” Agni is also called Bhārata in R.V. ii. 7, 1, 5; iv. 25, 4; vi. 16, 19. On the first text (ii. 7, 1) Sāyaṇa says Bhārataḥ ritiṣṭvaḥ ċ teshāṁ sambandhi Bhārataḥ, “Bhārata are priests. Bhārata is he who is connected with them.” On ii. 7, 5 he explains the word by ritiṣṭvām putra-sthānyya, “Thou who art in the place of a son to the priests.” On the second text (iv. 25, 4) tamai Agniir Bhārataḥ sarma yāmsat, “may Agni Bhārata give him protection“) Sāyaṇa takes Bhārata to mean “the bearer of the oblation” (haviḥo bhartā); but also refers to the S.P. Br. i. 4, 2, 2, where it is said, “or Agni is called ‘Bhārata,’ because, becoming breath, he sustains all creatures”
According to the Vishnu Purana (pp. 398–400, Wilson, 4th ed.) Viśvāmitra was the twelfth in descent from Purūravas, the persons intermediate being (1) Amāvasu, (2) Bhīma, (3) Kānchana, (4) Suhotra, (5) Jahnū, (6) Sumantu, (7) Ajaka, (8) Valākāśva, (9) Kuśa, (10) Kuśāmba, and (11) Gādhi. The birth of Viśvāmitra’s father is thus described, V.P. iv. 7, 4: Toshāṁ Kuśāmbaḥ “ṣakra-tulyo me putro bhaved” iti tapaḥ chahāra | tam cha ugra-tapasam avakṣya “mā bhavatv anyo ʿsmat-tulya-viryaḥ” ity utmanā eva asya Indraj putravam aga- chhat | Gādhir nāma sa Kauśikovbhavat | “Kuśāmba (one of Kuśa’s four sons) practised austere fervour with the view of obtaining a son equal to Indra. Perceiving him to be very ardent in his austere fervour, Indra, fearing lest another person should be born his own equal in vigour, became himself the son of Kuśāmba, with the name of Gādhi the Kauśika.” Regarding the birth of Viśvāmitra himself, the Vishnu Purana relates the following story: Gādhi’s daughter Satyavatī had been given in marriage to an old Brāhmaṇa called Rīchika, of the family of Bhrigu. In order that his wife might bear a son with the qualities of a Brāhmaṇa, Rīchika had prepared for her a dish of charu (rice, barley, and pulse, with butter and milk) for her to eat; and a similar mess for her mother, calculated to make her conceive a son with the character of a warrior. Satyavatī’s mother, however, persuaded her to exchange messes. She was blamed by her husband on her return home for what she had done. I quote the words of the original:


(esha u vai imāḥ praṭiḥ praṇo bhūteś bibharti tamād vā eva āha “Bhārata” iti). Another explanation had previously been given that the word Bhārata means “he who bears oblations to the gods.” On the third text (vi. 16, 19) Sāyāṇa interprets the term in the same way. Roth, s.v., thinks it may mean “warlike.” In R.V. vii. 8, 4, (V.S. 12, 34) we find the words pra pra ayam Agniś Bharataśya ērīṇe, “this Agni (the son?) of Bharata has been greatly renowned.” Sāyāṇa makes bharataśya = gajamūnasya, “the worshipper,” and pra pra ērīṇe = pratītho bhavat, “is renowned.” The Comm. on the Vāj. S. translates “Agni hears the invocation of the worshipper” (ērīṇe ērīṇute āhūnām). The Sā. P. Br. vi. 8, 1, 14, quotes the verse, and explains Bharata as meaning “Prajāpati, the supporter of the universe” (Prajāpatīr vai Bharataḥ sa hi idāṁ sarvam bibharti).
ritau kuravyas tava atiadvrastra-dhara-mara-nishtha-kshattri-
yacharaḥ putro bhaishyaty asyāḥ cha upaśama-ruchir brāhmaṇa-
chāraḥ” | ity ākargaeva sā tasya pādaudr jagrāha prāṇi-patya cha enam 
āha “bhagavan mayā etad ajnānād anushṭhitam | prasādaṁ me kuru | 
mā evaśvīdaḥ putro bhavatu | kāmam evaśvīdaḥ pautro bhavatu” | ity 
ukto munir apy aha “evam astu” iti | 16. Anantarān cha sau 
Jamadagnim ajjjanat tan-mātā cha Viśvāmitraṁ janayāmāsa | Satyavati cha 
Kauśikī nāma nady abhavat | Jamadagnir Ikṣvāku-vaṁśodhavasya Renos 
tanayāṁ Renukām upayema tasyāṁ cha aśeṣā-kaṭhattra-vaṁśa-hantāram 
Paraśurāma-sanāṇam bhagavataḥ sakala-loka-guṇor Nārāyaṇasya aṁśaṁ 
Jamadagni ajjjanat | Viśvāmitra-putras tu Bhārgavaḥ eva Sūnaḥsepo 
nāma devair dattaḥ | tataḥ cha Devarāṭa-nāmāḥ bhavat | tataḥ cha anye 
Madhucchanda-Jayajīva-Devadeva-Aṣṭaka-Kachchapa-Hūrītalakāhyāḥ 
Viśvāmitra-putraḥ babhāvuh | 17. Teshāṁ cha bahāni Kauśika-gotrāṇi 
rishyantareshu vaivāhyāṇi bhavanti | 

‘Sinful woman, what improper deed is this that thou hast done? 
I behold thy body of a very terrible appearance. Thou hast certainly 
eaten the charu prepared for thy mother. This was wrong. For into 
that charu I had infused all the endowments of heroism, vigour, and 
force, whilst into thine I had introduced all those qualities of quietude, 
knowledge, and patience which constitute the perfection of a Brāhmaṇ. 
Since thou hast acted in contravention of my design a son shall be born 
to thee who shall live the dreadful, martial, and murderous life of a 
Kshattriya; and thy mother’s offspring shall exhibit the peaceful 
disposition and conduct of a Brāhmaṇ.’ As soon as she had heard this, 
Satyavati fell down and seized her husband’s feet, and said, ‘My lord, 
I have acted from ignorance; show kindness to me; let me not have 
a son of the sort thou hast described; if thou pleasest, let me have a 
grandson of that description.’ Hearing this the muni replied, ‘Be it 
so.’ Subsequently she bore Jamadagni, and her mother gave birth to 
Viśvāmitra. Satyavati became the river called Kauśikī. Jamadagni 
wedded Renukā, the daughter of Renu, of the family of Ikṣvāku; and 
on her he begot a son called Paraśurāma, the slayer of the entire race 
of Kshatriyas, who was a portion of the divine Nārāyaṇa, the lord of 
the universe.166 To Viśvāmitra a son called Sūnaśēpa, of the race of 

166 According to the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, i. 3, 20, Paraśurāma was the sixteenth 
incarnation of Viṣṇu: Adevāre hṛdaśāme paśyam brāhma-duḥko niśpaṁ | trissapta-
Bhrigu, was given by the gods, who in consequence received the name of Devarāta ("god-given"). And then other sons, Madhuchhandas, Jayakrīta, Devadeva, Ashṭaka, Kachhapā, Hāritaka, etc., were born to Viṣvāmitra. From them sprang many families of Kauśikas, which intermarried with those of other rishis."

The Harivaṃśa, verses 1425 ff., gives a similar account, but makes Kuśika, not Kuśamba, the grandfather of Viṣvāmitra:

*Kuśa-puṭraḥ babhūvur hi chatvāro deva-varchasaḥ | Kuśikaḥ Kuśanā-bhaś cha Kuśamba Mūrtimāṁ tathā | Pahlavaḥ saha saṁvṛiddho rājā vana-charais tadā | Kuśikas tu tapas tepe putram Indra-samaṁ vibhuḥ | labheyam iti taṁ Sākram trīsaad abhyetya jajnivān | pūrṇe varha-sahasre vai taṁ tu Śakro hy apasyata | aty ugra-tapasāṁ dṛṣṭvā sahasrākṣaḥ purandaraḥ | samarthaḥ putra-janane svam evāṁśam avāsyaḥ | putrataṁ kalpayāmāśa sa devendraḥ surottamaḥ | sa Gādhir abhavad rājā Mahāvān Kuśikaḥ svayam | Paurukutsy abhavad bhāryya Gādhis tasyāṁ ajayata |

"Kuśa had four sons, equal in lustre to the gods, Kuśika, Kuśanā-bha, Kuśamba, and Mūrttimat. Growing up among the Pahlavas, who dwelt in the woods, the glorious king Kuśika practised austere fervour, with the view of obtaining a son equal to Indra; and Indra from apprehension came and was born. When a thousand years had elapsed Sakra (Indra) beheld him. Perceiving the intensity of his austere fervour, the thousand-eyed, city-destroying, god of gods, highest of the deities, powerful to procreate offspring, introduced a portion of himself, and caused it to take the form of a son; and thus Maghavat himself became Gādhi, the son of Kuśika. Paurukutsī was the wife (of the latter), and of her Gādhi was born."

The Harivaṃśa then relates a story similar to that just extracted from the Viṣṇu Purāṇa regarding the births of Jamadagni and Viṣvāmitra, and then proceeds, verse 1456:

*Auravaśaiyam Richikasya Satyavatīyām mahāyaśaḥ | Jamadagnis tapo-viryaśajyajane brahma-vidāṁ varaḥ | madhyamaḥ cha Śunaśēpah Śunuḥ-puchhaḥ kanishṭhakaḥ | Viṣvāmitraṁ tu dāyādam Gādhiḥ Kuśika-nan-danaḥ | janayāmāṁ putrāṁ tu tapo-vidyā-samātmakam | prāpya brah-krītevaḥ kupto niḥkshatrām akaroid mahīm | "In his sixteenth incarnation, perceiving that kings were oppressors of Brāhmans, he, mcnsdc, made the earth destitute of Kshattriyas one and twenty times."
marshi-samataṁ yo 'yaṃ saptarshītām gataḥ | Viśvāmitraṁ tu dharmātmā
nāma Viśvarathāḥ smṛitāḥ | jagne Bṛigu-praśādāna Kauśikād vaṁśa-
varddhanāḥ | Viśvāmitrasya cha sutāḥ Devaratādayaḥ smṛitāḥ | viṁśhyātaṁ
trīśu lokeshu teshāṁ nāmāni vai śrīnu | Devaśrāvāḥ Katiśa chaiva yasmāt
Kātyāyanāḥ smṛitāḥ | Sālāvatyāṁ Hiranyākṣho Reṇor jagne 'tha Reṇu-
mān | Sāṅkrīti Gālavaḥ chaiva Mudgalaḥ cheti viśrutāḥ | Madhuḥchando
Jayaḥ chaiva Devalaḥ cha tathā 'śṭakaḥ | Kachhapa Hārītaḥ chaiva Viśvā-
mirasya te sutāḥ | teshāṁ khyātāni gotrāṇi Kauśikānāṁ mahātmanāṁ |
Pāṇino Baḥravaḥ chaiva Dhyānajapyāś tathāiva cha | Pārthivāḥ Deva-
ratāś cha Sālankāyana-Vāskalaḥ | Lohitāḥ Yāmadatāḥ cha tathā Kārī-
shayaḥ smṛitāḥ | Sauśrutāḥ Kauśikāḥ rājāṁs tathā 'nīye Saindhavāva-
nyāḥ | Devalaḥ Reṇavaḥ chaiva Yājnovalkṣyāgamarshanāḥ | Audumbaraḥ
hy Abhishekaṁ Tārakāyaṇa-chunchukālaḥ | Sālāvatyāṁ Hiranyākṣaḥ
Sāṅkrītyāḥ Gālavaḥ tathā | Nārāyaṇir Naraś chāṇyo Viśvāmitrasya
dātātaḥ | rīśhy-antara-vivāhyaṁ cha Kauśikāḥ bahavah smṛitāḥ | Pau-
ravasya mahārāja brahmārṣheḥ Kauśikasya cha | sambandho 'py asya
vaṁśo 'smīn brahma-śhattrasya viśrutāḥ |

"Thus was the renowned Jamadagni, the most excellent of those
possessed of sacred knowledge, born by the power of austere fervour to
Richika, the son of Urva, by Satyavati. Their second son was Sūnas-
śepha and the youngest Sūnāhpuchha. And Gāḍhi, son of Kuśika,
begot as his son and inheritor Viśvāmitra, distinguished for austere
fervour, science, and quietude; who attained an equality with Bra-
man-rishis, and became one of the seven rishis. The righteous Viśvā-
imtra, who was known by name as Viśvaratha, was by the favour of
a Bṛigu born to the son of Kuśika, an augmenter (of the glory) of his
race. The sons of Viśvāmitra are related to have been Devarāta and
the rest, renowned in the three worlds. Hear their names: Devaśravas,
Kati (from whom the Kātyāyanas had their name); Hiranyākṣha, born
of Sālāvatī, and Reṇumat of Reṇu; Sāṅkrīti, Gālava, Mudgala, Madhu-
chhandā, Jaya, Devala, Asṭāka, Kachhapa, Hārīta—these were the

147 The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, as we shall shortly see, makes 'Sūnasśe'pa' a son of
Ajīgarta. The Mahābhārata Anuśāsanap. verse 186, coincides with the Harivāmaṇa.
148 In another passage of the Harivaṃśa (verses 1766 ff.), which repeats the par-
ticulars given in this passage, it appears to be differently stated, verse 1766, that
besides a daughter Satyavati, and his son Viśvāmitra, Gāḍhi had three other sons,
Viśvaratha, Viśvākrit, and Viśvajit (Viśvāmitras tu Gāḍhāya rājā Viśvarathas tāda ā
Viśvakṛt Viśvečchha chaiva tathā Satyavatī nyāpa).
sons of Viśvāmitra. From them the families of the great Kauśikas are said to have sprung: the Pāṅins, Babhrus, Dhānajayyas, Pārthivas, Devarātas, Sālankāyanas, Vāskalas, Lohitas, Yāmadūtas, Kārīshis, Sauśrutas, Kauśikas, Saindhavāyanas, Devalas, Reṇus, Yājnavalkyas, Aghamarshaṇas, Audumbaraś, Abhisheetas, Tārakayaṇas, Chunchulas, Sālavatyas, Hiranyākshas, Śāmkṛityas, and Gālavaś.149 Nārāyaṇi and Nara were also (descendants) of the wise Viśvāmitra. Many Kauśikas are recorded who intermarried with the families of other rishis. In this race of the Paurava and Kauśika Brahman-rishi, there is well known to have been a connection of the Brāhmans and Kshattriyas. ŚunaśŚeṣha, who was a descendant of Bhrigu, and obtained the position of a Kauśika, is recorded to have been the eldest of Viśvāmitra’s sons."

It will be observed that in this passage, Devasravas is given as one of Viśvāmitra’s sons. A Devasravas, as we have already seen, is mentioned in R.V. iii. 23, 2, as a Bhārata, along with Devavātā. Here however in the Harivaṃśa we have no Devavātā, but a Devarāta, who is identified with ŚunaśŚeṣha. This, as we shall find, is also the case in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.

In the genealogy given in both of the preceding passages, from the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, and the 27th chapter of the Harivaṃśa respectively, Viśvāmitra is declared to be the descendant of Amāvasu the third son of Purūravas. In the 32nd chapter of the Harivaṃśa, however, we find a different account. Viśvāmitra’s lineage is there traced up to a Jahnu, as in the former case; but Jahnu is no longer represented as a descendant of Amāvasu, the third son of Purūravas; but (as appears from the preceding narrative) of Āyus, the eldest son of that prince, and of Puru, the great-grandson of Āyus. Professor Wilson (Viṣṇu Purāṇa, 4to. ed. p. 451, note 23) is of opinion that this confusion originated in the recurrence of the name of Suhotra in different genealogical lists, and in the ascription to one king of this name of descendants who were

149 Professor Wilson (V.P. 4to. ed. p. 405, note) gives these names, and remarks that the authorities add "an infinity of others, multiplied by intermarriages with other tribes, and who, according to the Vāyu, were originally of the regal caste like Viśvāmitra; but like him obtained Brahmanhood through devotion. Now these gotras, or some of them at least, no doubt existed, partaking more of the character of schools of doctrine, but in which teachers and scholars were very likely to have become of one family by intermarrying; and the whole, as well as their original founder, imply the interference of the Kshattriya caste with the Brahmanical monopoly of religious instruction and composition."
really sprung from another. It is not, however, clear that the genealogy of Viśvāmitra given in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa is the right one. For in the Rig-veda, as we have seen, he is connected with the Bharatas, and in the passage about to be quoted from the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, he is called a Bharata and his sons Kuśikas; and Bharata is said both in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa (Wilson’s V.P. 4to. cd. p. 449) and in the Harivāmśa (sect. 32, v. 1723, and preceding narrative) to be a descendant of Āyus and of Puru. Accordingly we have seen that the Harivāmśa styles Viśvāmitra at once a Paurava and a Kuśika.

A similar genealogy to that in the 32nd section of the Harivāmśa is given in the Mahābhārata, Anuśāsanaparvan, verses 201 ff., where it is said that in the line of Bharata there was a king called Ajamīḍha who was also a priest (Bharatasyaṁvaye chaivajamīḍha nāma pārthivah | babhūva Bharata-śreṣṭha yaje dharmabhṛtiṁ varaḥ), from whom Viśvāmitra was descended through (1) Jahnu, (2) Sindhuḍvīpa, (3) Balākaśva, (4) Kuśika, (5) Gāḍhi.

One of the genealogies applied to Viśvāmitra and his race, as I have just noticed, is Bharata. The last of the four verses at the close of the 53rd hymn of the third Maṇḍala of the Rig-veda, which are supposed to contain a malevolent directed by Viśvāmitra against Vasishṭha (see above) is as follows: iii. 53, 24. Ima Indra Bharatasya putṛāḥ apapitvam chikitur na prapitvam | “These sons of Bharata, o Indra, desire to avoid (the Vasishṭhas), not to approach them.” These words are thus explained by Sāyaṇa: Bharatasya putṛāḥ Bharata-vamśyāḥ ima Viśvāmitrāḥ apapitvam apagamanam Viśvishthēbhyaṣ chikitur na prapitvam | [Va]śīṣṭāḥ saha teshāṁ sāṅgatir nāsti | brāhmaṇāḥ eva ity arthaḥ | “These sons of Bharata, persons of his race, know departure from, and not approach to, the Vasishṭhas. They do not associate with the Vasishṭhas. This means they are Brāhmans.”

The persons who accompanied Viśvāmitra when he wished to cross the Vipāś and the Sutudrī are, as we have seen above, called Bhārātās; and Devārvakas and Devavāta are designated in R.V. iii. 23, 2, as Bhārātās. On the other hand in one of the hymns ascribed to Vasishṭha (R.V. vii. 33, 6) the Bhārātās are alluded to as a tribe hostile to the Tritus, the race to which Vasishṭha belonged.

150 See Roth’s Lexicon, s.v. Bharata, (7) ”the name of a hero, the forerfather of a tribe. His sons are called Viśvāmitras and the members of his family Bharatas.”
In the legend of Sunaśśepa, told in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, vii. 13–18, Viśvāmitra is alluded to as being the hotṛi-priest of king Hariśchandra, and as belonging to the tribe of the Bharatas. He is also addressed as rājaputra, and his sons are called Kuśikas. The outlines of the story are as follows: King Hariśchandra of the family of Ṛkṣhvāku having no son, promised to Varuṇa, by the advice of Nārada, that if a son should be born to him he would sacrifice him to that god. A son was accordingly born to the king, who received the name of Rohita; but Hariśchandra, though called upon by Varuṇa, put off from time to time, on various pleas, the fulfilment of his promise. When the father at length consented, the youth himself refused to be sacrificed and went into the forest. After passing six years there he met a poor Brāhman rishi called Ajīgartta who had three sons, the second of whom, Sunaśśepa, he sold for a hundred cows to Rohita, who brought the young Brāhman to be sacrificed instead of himself. Varuṇa accepted the vicarious victim, and arrangements were made accordingly, “Viśvāmitra being the hotṛi-priest, Jamadagni the adhvaryu, Vasishṭha the brāhmaṇ, and Ayāśya the udgātri (tasya ha Viśvāmitro hotā ānij Jamadagnir adhvaryur Vasishṭhoh brahmaṇ Ayāṣyaḥ udgāta).” The sacrifice was not, however, completed, although the father received a hundred more cows for binding his son to the sacrificial post, and a third hundred for agreeing to slaughter him. By reciting verses in honour of different deities in succession Sunaśśepa was delivered; and at the request of the priests took part in the ceremonial of the day. I shall quote the remainder of the story at length:

17. Atha ha Sunaśśepo Viśvāmitrasyāṇkam āsāda | sa ha uvācha Ajīgarttah Savayasir “rishe punar me puttram dehi” iti | “Na” iti ha uvācha Viśvāmitro “devaḥ vai imam mahyam arāsata” iti | sa ha Devarāto Vaiśvāmitraḥ āsa | tasya ete Ṛpīlye-Bābhrevāḥ | sa ha uvācha Ajīgarttaḥ Savayvasir “tvaṁ vahi vihvasvahai” iti | sa ha uvācha Ajīgarttaḥ Savayvasir “Āṅgirasa janmanā ’sy Ajīgarthiḥ śrutatāḥ kaviḥ | rishe paitāmahāt tantor mā ’pagāḥ punar ehi mām” iti | sa

131 This legend is translated into German by Prof. Roth in Weber’s Ind. Stud. i. 457 ff., into English by Prof. Wilson, Journ. Roy. As. Soc. vol. xiii. for 1851, pp. 96 ff., by Dr. Haug in his Ait. Brāhmaṇa, vol. ii. 460 ff., by Prof. Müller in his Anc. Sansk. Lit. pp. 408 ff., and into Latin by Dr. Streiter in his “Diss. de Sunaśśepo.”
ha uvācha Sūnāḥsepaḥ “adarśus tvā śāsa-hastam na yac chhūdresv alaptata | gavaṁ trīṇi satāṁ tvam avṛtiśthāḥ mañ Angiraḥ” iti | sa ha uvācha Ajīgartaḥ Savyavasis “tad vai mā tāta tapati pāpaṁ kūrna mayā kṛitam | tad aham nih nave tubhyam pratiyantu satā gavaṁ” iti | sa ha uvācha Sūnāḥsepaḥ “yāḥ sakrit pāpakaṁ kuryāt kuryād enat tato ‘param | nāpāgāḥ suādānīyāyād asāndheyaṁ tvaya kṛitam” iti | “asāndheyaṁ” iti ha Viśvāmitraḥ upapapāda | sa ha uvācha Viśvāmitraḥ “Bhāmaḥ eka Savyavasiḥ śāsena viśiṣṭaṁ sūtraḥ asthād mataṣya putro bhūr mamāvopeti putrātām” iti | sa ha uvācha Sūnāḥsepaḥ “sa vai yathā no jñāpaya rūjaputra tathā pada | yathaiśvāngirasah sann upaeyāṁ tava putrātām” iti | sa ha uvācha Viśvāmitro “Jyeshtho me tvam putrānāṁ syās tava sreshthā prajā syāt | upaeyāḥ daivam me dayāṁ tene vai tvopamantraye” iti | sa ha uvācha Sūnāḥsepaḥ “sanjanānāneshu vai bṛja-yāḥ suahāryāya me śriyaś | yathā ’ham Bharata-riṣabhā upaeyāṁ tava putrātām” iti | atha ha Viśvāmitraḥ putrān aṃantarayāmāsa “Madhuchhandāḥ śrinotana Rishabhḥ Renuḥ Ashtakāḥ | ye ko cha bhrataraḥ sthana asmai jyaiśhyāya kalpaśadvam” iti | 18. Tasya ha Viśvāmitrasya eka-satam putrāḥ asuḥ panchāsād eva jyaiśhyo Madhuchhandasah panchāsāt kantyaṁsaḥ | tad ye jyaiśhyo na te kuśalam menre | tān anuviyāhāra “antar vah prajā bhakshishtha” iti | te eto ’ndhrāḥ Pundraḥ S’abarāḥ Pulindāḥ Mūtibāḥ ity udantyaḥ bahavo bhavanti | Vaiśvāmitraḥ Dasyānām bhūyishthāḥ | sa ha uvācha Madhuchhandhaḥ panchāsāt saradham “yad naḥ pitā sanjanātī tasmāṁ tisṭhāmahe vayaṁ | puras tvā sarve kuruṁtvām anvancho vayaṁ smasi” iti | atha ha Viśvāmitraḥ pratītaḥ putrāṁs tustēva “te vai putrāḥ pāsumanto viravanto bhaviśyataḥ | ye mānam me ’nugrihanto viravantam akartta mā | pura-etrā viṟavaṅto Devarātēna Gāthīnāḥ | sarve rādhāyāh eta putrāḥ esa vah sad-viṣcūhanam | esa vah Kuśikāḥ viro Devaratās tam anvitaḥ | yushmāṁs dayam me upeti vidyāṁ yūm u cha vidama | te savyancito Vaiśvāmitraḥ sarve sākeṁ sarūtayaḥ | Devaratāya taṣṭhre āhṛtaya śrāiśhyāya Gāthīnāḥ | adhiyata Devarāto rikthayor ubhyayar rishiḥ | Jahnunāṁ cha-dhipatye daive veda cha Gāthīnām | “Sunaśsepa came to the side of Viśvāmitra. Ajīgarta, the son of Suyavasa, said, ‘Rishi, give me back my son.’ ‘No,’ said Viśvāmitra, ‘the gods have given him to me’ (devāḥ arāsata); hence he became Devarāta the son of Viśvāmitra. The Kāpilyas and Bābhrawas are his descendants. Ajīgarta said to Viśvāmitra, ‘Come; let us both call
(him) to us.' He (again) said (to his son), 'Thou art an Ángirasa, the son of Ajígarta, reputed a sage; do not, o rishi, depart from the line of thy ancestors; come back to me.' Súnaśsépa replied, 'They have seen thee with the sacrificial knife in thy hand—a thing which men have not found even among the Súdras; thou didst prefer three hundred cows to me, o Ángiras.' Ajígarta rejoined, 'That sinful deed which I have done distresses me, my son; I abjure it to thee. Let the [three] hundreds of cows revert (to him who gave them)." Súnaśsépa answered, 'He who once does a sinful deed, will add to it another; thou hast not freed thyself from that iniquity, fit only for a Súdra. Thou hast done what cannot be rectified.' 'What cannot be rectified,' interposed Viśvāmitra; who continued, 'Terrible was the son of Suya- vasa as he stood about to immolate (thee) with the knife: continue not to be his son; become mine.' Súnaśsépa replied, 'Speak, o king's son (rāja- putra), whatever thou hast to explain to us, in order that I, though an Ángirasa, may become thy son.' Viśvāmitra rejoined, 'Thou shalt be the eldest of my sons, and thy offspring shall be the most eminent. Thou shalt receive my divine inheritance; with this (invitation) I address thee.' Súnaśsépa answered, 'If (thy sons) agree, then for my welfare enjoin on them to be friendly, that so, o chief of the Bharatas, I may enter on thy sonship.' Viśvāmitra then addressed his sons, 'Do ye, Madhuchhandas, Rishabha, Reṇu, Ashtaka, and all ye who are brothers, listen to me, and concede to him the seniority.' 18. Now Viśvāmitra had a hundred sons, fifty of whom were older than Madhuchhandas and fifty younger. Then those who were older did not approve (their father's proposal). Against them he pronounced (this

132 I follow here the tenor of the interpretation (which is that of the Commentator on the S'āṅkhāyaṇa Brāhmaṇa) given by Prof. Weber in his review of Dr. Haug's Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, in Indische Studien, ix. 316. Prof. Weber remarks that in the Brāhmaṇas the root āhu + vi is employed to denote the opposing invitations of two persons who are seeking to bring over a third person to their own side; in proof of which he quotes Taítū. S. 6, 1, 6, 6, and S'. P. Br. 3, 2, 4, 4, and 22. Profs. Roth, Wilson, and Müller, as well as Dr. Haug, understand the words to be addressed to S'unaśsēpa by his father, and to signify "we, too (I and thy mother), call, or will call (thee to return to us)." But it does not appear that S'unaśsēpa's mother was present. And it is to be observed that the next words uttered by Ajígarta, which are addressed to S'unaśsēpa, are preceded by the usual formula sa ha uṣēcha Ají- gartāh Suya-vasasīh, "Ajígartha the son of S. said," which perhaps would not have been the case if both sentences had been addressed to the same person.

doom). ‘Let your progeny possess the furthest ends (of the country).’ These are the numerous border-tribes, the Andhras, Pundras, Sabaras, Pulindas, Matibas. Most of the Dasyus are sprung from Visvamitra. Madhuchhandas with the (other) fifty said, ‘Whatever our father determines, by that we abide. We all place thee in our front, and follow after thee.’ Then Visvamitra was pleased, and said to his sons, ‘Ye, my children who, shewing deference to me, have conferred upon me a (new) son, shall abound in cattle and in sons. Ye, my sons, the offspring of Gatesin, who possess in Devarata a man who shall go before you, are all destined to be prosperous; he is your wise instructor. This Devarata, o Kuśikas, is your chief; follow him. He will receive you as my inheritance, and obtain all the knowledge which we possess.’

All these sons of Visvamitra, descendants of Gatesin, submitted together in harmony and with good will to Devarata’s control and superiority. The rishi Devarata was invested with both possessions, with the lordly authority of the Jahnus, and with the divine Veda of the Gáthins.”

On this legend Professor Müller (Anc. Sansk. Lit. pp. 415 f.) remarks, amongst other things, as follows: “So revolting, indeed, is the descrip-

354 See Weber, Ind. St. ix. p. 317 f., and Roth in his Lexicon, s.vv. anta and udantya.
355 This legend is perhaps alluded to in the Káthaka Brāhmaṇa, 19, 11, quoted by Prof. Weber, Ind. St. iii. 478: Súnasēpa vai etām Ajīgarṭir Varuṇa-grhītō’pajyat | tayā sa vai Varuṇa-pāśād anuvayata | “Sunasēpa the son of Ajīgarṭa, when seized by Varuṇa, saw this (verse); and by it he was released from the bonds of Varuṇa.” Manu also mentions the story, x. 105: Ajīgarṭaḥ sutaṁ hantum upāsarṇā dibhukṣhitah | na chādyata pāpena khet-pratikārem ācharan | “Ajīgarṭa, when famished, approached to slay his son; and (by so doing) was not contaminated by sin, as he was seeking the means of escape from hunger.” On this Kullūka annotates: Rishir Ajīgarṭaḥkhyo dibhukṣhitah san putrāṁ Sūnasēpah nāmānaṁ svayaṁ vikrītavān yajne go-jata-tāhāya yajna-yūpe badhāvā viśastā bhūteṁ hantum pratikramo | na cha khet-pratikārthāṁ tathā kurvan pāpena biptaḥ | etach cha Bahūrīca-brāhmaṇe Sūnasēphākhyēnaṁ vyaktam uktam | “A rishi called Ajīgarṭa, having, when famished, himself sold his son called Sunasēpa, in order to obtain a hundred cows at a sacrifice, bound him to the sacrificial stake, and in the capacity of immolator was about to slay him. By doing so, as a means of escape from hunger, he did not incur sin. This is distinctly recorded in the Bahūrica (Aitareya) Brāhmaṇa in the legend of Sunasēpa.” The speakers in the Brāhmaṇa, however, do not take by any means so lenient a view of Ajīgarṭa’s conduct as Manu. (See Müller’s Anc. Sansk. Lit. p. 416.) The compiler of the latter work lived in an age when it was perhaps thought that a rishi could do no wrong. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa, ix. sect. 7, and sect. 16, verses 30–37 follows the Ait. Br. in the version it gives of the story; but, as we shall see in a subsequent section, the Rāmāyaṇa relates some of the circumstances quite differently.
tion given of Ajīgartha’s behaviour in the Brāhmaṇa, that we should rather recognize in him a specimen of the un-Āryan population of India. Such a supposition, however, would be in contradiction with several of the most essential points of the legend, particularly in what regards the adoption of Sunahṣēpah by Viśvāmitra. Viśvāmitra, though arrived at the dignity of a Brāhmaṇa, clearly considers the adoption of Sunahṣēpah Devarāta, of the famous Brahmanic family of the Āngirasas, as an advantage for himself and his descendants; and the Devarātas are indeed mentioned as a famous branch of the Viśvāmitras (V.P. p. 405, 23). Sunahṣēpah is made his eldest son, and the leader of his brothers, evidently as the defender and voucher of their Brahmanhood, which must have been then of very recent date, because Viśvāmitra himself is still addressed by Sunahṣēpah as Rāja-putra and Bhara-rata-rishabha.” It must, however, be recollected that the story, as told in the Brāhmaṇa, can scarcely be regarded as historical, and that it is not unreasonable to suppose that the incidents related, even if founded on fact, may have been coloured by the Brahmanical posses sessions of the narrator. But if so, the legend can give us no true idea of the light in which Viśvāmitra’s exercise of priestly functions was looked upon either by himself or by his contemporaries.

In Indische Studien, ii. 112–123, this story forms the subject of an interesting dissertation by Professor Roth, who arrives at the following conclusions:

“(i.) The oldest legend about Sunahṣēpah (alluded to in R.V. i. 24, 11–13, 156 and R.V. v. 2, 7) knows only of his miraculous deliverance by divine help from the peril of death.

“(ii.) This story becomes expanded in the sequel into a narrative of Sunahṣēpah’s threatened slaughter as a sacrificial victim, and of his deliverance through Viśvāmitra.

“(iii.) This immolation-legend becomes severed into two essentially distinct versions, the oldest forms of which are respectively represented by the stories in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, and the Rāmāyaṇa.

“(iv.) The latter becomes eventually the predominant one; but its proper central-point is no longer the deliverance from immolation, but.

156 Compare also Rosen’s remarks on the hymns ascribed to Sunahṣēpah; Rig-veda Sanhitā, Annotationes, p. iv. He thinks they contain nothing which would lead to the belief that they have any connection with the legend in the Rāmāyaṇa and Ait. Br.
the incorporation of Śunāhśepa, or (with a change of persons) of Rīchīka, into the family of the Kuśikas. It thus becomes in the end a family-legend of the race of Viśvāmitra.

"There is thus no historical, perhaps not even a genealogical, result to be gained here. On the other hand the story obtains an important place in the circle of those narratives in which the sacerdotal literature expressed its views regarding the character and agency of Viśvāmitra."

In a passage of the Mahābhārata, Adīp. verses 3694 ff.,157 where the descendants of Pūru are recorded, we find among them Bharata the son of Dushyanta (verse 3709) from whom (1) Bhumanyu, (2) Suhotra, (3) Ajamīdha, and (4) Jahnu are said to have sprung in succession (verses 3712–3722); and the last-named king and his brothers Vrajana and Rūpin are said to have been the ancestors of the Kuśikas (verse 3723: avayāḥ Kuśikāḥ rājan Jahnor amita-tejasaḥ | Vrajana-Rūpinah), who were therefore, according to this passage also, descended from Bharata (see above, p. 354). The Mahābhārata then goes on to relate that during the reign of Samvaraṇa, son of Jahnu's eldest brother Rīksha, the country over which he ruled was desolated by various calamities (verses 3725 ff.). The narrative proceeds, verse 3727:

Abhyaghnaṃ Bhāratāṃ chaiva sapatnānām balānī cha | chālayan
vasudhāṁ chemāṁ balena chaturangiṇā | abhyayāt taṁ cha Pānchālgyo
vijitya tarasaḥ māhim | akshauhiṅghiḥ dāsabhīḥ sa enam samara'jayat |
tataḥ sa-dāraḥ sāmāyaḥ sa-puttrah sa-sukriyijanaḥ | rāja Samvarānas
tasmāt parāyata mahābhayaḥ | 3730. Sindhor nadoṣya mahato nīkunye
nyavasat tādā | nādi-vishaya-parvyante parvatasya samiṣṭaḥ | tattrā-
vasan bahūn kālān Bhāratāḥ durgam āsritāḥ | teshāṁ nivasaṭān samattra
sahasram parivatsarān | athābhhya-gachhad Bhārataṃ Vasishṭho bhagavān
ṛishīḥ | tam āgataṃ prayatnena pratyudgamyābhivādyā cha | argyham
abhyaḥaraṁ taṁsaī te sarve Bhāratas tadā | nivedyā sarvam rishaye
sathārena sauvarchaḥ | tāṁ āsane chopavistāṁ rājā vavo svayaṁ tadā |
puhōito bhavān no 'stu rājyāya prayatemahi" | 3735. "Om", ity
enaḥ Vasishṭho 'pi Bhāratāṁ pratyapadyata | athābhhyasinchat sāmṛāye
sarva-kṣattraśa Paurānam | vishāna-bhūtāṁ sarvasyāṁ prithivyān iti
naḥ kṛtan | Bhāratādhyuṣhitam pūrvaḥ sv 'dhyatishṭhat purottamam |
punar balībhiratā chaiva chakre sarva-mahākṣitaḥ |

157 Referred to by Roth, Litt. u. Gesch. des Weds, pp. 142 ff., and Wilson, Rig-
voda, iii. p. 86.
"3727. And the hosts of their enemies also smote the Bhāratas. Shaking the earth with an army of four kinds of forces, the Pāṇchālaya chief assailed him, having rapidly conquered the earth, and vanquished him with ten complete hosts. Then king Samvaraṇa with his wives, ministers, sons, and friends, fled from that great cause of alarm; (3730) and dwelt in the thickets of the great river Sindhu (Indus), in the country bordering on the stream, and near a mountain. There the Bhāratas abode for a long time, taking refuge in a fortress. As they were dwelling there, for a thousand years, the venerable rishi Vasishṭha came to them. Going out to meet him on his arrival, and making obeisance, the Bhāratas all presented him with the arghya offering, shewing every honour to the glorious rishi. When he was seated the king himself solicited him, 'Be thou our priest; let us strive to regain my kingdom.' 3735. Vasishṭha consented to attach himself to the Bhāratas, and, as we have heard, invested the descendant of Pūru with the sovereignty of the entire Kshattriya race, to be a horn (to have mastery) over the whole earth. He occupied the splendid city formerly inhabited by Bhārata, and made all kings again tributary to himself."

It is remarkable that in this passage the Bhāratas, who, as we have seen, are elsewhere represented as being so closely connected with Viśvāmitra, and are in one text of the Rig-veda (vii. 33, 6) alluded to as the enemies of Vasishṭha's friends, should be here declared to have adopted the latter rishi as their priest. The account, however, need not be received as historical, or even based on any ancient tradition; and the part referring to Vasishṭha in particular may have been invented for the glorification of that rishi, or for the honour of the Bhāratas.

The 11th and 12th khandas of the second adhyāya of the Sarvasāra Upanishad (as we learn from Professor Weber's analysis in Ind. St. i. 390) relate that Viśvāmitra was instructed on the identity of breath (prāṇa) with Indra, by the god himself, who had been celebrated by the sage on the occasion of a sacrifice, at which he officiated as hotṛ-priest, in a thousand Bṛihatī verses, and was in consequence favourably disposed towards him.

It is abundantly clear, from the details supplied in this section, that Viśvāmitra, who was a rājanya of the Bhārata and Kuśika families (Ait. Br. vii. 17 and 18), is represented by ancient Indian tradition as
the author of numerous Vedic hymns, as the domestic priest (purohita) of king Sudās (Nir. ii. 24), and as officiating as a hotri at a sacrifice of king Harischandra (Ait. Br. vii. 16). The Rāmāyaṇa also, as we shall see in a future section, connects him with Trisanku, the father of Harischandra, and makes him also contemporary with Ambarisha; and in the first book of the same poem he is said to have visited king Daśaratha, the father of Rāma (Bālakanda, i. 20, 1ff.). As these kings were separated from each other by very long intervals, Trisanku being a descendant of Ikshvāku in the 28th, Ambarisha in the 44th,158 Sudās in the 49th, and Daśaratha in the 60th generation (see Wilson’s Viṣṇu Purāṇa, vol. iii. pp. 284, 303, 304, 313), it is manifest that the authors of these legends either intentionally or through oversight represented Viśvāmitra, like Vasishṭha (see above), as a personage of miraculous longevity; and on either supposition a great deal that is related of him must be purely fabulous. All the authorities describe him as the son of Gāthin or Gādhi, the Anukramaṇī, the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, and the Harivaṃśa declaring also that Gāthin was an incarnation of Indra, and thus asserting Viśvāmitra to be of divine descent. It is not clear whether this fable is referred to in R.V. iii. 53, 9, where Viśvāmitra is styled deva-jaḥ, “born of a god,” or whether this verse may not have led to the invention of the story. In either case the verse can scarcely have emanated from the rishi himself; but it is more likely to be the production of one of his descendants.159

158 According to the Rāmāyaṇa, i. 70, 41; ii. 110, 32, Ambarisha was only 28th from Ikshvāku. Compare Prof. Wilson’s note on these genealogies, V.P. iii. 313 ff.
159 The word deva-jaḥ, which, following Roth, s.v., I have translated “god-born,” is taken by Sāyana as = dyotamānānuḥ tejasāṃ janayitaḥ, “generator of shining lights,” and appears to be regarded by him as referring to the creation of constellations by Viśvāmitra, mentioned in the Rāmāyaṇa, i. 60, 21. Prof. Wilson renders the phrase by “generator of the gods;” and remarks that “the compound is not deva-jaḥ, ‘god-born,’ nor was Viśvāmitra of divine parentage” (R.V. iii. p. 85, note 4). This last remark overlooks the fact above alluded to of his father Gādhi being represented as an incarnation of Indra, and the circumstance that Prof. Wilson himself (following Sāyana) had shortly before translated the words prathama-jaḥ brahmaṇaḥ in R.V. iii. 29, 15, as applied to the Kuśikas, by “the first-born of Brahmā,” although from the accent brahmaṇ here must be neuter, and the phrase seems to mean, as I have rendered above, “the first-born of prayer.” The word jaḥ is given in the Nighaṇṭu as one of the synonyms of apatya, “offspring;” and in R.V. i. 164, 15, where it is coupled with rishayaḥ, the compound deva-jaḥ is explained by Sāyana as “born of the god,” i.e. the sun, and by Prof. Wilson as “born of the gods.” See
This verse (R.V. iii. 53, 9) which claims a superhuman origin for Viśvāmitra, and the following verses 11–13 of the same hymn, which assert the efficacy of his prayers, form a sort of parallel to the contents of R.V. vii. 33, where the supernatural birth of Vasishṭha (vv. 10 ff.), the potency of his intercession (vv. 2–5), and the sacred knowledge of his descendants (vv. 7 and 8), are celebrated.

As the hymns of Viśvāmitra and his descendants occupy so prominent a place in the Rig-veda Sanhitā, and as he is the alleged author of the text reputed the holiest in the entire Veda (iii. 62, 10), the Gāyatrī par excellence, there is no reason to doubt that, although he was a rājanya, he was unreservedly acknowledged by his contemporaries to be both a rishi and a priest. Nothing less than the uniform recognition and employment of the hymns handed down under his name as the productions of a genuine "seer," could have sufficed to gain for them a place in the sacred canon. It is true we possess little authentic information regarding the process by which the hymns of different families were admitted to this honour; but at least there is no tradition, so far as I am aware, that those of Viśvāmitra and his family were ever treated as antilegomena. And if we find that later works consider it necessary to represent his priestly character as a purely exceptional one, explicable only on the ground of supernatural merit acquired by ardent devotion, we must recollect that the course of ages had brought about a most material change in Indian society, that the sacerdotal function had at length become confined to the members of an exclusive caste, and that the exercise of such an office in ancient times by persons of the regal or mercantile classes had ceased to be intelligible, except upon the supposition of such extraordinary sanctity as was alleged in the case of Viśvāmitra.

It is worthy of remark that although the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (see above) declares that Sunāsśeṣa, as belonging to a priestly family, was called on to exercise the sacerdotal office immediately after his release, yet the anterior possession of divine knowledge is also ascribed to Viśvāmitra and the Gāthins, and that Sunāsśeṣa is represented as suc-

also R.V. ix. 93, 1 = S.V. i. 538. (Compare Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, for 1866, p. 387 ff.)

100 That many at least of these compositions were really the work of Viśvāmitra, or his descendants, is proved, as we have seen, by the fact that their names are mentioned in them.
ceeding to this sacred lore, as well as to the regal dignity of the race on which he became engrafted.

The fact of Viśvāmitra having been both a rishi and an officiating priest, is thus, as we have seen, and if ancient tradition is to be believed, undoubted. In fact, if we look to the number of Vedic hymns ascribed to him and to his family, to the long devotion to sacerdotal functions which this fact implies, and to the apparent improbability that a person who had himself stood in the position of a king should afterwards have become a professional priest, we may find it difficult to believe that although (as he certainly was) a scion of a royal stock, he had ever himself exercised regal functions. Professor Roth remarks (Litt. u. Gesch. p. 125) that there is nothing either in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, or in the hymns of the Rig-veda to shew that he had ever been a king. But on the other hand, as the same writer observes (p. 126), and as we shall hereafter see, there are numerous passages in the later authorities in which the fact of his being a king is distinctly, but perhaps untruly, recorded.

It is so well known, that I need scarcely adduce any proof of the fact, that in later ages Rājanyas and Vaiśyas, though entitled to sacrifice and to study the Vedas, were no longer considered to have any right to officiate as priests on behalf of others. I may, however, cite a few texts on this subject. Manu says, i. 88 :

_Adhyāpanam adhyāyanām yājanaṁ yājanaṁ tathā | dānam prati-
grahaṁ chaiva Brāhmaṇānāṁ akalpayat | 89. Prajānāṁ rakṣaṇaṁ
dānam īyādhyāyanam eva cha | viṣhayeshv aprasaktiṁ cha kṣattri-
yasya samūsataḥ | 90. Paśūnāṁ rakṣaṇaṁ dānam īyādhyāyanam eva
dha | vaṇikpatham kusidaṁ cha Vaiśyasya kṛṣhīm eva cha | , 91. Ekam
eva tu Śudrasya prabhūḥ kṛma samādhisat | etesāṁ eva varṇānāṁ suśrū-
shāṁ anāsāyā | 88. He (Brahmā) ordained teaching, study, sacrificing, officiating for others at sacrifices, and the giving and receiving of gifts, to be the functions of Brāhmans. 89. Protection of the people, the giving of gifts, sacrifice, study, and non-addiction to objects of sense he assigned as the duties of the Kṣattriya. 90. The tending of cattle, giving of gifts, sacrifice, study, commerce, the taking of usury, and agriculture he appointed to be the occupations of the Vaiśya. 91. But the

May not R.V. iii. 43, 5 (quoted above), however, be understood to point to something of this kind?
lord assigned only one duty to the Śūdra, that of serving these other three classes without grudging.”

Similarly it is said in the second of the Yajna-paribhāṣā Śūtras, translated by Professor M. Müller (at the end of the ninth volume of the Journal of the German Oriental Society, p. xliii.), “that sacrifice is proper to the three classes, the Brāhmaṇa, Rājanya, and also the Vaiśya.”

Prof. Müller also refers to Kātyāyana’s Śrauta Śūtras, of which i. 1, 5 and 6 are as follows:

5. Angahināsrotiya - śaṅda - śūdra - varjam | 6. Brāhmaṇa-rājanya-
vaiśyānām śruteḥ | “Men,” with the exception of those whose members

Prof. Müller does not give the original text.

In one of these Sūtras of Kātyāyana (i. 1, 4) and its commentary a curious question (one of those which the Indian authors often think it necessary to raise and to settle, in order that their treatment of a subject may be complete and exhaustive) is argued, viz. whether the lower animals and the gods have any share in the practice of Vedic observances; or whether it is confined to men. The conclusion is that the gods cannot practise these rites, as they are themselves the objects of them, and as they have already obtained heaven and the other objects of desire with a view to which they are practised (tatra devānām devatāntarābhāvād anadhiyakāḥ | na hy ātmānam udiśya tyāgaḥ sambhavati | kinccha | devās ca prūṣa-śvargādi-kāmāḥ | na ca teshān kincchid avapātayam asti yad-arthaṁ karmāṇi kurvate | ). As regards the right of the lower animals to sacrifice, although the point is decided against them on the ground of their only “looking to what is near at hand, and not to the rewards of a future world” (te hy āsannam eva chetayante na pārālaṅkikham phalam); still it is considered necessary seriously to obviate a presumption in their favour that they seek to enjoy pleasure and avoid pain, and even appear to indicate their desire for the happiness of another world by seeming to observe some of the Vedic prescriptions: “Na- nu uktam śunam chaturdasyam upavāsa-darśanāt iṣyaṇaya cha ashṭamyam upavisa-
darśanāc ēha te ‘pi pārālaṅkikāṁ jñanī” ēti | tat katham avagamyate “te Āhar-
mārthām upasavantī” ēti | ye hi vedā-sruti-pūrṇaṅgadham pāthanti te eva jñanī yad “anena karmanaḥ idam phalam amutra prāpayate” ēti | na ca ete vedāṅgadham pāthanti nāpy anyebhyāḥ āgamayanti | tena śāstrāṅgam avidevaṁsah phalam amūkhīmah akā-
mayantāḥ kathāṁ tat-sādhanāṁ karmā kuryauḥ | tasmād na dharmārtham upasavantī ēti | kimarthāṁ tarhī teṣeṁ upāvīṣaḥ | uchyate | rogād aruchir esām | tarhi niyata-
kāle kathāṁ rogāḥ | uchyate | niyata-kāle apī rogāḥ bhavanti yathā śrutiyaṁ-śa-
turthikādi-śvarūḥ | adhanās ēha ete | “But do not some say that ‘from a dog having been noticed to fast on the fourteenth day of the month, and a hawk on the eighth, they also have a knowledge of matters connected with a future life?’ But how is it known that these dogs and hawks fast from religious motives? For it is only those who read the Vedas, Saṁhitās, Purāṇas, etc., who are aware that by means of such and such observances, such and such rewards will be obtained in another world. But these animals neither read the sacred books for themselves, nor ascertain their contents from others. How then, ignorant as they are of the contents of the scriptures, and devoid of any desire for future rewards, can they perform those rites which are the means of attaining them? It is therefore to be concluded that they do not fast from religious motives. But why, then, do they fast? We reply, because from sickness they have a disinclin-
are defective, those who have not read the Veda, eunuchs, and Śūdras, have a right to sacrifice. 6. It is Brāhmans, Rājanyas, and Vaiśyas (only who) according to the Veda (possess this privilege)."

ation for food. But how do they happen to be sick on certain fixed days? We answer, there are also certain diseases which occur on fixed days, as tertian and quartan agues. Another reason why the lower animals cannot sacrifice is that they are destitute of wealth (and so unable to provide the necessary materials).

164 "And yet," Prof. Müller remarks (ibid), "concessions were made (to other and lower classes) at an early period. One of the best known cases is that of the Ratha-kāra. Then the Nishādasthapatī, though a Nishāda chief and not belonging to the three highest classes was admitted to great sacrifices, e.g. to the gāvedhukacharu." The S'atap. Br. i. 1, 4, 12, has the following words: Tāni vai etāni chatvāri vūchaḥ "ehi" iti brāhmaṇasya "āgahī" "ūdraṇa" vaiśyaṇya cha rājanyabandhūḥ cha "ādānva" iti śūdrasya | [In the formula, havisyakṛd ehi, 'come, oblation-maker,' referred to in the previous paragraph, and its modifications] these four (different) words are employed to express 'come:' ehi, 'come;' in the case of a Brāhman; āgahī, 'come hither,' in the case of a Vaiśya; ādānva, 'hasten hither,' in the case of a Rājanyabandhu, and ādānva, 'run hither,' in the case of a Sūdra." On this Prof. Weber remarks, in his translation of the first adhyāya of the first book of the S'. P. Br. (Journ. Germ. Or. Soc. iv. p. 301): "The entire passage is of great importance, as it shows (in opposition to what Roth says in the first vol. of this Journal, p. 83) that the Sūdras were then admitted to the holy sacrifices of the Aryans, and understood their speech, even if they did not speak it. The latter point cannot certainly be assumed as a necessary consequence, but it is highly probable; and I consequently incline to the view of those who regard the Sūdras as an Aryan tribe which immigrated into India before the others." See above, p. 141, note 251, and Ind. Stud. ii. 194, note, where Prof. Weber refers to the Mahābhārata, S'āntip. verses 2304 ff. which are as follows: Svāhākāra-vahatḥkāra mantrāḥ śūdraḥ na vidyate | tasmāḥ chhīḍhāḥ pākayajnaṁ yajetvāravatoṁ evayam | pūrṇapātramayām ahūḥ pākayajnasya daksinām | śūdraḥ Pajavano nāma sahasrōṇēm śataṁ dadau | Aindragnya vidhiṁna daksinām iti naḥ śrutam | "The svāhākāra, and the vahatḥkāra, and the mantras do not belong to a Sūdra. Wherefore let a man of this class sacrifice with pākayajas, being incapacitated for (Vedic) rites (śravaṇa-vratopāya-hīnaḥ) Comm.. They say that the gift (daksinā) proper for a pākayajna consists of a full dish (pūrṇapātramayā). A Sūdra called Pajavana gave as a present a hundred thousand (of these pūrṇapātras) after the Aindragnya rule." Here, says Prof. Weber, "the remarkable tradition is recorded that Pajivana, i.e. Sudās, who was so famous for his sacrifices, and who is celebrated in the Rig-veda as the patron of Vievāmitra and enemy of Vasishtha, was a Sūdra." In the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, vii. 11, 24, the duties of a Sūdra are described to be "submissiveness, purity, honest service to his master, sacrifice without mantras, abstinance from theft, truth, and the protection of cows and Brāhmans" (śūdrasya sanmatīḥ sauchāṁ svātmā svāṁyāṁ amāyāyaḥ | amantrayajno hy asteyāṁ satyāṁ go-vipra-rakṣaṇām ). The Commentator defines amantrayajnas thus: namaskāraṇe jātaka pancha-yajnimuhthānam, "the practice of the five sacrifices with obeisance," and quotes Yajnavalkya. See also Wilson's Viṣṇu Purāṇa, vol. iii. p. 87, and notes; Müller's Anc. Sansk. Lit. p. 203; the same author's Essay, at the end of the ninth vol. of the Journ. Germ. Or. Soc. p. lxxiii.; and Bohtlingk and Roth's Lexicon, s.v. pākayajna.
According to the Ait. Br. vii. 19, "the Brāhman alone of the four castes has the right of consuming things offered in sacrifice" (etāḥ vai praśāh hutādo yaḥ brāhmaṇaḥ | atha etāḥ ahutado yaḥ rājanyo vaisyaḥ śūdraḥ). And yet, as Prof. Müller observes, it is said in the Satap. Br. v. 5, 4, 9: Chavāro vai varṇaḥ brāhmaṇaḥ rājanyo vaisyaḥ śūdraḥ na ha etehāṃ ekaśchana bhavati yaḥ somaṁ vanati | sa yad ha etehāṃ ekaśchit syāt syād ha eva prāyaśchitthāḥ | "There are four classes, the Brāhman, Rājanya, Vaiśya, and Śūdra. There is no one of these who vomits (i.e., I suppose, dislikes) the soma. If anyone of them however should do so, let there be an atonement."

Professor Weber, by whom also these words are quoted (Ind. St. x. 12), remarks that "they leave open the possibility of Rājanyas, Vaiśyas, and even Śūdras partaking of the soma, the only consequence being that they must as an expiation perform the Sautramaṇi rite."

In the twenty-first of the Yajna-paribhāśā Śūtras, translated by Müller, p. xlvii., it is declared that the priestly dignity belongs to the Brāhmans; and it is laid down by the Indian authorities that even when the sacrifice is of a kind intended exclusively for Kshatriyas, the priest must still be a Brāhman and not a Kshatriya, the reason being that men of the former class only can eat the remains of the sacrifice (see Kātyāyana's Sr. Śūtras, i. 2, 6): Brāhmaṇaḥ pītvijō bhaksha-pratishedhād itarayoh, "the Brāhmans only are priests, because the other two castes are forbidden to eat (the remains of the sacrifice)"). See also Weber, Ind. St. x. pp. 17 and 31, and the passages of the Ait. Br. viii. 24 and 27, referred to in pages 30 and 31: 24. Na ha vai apurohitasya rājya devaḥ annam adanti | tasmād rājā' yakshamāno brāhmaṇam puro dadhitā | "The gods do not eat the food offered by a king, who has no purohita. Wherefore (even) when not about to sacrifice, the king should put forward a Brāhman (as his domestic priest)." 27. Yo ha vai trīṇ purohitāṁs trīṇ purodhātin veda sa brāhmaṇāḥ purohitāḥ | sa vadeta purodhāyai | Agnir vāca purohitāḥ prithivi purodhātā vāyur vāca purohitā 'ntariksham purodhātā ādityo vāca purohito dyauḥ purodhātā | esha ha vai purohito yaḥ evaṁ veda atha sa tirohito yaḥ evaṁ na veda | tasya rājā mitraṁ bhavati devishantam apabādhate | yasyaivaṁ vidvān brāhmaṇo rāṣṭra-gopaḥ purohitāḥ | kshattraya kshattraye jayati baleṇa balem aśnute | yasyaivaṁ vidvān brāhmaṇo rāṣṭra-gopaḥ purohitāḥ | tasmāi viśāḥ sanjānate samukkanāḥ ekamanaśaḥ | yasyaivaṁ vidvān brāhmaṇo
“The Brähman who knows the three purohitas, and their three pointers, is a (proper) purohita, and should be nominated to this office. Agni is one purohita, and the earth appoints him; Väyu another, and the air appoints him; the Sun is a third, and the sky appoints him. He who knows this is a (proper) purohita; and he who does not know this is to be rejected. (Another) king becomes the friend of the prince who has a Brähman possessing such knowledge for his purohita and the protector of his realm; and he vanquishes his enemy. He who has a Brähman possessing etc. (as above) conquers (another’s) regal power by (his own) regal power, and acquires another’s force by (his own) force. With him who has a Brähman etc. (as above) the people are openly united and in harmony.”

I add another passage from the same Brähmana, which might also have been properly introduced in an earlier chapter of this work (chapt. i. sect. iii.) as it relates to the creation of the four castes:

Ait. Br. vii. 19. Prajäpatir yajnam asrijata | yajnaṁ srishiṁ anu brahma-kshattre asrijyetam | brahma-kshattre anu dvayah praśah asrij-yanta hutādaḥ cha ahutādaḥ cha brahma eva anu hutādaḥ kshattram anu ahutādaḥ | etāḥ vai praśah hutādo yad brāhaṇaḥ | atha etāḥ ahutādo yad rājanyo vaiśyoh śudraḥ | tābhyo yajnaḥ udakrāmat | tam brahma-kshattre anvaitaṁ yāṇy eva brahmanaḥ āyudhāni tair brahma anvait yāṇi kshattrasya tam (ṭ taṁ) kshattram | etāṁ vai brahmanaḥ āyudhāni yad yajnāyudhāni | atha etāṁ kshattrasya āyudhāni yad āśva-ratthah kavachaḥ ishu-dhanva | tam kshattram ananvāpya nyavarttata | āyudhebhyo ha sma asya vijamānaḥ parān eva eti | atha enam brahma anvait | tam āpnot | tam āptvā-parastād niruddhya atishṭhat | so āptah parastād niruddhas tishṭhan jñātvā svānya āyudhāni brahma upāvarttata | tasmād ha apy etarhi yajno brahmany eva brāhaṇesha pratishthitaḥ | atha evat kshattram anvāgachhat tad abraviḥ “upa mā asmin yajno kavyasva” iti | tat “tathā” ity abraviḥ “tad vai nidhāya svānya āyudhāni brahmanaḥ eva āyudhaṁ brahmaṁ rūpeṇa brahmaṁ bhātvā yajnam upavrattasva” iti | “tathā” iti tat kshattraiḥ nidhāya svānya āyudhāni brahmano eva āyudhāṁ brahmaṁ rūpeṇa brahmaṁ bhātvā yajnam upavrattatā | tasmād ha apy etarhi kṣhattrayo yajamāno nidhāya eva svānya āyudhāni brahmaṁ eva āyudhaṁ brahmaṁ rūpeṇa brahmaṁ bhātvā yajnam upāvartatā |
ledge) and Kshättra (regal power)\textsuperscript{165} were created. After these, two kinds of creatures were formed, viz. those who eat, and those who do not eat, oblations. After Brähmān came the eaters of oblations, and after Kshättra those who do not eat them. These are the eaters of oblations, viz. the Brähmans. Those who do not eat them are the Rājanya, the Vaiśya, and the Sūdra. From these creatures sacrifice departed. Brähmān and Kshättra followed it, Brähmān with the implements proper to itself, and Kshättra with those which are proper to itself. The implements of Brähmān are the same as those of sacrifice, while those of Kshättra are a horse-chariot,\textsuperscript{166} armour, and a bow and arrows. Kshättra turned back, not having found the sacrifice; which turns aside afraid of the implements of Kshättra. Brähmān followed after it, and reached it; and having done so, stood beyond, and intercepting it. Being thus found and intercepted, sacrifice, standing still and recognizing its own implements, approached to Brähmān. Wherefore now also sacrifice depends upon Brähmān, upon the Brähmans. Kshättra then followed Brähmān, and said, ‘invite me\textsuperscript{167} (too to participate) in this sacrifice.’ Brähmān replied, ‘so be it: then laying aside thy own implements, approach the sacrifice with the implements of Brähmān, in the form of Brähmān, and having become Brähmān.’

\textsuperscript{165} The two principles or functions represented by the Brähmans and Kshattriyas respectively.

\textsuperscript{166} See Weber, Indische Studien, ix. p. 318.

\textsuperscript{167} See Weber, in the same page as last quoted.

\textsuperscript{168} This idea may be further illustrated by a reference to several passages adduced by Professor Weber, Ind. St. x. 17, who remarks: “Hence every Rājanya and Vaiśya becomes through the consecration for sacrifice (dīkṣāḥ) a Brähmān during its continuance, and is to be addressed as such in the formula employed,” and cites S. P. Br. iii. 2, 1, 39 f., part of which has been already quoted above, in p. 136, note; and also Ait. Br. vii. 23: Sa ha dīkṣhamāṇah eva brāhmaṇatāṁ abhyupaiti | “He a king, when consecrated, enters into the condition of a Brähman.” See the rest of the section and sections 24, 25, and 31 in Dr. Haug's translation. The S.P. Br. xiii. 4, 1, 3, says, in opposition to the opinion of some, that an as'-vamedha, which is a sacrifice proper to Rājanyas, should be begun in summer, which is their season: tad vai vasante eva abhyarābheta | vasante vai brāhmaṇasya rītuḥ | yah u vai kaś cha yajate brāhmaṇig- bhūya eva eva yajate | “Let him commence in spring, which is the Brähman's season. Whosoever sacrifices does so after having as it were become a Brähman.” So too Kātyāyana says in his S'rāuta Sūtras vii. 4, 12: “Brāhmaṇa’ ity eva vaisya-rājanyatāṁ api | “The word Brāhmaṇa is to be addressed to a Vaiśya and a Rājanya also,” On which the Commentator annotates: Vaiśya-rājanyatāṁ api yajna ‘dīkṣāḥ yam brāhmaṇaḥ’ ity eva viktavyam | na ‘dīkṣāḥ yam kṣattriyavo vaiśyo vā’ iti | “The formula 'This Brähmān has been consecrated' is to be used at the sacrifice of a Vaiśya.
Kshātra rejoined, ‘Be it so,’ and, laying aside its own implements, approached the sacrifice with those of Brāhmaṇ, in the form of Brāhmaṇ, and having become Brāhmaṇ. Wherefore now also a Kshattriya when sacrificing, laying aside his own implements, approaches the sacrifice with those of Brāhmaṇ, in the form of Brāhmaṇ, and having become Brāhmaṇ.”

The Mahābhārata, Sāntip. verses 2280 f. distinctly defines the duty of a Kshattriya in reference to sacrifice and sacred study: Kshattriya-asyāpi yo dharmas taṁ te vākhyāmi Bhārata | dadyād rājan na yācheta yajeta na cha yājayer | nūdhyāpayed adhīyita prajāś cha paripālayet | “I will tell thee also the duties of a Kshattriya. Let him give, and not ask (gifts); let him sacrifice, but not officiate for others at sacrifices; let him not teach, but study; and let him protect the people.”

It is clear that these passages which restrict the right of officiating ministerially at sacrifices to the members of the Brahmanical order, represent a very different state of opinion and practice from that which prevailed in the earlier Vedic age, when Viśvāmitra, a Rājanya, and his relatives, were highly esteemed as the authors of sacred poetry, and were considered as perfectly authorized to exercise sacredotal functions.

The result of the conflict between the opposing interests represented by Vasishtha and Viśvāmitra respectively, is thus described by Professor...

and a Rājanya also; and not the words ‘this Rājanya, or this Vaiśya, has been consecrated.’”

It appears from Arrian that the Greeks were correctly informed of this prerogative of the Brāhmaṇs. He says, Indica, ch. xii.: Καὶ δοτις δὲ ἰδίᾳ θεῖα, ἔξεγγυῆ ἄντω τῆς θυεῖς τῶν τίς σοφίστων τοῦτον γίνεται, ἄσ δικ ἔν ἄλλος κεχαριμένα τοῖς θείς θυσίας. “And whosoever sacrifices in private has one of these Sophists” (so the highest of the classes, here said to be seven in number, is designated) “as director of the ceremony, since sacrifice could not otherwise be offered acceptably to the gods.” Arrian makes another assertion (ibid. xii.) which, if applied to the time when he wrote (in the second Christian century), is not equally correct. After observing that the several classes were not allowed to intermarry, nor to practice two professions, nor to pass from one class into another, he adds: Μονὸν σφιστὴν αὐτῆς σοφίστην ἐν παντὶ γένεσιν γενέσθαι; ὅτι οὐ μαλακὰ τοῖς σοφίστοις ἐκεῖ τὰ πρόγματα, ἐκεῖ πάντων ταλαιπωρότατα. “Only it is permitted to a person of any class among them to become a sophist; for the life of that class is not luxurious, but the most toilsome of all.” However indubitably true the first part of this sentence may have been in the age of Viśvāmitra, it cannot be correctly predicated of the age of Arrian, or even of the period when India was invaded by Alexander the Great. The mistake may have arisen from confounding the Buddhists with the Brāhmaṇs, or from supposing that all the Brahmanical Indians, who adopted an ascetic life, were regarded as “sophists.”
Roth at the close of his work on the literature and history of the Veda, which has been so often quoted, p. 141: "Vasishṭha, in whom the future position of the Brahmans is principally foreshadowed, occupies also a far higher place in the recollections of the succeeding centuries than his martial rival; and the latter succumbs in the conflict out of which the holy race of Brahmāvarta was to emerge. Vasishṭha is the sacerdotal hero of the new order of things. In Viśvāmitra the ancient condition of military shepherd-life in the Punjab is thrown back for ever into the distance. This is the general historical signification of the contest between the two Vedic families, of which the literature of all the succeeding periods has preserved the recollection."

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

It appears from the data supplied in the two preceding sections that both Vasishṭha and Viśvāmitra are represented as priests of a king called Sudās. This is shewn, as regards the former rishi (see pp. 319 ff., above), by R.V. vii. 18, 4, 5, and 21–25; and vii. 33, 1–6, where he is said to have interceded with Indra for Sudās, who, as appears from verse 25 of the second of these hymns, was the son of Pijavana. A similar relation is shewn by R.V. iii. 53, 9–13 to have subsisted between Viśvāmitra and Sudās (see above, p. 342); and although Sudās is not in that passage identified with the king who was Vasishṭha’s patron, by the addition of his patronymic, we are told in the Nirukta, ii. 24, that he was the same person, the son of Pijavana. There is therefore no doubt that, according to ancient tradition, the tworishis were both priests of the same prince. It further appears that the Bharatas, with whom, as we have seen, Viśvāmitra was connected, are in R.V. vii. 33, 6 referred to as in hostility with Sudās and his priest. Are we then to conclude that the one set of facts excludes the other—that the two rishis could not both have been the family-priests of Sudās?

There is no reason to arrive at such an inference. Vasishṭha and Viśvāmitra could not, indeed, have been the domestic priests of Sudās at one and the same period. But they may have been so at different
times; and the one may have supplanted the other. It is, however, very
difficult to derive from the imperfect materials supplied in the passages
to which I have referred any clear conception of the shape and course
which the contest between these two rivals took, or to fix the periods
at which they respectively enjoyed their patron’s favour. Prof. Roth
thinks that some light is thrown on this obscure subject by the
different parts of the 53rd hymn of the third mandala of the Rig-veda.
This composition, as it stands, contains, as he considers, fragments of
hymns by Viśvāmitra or his descendants, of different dates; and the
verses (9-13), in which that rishi represents himself and the Kauśikas
as being the priests of Sudās, are, in his opinion, earlier than the con-
cluding verses (21-24), which consist of imprecations directed against
Vasishṭha. These last verses, he remarks, contain an expression of
wounded pride, and threaten vengeance against an enemy who had
come into possession of some power or dignity which Viśvāmitra him-
self had previously enjoyed. And as we find from one of his hymns
(the 53rd) that he and his adherents had at one time led Sudās to
victory, and enjoyed a corresponding consideration;—while from Vasish-
ṭha’s hymns it is clear that he and his family had also been elevated in
consequence of similar claims to a like position;—it would seem to
result that Viśvāmitra had cursed Vasishṭha for this very reason that he
had been supplanted by him. The former with his Kauśikas had through
the growing influence of his rival been driven away by Sudās to the
Bharatas the enemies of that prince and of the Tṛitṣus; and then

310 See Litt. und Gesch. des Wedia, pp. 121 ff.
311 I have (above, p. 343) characterized these verses as obscure and have left them
untranslated. The portions of the following version which are printed in italics are
doubtful: verse 22. “He (or, it) vexes (turns the edge of) even an axe; and breaks
even a sword. A seething cauldron, even, o Indra, when over-heated, casts out foam.
23. O men, no notice is taken of the arrow. They lead away the intelligent (lodha)
looking upon him as a beast. Men do not, however, pit a hack to run against a racer;
they do not lead an ass before horses. 24. These sons of Bharata, o Indra, desire
separation, not vicinity. They constantly urge the horse as if to a distance; they carry
about the bow in the battle.” The reader may consult Prof.Wilson’s translation R.V.
vol.iii. p. 89 f., as well as Roth’s Litt. u. Gesch. des Wedia, p. 109 f. In his Illustra-
tions of the Nirukta, p. 42, Roth conjectures that both lodha and pasu, in verse 23,
may denote animals of different natures, and that the clause may mean something to
the same effect as “they look on the wolf as if it were a hare.” In his Lexicon, s.v.
pasu, he takes that word to denote a head of cattle (ein Stück Vieh) as a term of
contempt. He takes jyūśvōja, in verse 24, to mean “having the impulsive force (?)
(Schnell-Kraft) of a bow-string.”
vowed vengeance against their enemies. Roth remarks that if this
conjecture appears too bold, which he does not allow, there is no al-
ternative but to regard verses 9–11 of R.V. iii. 53, as interpolated, and to
hold that Viśvāmitra had always been allied with the Bharatas. But,
as he urges, in a period such as that which the hymns of the Veda
represent to us—a time of feud and foray among the small neighbour-
ing tribes, when the power of the leaders of families and petty chiefs
was unlimited, when we observe that the ten kings were allied against
Sudās—in a period of subdivided dominion like this it would be far
more surprising to find a family so favoured by the gods as that of Viś-
vāmitra or Vasishṭha in continued and undisturbed possession of in-
fluence over any one of these chieftains, than to see mutual aggression,
hostility, and vindictiveness, prevailing even among families and clans
united to one another by community of language and manners. It is
further evident from later tradition, as Roth remarks, that Vasishṭha
and his family had not always been the objects of Sudās's favour; but
had, on the contrary, been at some time or other sufferers from his
enmity or that of his house; and in proof of this he refers to the
passage which has been cited above (p. 328) from Śāyaṇa's note on
R.V. vii. 32, and the Śātyāyana and Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇas, as there
quoted; and also to the 176th adhyāya of the Ādiparvan of the Mahā-
bhārata, verses 6696 ff., which will be adduced in a future section.

According to Roth's view (p. 124) the alienation between Sudās and
Vasishṭha fomented by Viśvāmitra was only of temporary duration, and
we must, therefore, understand that according to his view, the former
rishi and his family remained, eventually victors in the contest for
influence between themselves and their rivals.

Professor Weber, in a note appended to an article by Dr. A. Kuhn
in page 120 of the first volume of his Indische Studien, expresses
a different opinion. "The testimonies," he says, "adduced by Roth,
pp. 122 ff., according to which Sudās appears in the Epic age as
hostile to Brahmanical interests, stand in opposition to his assertion
that Vasishṭha's family finally banished Viśvāmitra a. i. the Kuśikas
from the court of that prince. The enmity between the latter and
Vasishṭha, the prototype of Brahmanhood, is thus by no means
temporary duration (Roth, p. 124), but the very contrary." The
passages cited by Roth, which Weber here claims as supporting his
own view, are Manu, vii. 41 (see above, p. 296), the Anakramaṇī with the Sātyāyana and Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇas quoted in p. 328, and the 126th and following sections of the Ādip. of the M. Bh. which will be adduced hereafter. To these may be added the text from the Kaushitāki Brāhmaṇa, cited in p. 328. If Sudās became ultimately reconciled to Vāsishṭha, and re-instated him and his relatives in their position of court priests, to the exclusion of the rival family of Viśvāmitra, it seems hard to understand, according to Professor Weber’s argument, how that prince’s name should have been handed down by tradition as one of the most prominent examples of impiety displayed in resistance to Brahmanical pretensions. It is, however, to be observed that, except in the text of Manu, it is the descendants of Sudās, and not the king himself, who are charged with the outrages committed against Vāsishṭha’s family; and that in the passage of the M. Bh. above referred to (Ādip. vv. 7669 ff.) the son of Sudās is represented as becoming ultimately reconciled to Vāsishṭha. 172 And if the passages, which have been cited above from the Rig-veda (pp. 330 f.) in allusion to Sudās’s deliverance by the gods, refer to a real person, and to the

172 It is also worthy of remark that the Anuśāsuṇa of the M.Bh. contains a conversation between Vāsishṭha and Saudāsa (the son, or one of the descendants of, Sudās) about the pre-eminent purity and excellence of cows, verse 3732: Etasmin eva kōle tu Vāsishṭham rishi-sattamam | Ikshvāku-vamśaś ca rōjā Saudāsa vādatām varāk | sarva-loka-charaṁ siddhaṁ brāhma-kosāṁ sanātanaṁ | purohitam abhi-praśīṁ abhi-vyādyopacakkrama | Saudāsa uśāca | tatra lokyoe bhagavan kīṁvīt pavi-traṁ kathya `nagha | yat kirttayan sadā marityaṁ prāmpyat punyam uttamaṁ | “At this time the eloquent king Saudāsa, sprung from the race of Ikshvāku, proceeded, after salutation, to make an enquiry of his family-priest Vāsishṭha, the eternal saint, the most excellent of rishis, who was able to traverse all the world, and was a treasure of sacred knowledge: ‘What, o venerable and sinless man, is declared to be the purest thing in the three worlds, by constantly celebrating which one may acquire the highest merit?’ Vāsishṭha in reply expatiates at great length on the merit resulting from bestowing cows, and ascribes to these animals some wonderful properties, as that they are the “support of all beings” (pratishṭhā bhūtaṁ, verse 3736), “the present and the future” (gāṇo bhūtaṁ cha bhavyaṁ cha, 3737), and describes the cow as “pervading the universe, the past and future” (yayā sarvaṁ idaṁ vyūptau jagat sthīvara-jangamam | tām dhenuṁ śirasā vande bhūta-bhavyasya mātaram, 3799). The sequel is thus told in verse 3801: Varam idam iti bhūmido (bhūmigo?) viśhitva pravaram risher vacchanaṁ tato mahātma | vyaspṛṣṭa niyataścchādvin deviścchīrya subhau cha go-dhanaṁ āptavāṁ lokāḥ | “The great, self-subsiding king, considering that these words of the rishi were most excellent, lavished on the Brāhmans very great wealth in the shape of cows, and obtained the worlds.”—So here we find the son of Saudāsa extolled as a saint.
same individual with whom we are at present concerned, they are difficult to reconcile with these traditions in the Brāhmaṇas, Mahābhārata, and Purāṇas; inasmuch as they are not said to be the productions of Viśvāmitra or his descendants, and as they necessarily imply that Sudās was a pious prince who worshipped the popular deities in the way prescribed by the rishis by whom he was commemorated, since the latter would not otherwise have celebrated him in their hymns as a conspicuous object of divine favour. Tradition, too, as we have seen (p. 268) represents Sudās to have been the author of a Vedic hymn. The verses of the 104th hymn of the seventh book which I have quoted (above, p. 327) do not appear to contribute any further aid towards the solution of the question under consideration. Assuming that they contain a curse aimed at Viśvāmitra we have no means of ascertaining when they were uttered; whether the charge preferred against Vasishṭha preceded or followed the ascendency of his rival.

We seem, therefore, to possess no sufficient data for settling the question of the relations in which Vasishṭha and Viśvāmitra respectively stood to king Sudās, further than that they both appear, from the hymns of the Rig-veda, to have been, at one period or another, his family priests; but which of the two was the first, and which the last, to enjoy the king’s favour, must, according to all appearance, remain a mystery.

SECT. VIII.—Story of Triśanku.

I shall now proceed to adduce the different legends in the Purāṇas, the Rāmāyana, and the Mahābhārata, in which Vasishṭha and Viśvāmitra are represented as coming into conflict.

In the third chapter of the fourth book of the Vishṇu Purāṇa (Wilson, vol. iii. pp. 284 ff.) we find a story about a king Satyavrata, called also Triśanku, the 26th in descent from Ikshvāku, who had become degraded to the condition of a Chaṇḍāla, about whom it is briefly related, iv. 3, 13: Dvādaśa-vārshikyām anāvrishtyām Viśvāmitra-kalatāpatya-poshaṇārthām chaṇḍāla-pratigraha-pariharanāya cha Jāhnavī-tira-nyagrodha mriga-māṁsaṁ anuśdīnas babandha | 14. Paritushṭena cha Viśvāmitreṇa sa-saṁrāṭaṁ svargam āropitāḥ | “During a twelve years’ drought he daily suspended deer’s flesh for the support of Viśvāmitra’s wife and children
on a nyagrodha-tree on the banks of the Ganges, intending by this means to spare them the (humiliation of) receiving a gift from a Chanḍāla; and was in consequence raised bodily to heaven by Viśvāmitra, who was gratified (with his conduct).”

This story is told at greater length in the Harivaṃśa (sections 12 and 13) where Vasishṭha also is introduced. I have already (p. 337) remarked on the super-human longevity ascribed to this sage, who is represented as contemporary both with Ikshvāku, and with his descendants down to the sixty-first generation. But Indian mythology, with its boundless resources in supernatural machinery, and in the doctrine of transmigration, can reconcile all discrepancies, and explain away all anachronisms, making any sage re-appear at any juncture when his presence may be required, another and yet the same.

The Harivaṃśa states that Satyavrata (Triśanku) had been expelled from his home by his father for the offence of carrying off the young wife of one of the citizens under the influence of a criminal passion (verse 718. Yena bhāryyā hṛtā pūrvaṁ kriodorehā parasya vai | 720. Jahāra kāmāt kanyāṃ sa kanyachit puravāsinah); and that Vasishṭha did not interfere to prevent his banishment. His father retired to the woods to live as a hermit. In consequence of the wickedness which had been committed, Indra did not rain for a period of twelve years. At that time Viśvāmitra had left his wife and children and gone to practice austerities on the sea-shore. His wife, driven to extremity by want, was on the point of selling her second son for a hundred cows, in order to support the others; but this arrangement was stopped by the intervention of Satyavrata, who liberated the son when bound,” and

173 In the Mahābh. S’āntip. verses 5330 ff. (referred to by Weber, Ind. St. i. 475, note) there is a story of Viśvāmitra determining to eat dog’s flesh in a period of famine between the end of the the Tretā-age and the beginning of the Dwāpara; and holding a conversation on this subject with a Chanḍāla. The circumstance is referred to in Manu, x. 108 : Kshudhārtas chāttum abhyāgūd Viśvāmitraḥ śva-jāghanīm | chanḍāla-hastād ādaya dharmādharma-vichakṣaṇaḥ | “And Viśvāmitra, who knew right and wrong, resolved to eat a dog’s thigh, taking it from the hand of a Chanḍāla.”

174 See in Ind. Stud. ii. 121 ff. Professor Roth’s remarks on the peculiar relation in which he regards this story as standing to that of S’unasāśa, as given in the Aitareya Brūhmaṇa. The various incidents in the one present in many respects a curious parallel to those of the other, which he considers can hardly be accidental; and he thinks this version of the legend of Triśanku may have arisen out of a transformation and distortion of that of S’unasāśa,
maintained the family by providing them with the flesh of wild animals; and according to his father's injunction, consecrated himself for the performance of a silent penance for twelve years (verse 732. \textit{Upāmba-} eratam āsthāya dīkshāṁ dvādaśa- varṣhikīṁ | pitṛ nīyōgaṁ avahat tasin vana-gate nīrpe). The story proceeds thus:

Verse 733. Ayodhyāṁ chaiva rāśṭraṁ cha tathaśvanteḥpuram muniḥ | yājyopādhyāya-sambandhād Vasīśṭhāḥ paryaraktāḥ | Satyavrata tu bālyād vai bhāvino 'rtāsya vā balāt | Vasīśṭhā bhyādhiham manyuṁ dhārayāmāsa nityādā | 735. Pitrā hi taṁ tadā rājyāt tyajyāmanāṁ svam ātmajam | na vārayāmāsa munir Vasīśṭhā kāraṇaḥ ha | pāgni-grahaṇa-mantarānāṁ nīṣṭhāḥ syāt saaptame pade | na cha Satyavratas tasmād dhrītavān saaptame pade | jānan dharmān Vasīśṭhas tu na māṁ trātiti Bhārata | Satyavrata tadā roshaṁ Vasīśṭhā manasa 'karot | guna-buddhiḥ tu bhagavān Vasīśṭhāḥ kriyāvāṁs tadā | na cha Satyavratas tasya tam upāśmaṁ abuddhyata | . . . 740. Tena tu idāṁṁ vahatā dīkshāṁ tāṁ durvahāṁ bhuvī | "kulasya nishkritis tāta kriṭā sā vai bhaved" itī | na taṁ Vasīśṭhāḥ bhagavān pitrā tyaktaṁ nyāvārayat | abhishektvāyaḥ aham putram asety evam matir muneḥ | sa tu dvādaśa- varshāṁ tāṁ dīkshāṁ udbhahān bali | avidyamāne māṁs tva Vasīśṭhāṣṣya mahātmanāḥ | sarva-kāma-dughāṁ dogdhāṁ dadarśa sa nṛpātmajāḥ | tāṁ vai krodhāḥ cha mohāḥ cha śrāmāḥ chaiva kṣudhārditāḥ | daśa-dharmā-gato rājā jaghāṇa Janamejaya | . . . 745. Tuch cha māṁsaiṁ svayaṁ chaiva Viśvāmitrayaḥ chātmajān | bhoyāyāsa tach chhritvā Vasīśṭhāḥ 'py asya chukruṭhe | . . . 750. Viśvāmitras tu dārāṇāṁ āgato bharaṇe kriye | sa tu tasmāi varam prādād muniḥ prītas | Triśāṅkave | cchudednāno varamāḥ varam vare nṛpātmajāḥ | saśarīro vrejā svargam ity evam yāchito varah | anāvṛvṛṣṭi-bhaye tasin gato dvādaśa-vārśke | pitrye 'bhishhichya rājye tu yājyāmāsa tam muniḥ | miśratāṁ devatāmāṁ cha Vasīśṭhāṣṣya cha Kaúṣikaḥ | saśarīrāṁ tadā taṁ tu divam āropayat prabhuh | 733. "Meanwhile Vasīśṭhāḥ, from the relation subsisting between the king (Satyavrata's father) and himself, as disciple\textsuperscript{175} and spiritual preceptor, governed the city of Ayodhya, the country, and the interior apartments of the royal palace. But Satyavrata, whether through folly or the force of destiny, cherished constantly an increased indignation against Vasīśṭhā, who for a (proper) reason had not interposed to pre-

\textsuperscript{175} Literally "the person in whose behalf sacrifice was to be performed."
vent his exclusion from the royal power by his father. 'The formulas of the marriage ceremonial are only binding,' said Satyavrata, 'when the seventh step has been taken,' and this had not been done when I seized the damsel: still Vaśishṭha, who knows the precepts of the law, does not come to my aid.' Thus Satyavrata was incensed in his mind against Vaśishṭha, who, however, had acted from a sense of what was right. Nor did Satyavrata understand (the propriety of) that silent penance imposed upon him by his father. . . . 740. When he had supported this arduous rite, (he supposed that) he had redeemed his family position. The venerable muni Vaśishṭha did not, however, (as has been said) prevent his father from setting him aside, but resolved to install his son as king. When the powerful prince Satyavrata had endured the penance for twelve years, he beheld, when he was without flesh to eat, the milch cow of Vaśishṭha which yielded all objects of desire; and under the influence of anger, delusion, and exhaustion, distressed by hunger, and failing in the ten ātītes [the opposites of which are then enumerated] he slew her . . . (745) and both partook of her flesh himself, and gave it to Viśvāmitra's sons to eat. Vaśishṭha hearing of this, became incensed against him,’” and imposed on him the name of Triśanku as he had committed three sins (verses 747–749).

“750. On his return home, Viśvāmitra was gratified by the support which his wife had received, and offered Triśanku the choice of a boon. When this proposal was made, Triśanku chose the boon of ascending bodily to heaven. All apprehension from the twelve years’ drought being now at an end, the muni (Viśvāmitra) installed Triśanku in his father’s kingdom, and offered sacrifice on his behalf. The mighty Kauśika then, in spite of the resistance of the gods and of Vaśishṭha, exalted the king alive to heaven.”

The legend of Triśanku is also related, though differently, in the Bālakāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa; but as it is there introduced as a portion of the history of Viśvāmitra’s various contests with Vaśishṭha recorded in the 51st to 65th sections of that book, I shall reserve it till I take up that narrative.

176 “The next ceremony is the bride’s stepping seven steps. It is the most material of all the nuptial rites; for the marriage is complete and irrevocable so soon as she has taken the seventh step, and no sooner.” Colebrooke’s Misc. Ess. i. 218, where further details will be found.
Sect. IX.—Legend of Harischandra.

The son of Trišanku, the subject of the preceding story, was Hariśchandra, whose name is mentioned in the Vishnu P., but without any allusion to the events of his life. According to the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa,177 however, he gave up his whole country, and sold his wife and son, and finally himself, in satisfaction of Viśvāmitra’s demands for money. The following is a summary of the story as there told, book i., sections 7–9. We may perhaps regard it as having in part a polemical import, and as intended to represent Viśvāmitra, the Kshattriya rival of the Brāhmans, in the most unfavourable colours. The sufferings of Hariśchandra, his wife, and son, are very pathetically depicted, and the effect of the various incidents is heightened with great artistic skill. The story, in fact, appears to me one of the most touching to be found in Indian literature. Hariśchandra, the Purāṇa tells us, was a royal rishi (rājarṣi) who lived in the Tretā age, and was renowned for his virtues, and the universal prosperity, moral and physical, which prevailed during his reign. On one occasion, when hunting, the king heard a sound of female lamentation which proceeded, it appears, from the Sciences who were becoming mastered by the austerely-fervid sage Viśvāmitra, in a way they had never been before by anyone else; and were consequently crying out in alarm at his superiority. In fulfilment of his duty as a Kshattriya to defend the weak, and inspired by the god Ganeśa, who had entered into him, Hariśchandra exclaimed (i. 7, 12) "'What sinner is this who is binding fire in the hem of his garment, while I, his lord, am present, resplendent with force and fiery vigour?' He shall to-day enter on his long sleep, pierced in all his limbs by arrows, which, by their discharge from my bow, illuminate all the quarters of the firmament" (12. Ko'yaṃ badhmāti vastrānte pāvakam pāpa-krīn naraḥ | balōsna-tejasā dipte mayi patyāv upasthita | 13. So 'dya mat-kārmukā- khopa - viśpita - digantaraiḥ | sarair viśhīna - sarvāṅgo dirghanidrām pravekṣhaya iṣ). Viśvāmitra was provoked by this address. In consequence of his wrath the Sciences instantly perished, and Hariśchandra, trembling like the leaf of an asvatsatha tree, submissively represented that

177 The same story is told in the Padma Purāṇa also. See Wilson's V.P. vol. iii. p. 287, and note. The glory of Hariśchandra is described in the M.Bh. Sabhāp. verses 489 ff.
he had merely done his duty as a king, which he defined as consisting in the bestowal of gifts on eminent Brāhmans and other persons of slender means, the protection of the timid, and war against enemies. Viśvāmitra hereupon demands a gift as a Brāhmaṇa intent upon receiving one. The king offers him whatever he may ask: Gold, his own son, wife, body, life, kingdom, good fortune (hīranyām vā suvarṇām vā putraḥ. patnī kālevaram | prāṇāḥ rājyam purām lakṣmīr yad abhipretam ātmānaḥ |). The saint first requires the present for the Rājasūya sacrifice. On this being promised, and still more offered, he asks for the empire of the whole earth, including everything but Hariśchandra himself, his wife and son, and his virtue which follows its possessor wherever he goes (i. 7, 28. Vinā bhāryyām cha putraṁ cha sariraṁ cha tavānagha | 29. Dharmaṁ cha sarva-dharma-jña yo yāntam anugachhati). Hariśchandra joyfully agrees. Viśvāmitra then requires him to strip off all his ornaments, to clothe himself in the bark of trees, and to quit the kingdom with his wife Saivyā and his son. When he is departing the sage stops him and demands payment of his yet unpaid sacrificial fee. The king replies that he has only the persons of his wife, his son, and himself left. Viśvāmitra insists that he must nevertheless pay; and that “unfulfilled promises of gifts to Brāhmans bring destruction” (i. 7. 35. Viśeshato brāhmaṇānāṁ hanty adattam pratiśrutam). The unfortunate prince, after being threatened with a curse, engages to make the payment in a month; and commences his journey with a wife unused to such fatigues, amid the universal lamentations of his subjects. While he lingers, listening to their affectionate remonstrances against his desertion of his kingdom, Viśvāmitra comes up, and being

178 Compare Manu’s very striking verses, viii. 17, and iv. 239 ff., which may be freely rendered as follows:

“Our virtue is the only friend that follows us in death;
All other ties and friendships end with our departing breath.
Nor father, nor mother, nor son beside us then can stay,
Nor kinsfolk:—virtue is the one companion of our way.
Alone each creature sees the light, alone the world he leaves;
Alone of actions, wrong or right, the recompense receives.
Like log or clod, beneath the sod their lifeless kinsman laid,
His friends turn round and quit the ground; but virtue tends the dead.
Be then a hoard of virtue stored, to help in day of doom;
By virtue led, we cross the dread, immeasurable gloom.”

incensed at the delay and the king’s apparent hesitation, strikes the queen with his staff, as she is dragged on by her husband. All his Hariśchandra endures with patience, uttering no complaint. Then the five Viśve devas, merciful gods, exclaimed, "‘To what worlds shall this sinner Viśvāmitra go, who has thrust down this most excellent of sacrificers from the royal dignity? Whose faith shall now sanctify the soma-juice poured out with recitation of texts at the great sacrifice, that we may drink it, and become exhilarated?’” (i. 7, 62. Ātha viśve tādā devāḥ pancha prāhuḥ kripālavāḥ | Viśvāmitraḥ supāpo yaṁ lokāṇ kān samavāpsyati | 63. yenāyaṁ yañvanāṁ śreṣṭhaṁ svā-rajyād avaro-pitaḥ | kasya vā brāddhayā prūtaṁ sutaṁ somam mahādhvare | pītvā vasyam prayāsyāmo muḍam mantra-purassaram |). Viśvāmitra heard what they said, and by a curse doomed them to become men; he relented, however, so far as to exempt them from having offspring, and from other family ties and human weaknesses, and promised that they should eventually be restored to their pristine position as gods. They in consequence became partially incarnate as the five Pāṇḍus, the sons of Draupadī. Resuming the story of Hariśchandra, the writer tells us that he then proceeded with his wife and little son to Benares, imagining that this divine city, as the special property of Śiva, could not be possessed by any mortal. Here he found the relentless Viśvāmitra waiting for him, and ready to press his demand for the payment of his sacrificial gift, even before the expiration of the full period of grace. In this extremity Saivyā the queen suggests with a sobbing voice that her husband should sell her. On hearing this proposal Hariśchandra swoons, then recovers, utters lamentations, and swoons again, and his wife, seeing his sad condition, swoons also. While they are in a state of unconsciousness, their famished child exclaims in distress, “O father, father, give me bread; O mother, mother, give me food: hunger overpowers me; and my tongue is parched” (i. 8, 35. Tāta tāta dadasvānam ambāmba bhojanaṁ dāda | kehuṁ me balavati jātā jihvāgraṁ śushyate tathā). At this moment Viśvāmitra returns, and after recalling Hariśchandra to consciousness by sprinkling water over him, again urges payment of the present. The king again swoons, and is again restored. The sage threatens to curse him if his engagement is not fulfilled by sunset. Being now pressed by his wife, the king agrees to sell her, adding, however, “If my voice can utter such a wicked word, I do
what the most inhuman wretches cannot perpetrate" (i. 8, 48 f. Nṛśaṁsaiṇi api yat karantuḥ na sakyaṁ tat karomy aham | yadi me sakyate vaṁ vaktum idriṁ sudurvačaḥ). He then goes into the city, and in self-accusing language offers his queen for sale as a slave. A rich old Brāhman offers to buy her at a price corresponding to her value, to do his household work. Harisṛandra's heart was torn, and he could make no reply. The Brāhman paid down the money, and was dragging away the queen by the hair of her head, when her little son Rohitāśva, seeing his mother about to be taken away from him, began to cry, and laid hold of her skirts. The mother then exclaims: i. 8, 59, "Munchāryya munca māṁ tāvad yāvat pāsyāmy ahaṁ śiśum | durlabhamāṁ darśanam tāta punar asya bhavishyati | 60. Paśyaihi vatsa māṁ evam mātaram dāsyatam gatam | mām mā sprākṣaṁ rāja-putra aspriṣya 'haṁ tavāṭhunā" | 61. Tataḥ sa bālā sahasā ārīṣṭvā kriṣṭāṁ tu mātaram | samābhyaḍhavād ambeti rudan sāśrūvilekṣanah | 62. Tam āgatam dvījaḥ kṛtā bālam abhyāhanat padā | vadaṁś ṭathāpi so 'mbeti naivamūnchata mātaram | 63. Rāja-patny uvāca | "prasādaṁ kuru me nātha kriṣṇishvemāṁ ora bālakam | kṛtā 'pi nāham bhavato vinaināṁ kāryya-rādhikā | 64. Ittham mamālpā-bhāgyāyaḥ prasāda-sumukho bhava | māṁ saṁyojaya bālena vatseneva payasvinim" | 65. Brāhmaṇaḥ uvāca | "grihyatāṁ vittam etat te āyatāṁ bālako mama" | "Let me go, let me go, venerable sir, till I look upon my son. I shall hardly ever behold him again. Come, my darling, see thy mother now become a slave. Touch me not, young prince; I may no longer be handled by thee.' Seeing his mother dragged away, the child ran after her, his eyes dimmed with tears, and crying 'mother.' The Brāhman purchaser kicked him when he came up; but he would not let his mother go, and continued crying 'mother, mother.' The queen then said to the Brāhman, 'Be so kind, my master, as to buy also this child, as without him I shall prove to thee but a useless purchase. 64. Be thus merciful to me in my wretchedness; unite me with my son, like a cow to her calf.' The Brāhman agrees: 'Take this money and give me the boy.'" When his wife and son were being carried away, Harisṛandra broke out into lamentations: i. 8, 68. Yāṁ na vāyur na cādityo nendur na cha pri-thag-janaḥ | ārīṣṭavantāṁ purā paṁtīṁ soyaṁ dāsitvam āgatā | 69. Sūrya-vamsa-prasūta 'yaṁ sukumāra-karāṅguliḥ | samprāpto vikrayam

119 The whole of this reads like a scene from "Uncle Tom's Cabin."
balo dhīṁ māṁ āstu sudurmatim | "She, my spouse, whom neither air, nor sun, nor moon, nor stranger had beheld, is now gone into slavery. This my son, a scion of the solar race, with his delicate hands and fingers, has been sold. Woe to me, wicked wretch that I am." After the Brāhmaṇ had gone out of sight with his purchases, Viśvāmitra again appeared and renewed his demands; and when the afflicted Hariśchandra offered him the small sum he had obtained by the sale of his wife and son, he angrily replied, i. 8, 74: Kshattrabandho mame-māṁ tvam sadṛśīṁ yajna-dakshināṁ | manyase yadi tat kshipram paśya tvam me balam param | 75. Tapaso 'ttra sutaptasya brāhmaṁvayāmala-sya cha | mat-prabhāvasya chograsasya sūdhasyādhyayanasya cha | "If, miserable Kshattriya, thou thinkest this a sacrificial gift befitting my deserts, thou shalt soon behold the transcendent power of my ardent austere-fervour, of my spotless Brāhmaṇhood, of my terrible majesty, and of my holy study.'" Hariśchandra promises an additional gift, and Viśvāmitra allows him the remaining quarter of the day for its liquidation. On the terrified and afflicted prince offering himself for sale, in order to gain the means of meeting this cruel demand, Dharma (Righteousness) appears in the form of a hideous and offensive Chandāla, and agrees to buy him at his own price, large or small. Hariśchandra declines such a degrading servitude, and declares that he would rather be consumed by the fire of his persecutor's curse than submit to such a fate. Viśvāmitra however again comes on the scene, asks why he does not accept the large sum offered by the Chandāla; and, when he pleads in excuse his descent from the solar race, threatens to fulminate a curse against him if he does not accept that method of meeting his liability. Hariśchandra implores that he may be spared this extreme of degradation, and offers to become Viśvāmitra's slave in payment of the residue of his debt; whereupon the sage rejoins, "If thou art my slave, then I sell thee as such to the Chandāla for a hundred millions of money" (i. 8, 95. Yadi preshyo mama bhavān chandālaya tato mayā | dāsa-bhāvam anuprāpto datto vittārbudena vai |). The Chandāla, delighted, pays down the money, and carries off Hariśchandra, bound, beaten, confused, and afflicted, to his own place of abode. Morning, noon, and evening the unfortunate prince repeats these words: i. 8, 99. Bālā dīna-mukhī dīriṣṭvā bālāṁ dīna-mukham purah | māṁ smaraty asuhkāvishṭā "mohayishyati nau nripah | 100. Upātta-vitto
vīprāya dattvā vittam ato 'dhikam” | na sa mām mriga-kāvākshī vetti pāpata rāṇi kritam | 101. Rājya-nāsaḥ suhṛt-tyāgo bhāryyā-tenaya-vikrayaḥ | prāptā chaṇḍālata cheyam aho duṣkha-paramparaḥ | “My tender wife, dejected, looking upon my dejected boy, calls me to mind while she says, ‘The king will ransom us (100) after he has gained money, and paid the Brāhman a larger sum than he gave for us.’ But my fawn-eyed spouse is ignorant that I have become yet more wretched than before. 101. Loss of my kingdom, abandonment of friends, sale of my wife and son, and this fall into the condition of a Chaṇḍāla,—what a succession of miseries!” Hariśchandra is sent by the Chaṇḍāla to steal grave-clothes in a cemetery (which is described at tedious length, with all its horrors and repulsive features), and is told that he will receive two-sixths of the value for his hire; three-sixths going to his master, and one-sixth to the king. In this horrid spot, and in this degrading occupation, he spent, in great misery, twelve months, which seemed to him like a hundred years (1. 8, 127. Evaṁ dvādaśa-māsās tu nītāḥ bata-sampamāḥ). He then falls asleep and has a series of dreams suggested by the life he had been leading (śnaśānābhyaśa-yogena, verse 129). After he awoke, his wife came to the cemetery to perform the obsequies of their son, who had died from the bite of a serpent (verses 171 ff.). At first the husband and wife did not recognize each other, from the change in appearance which had been wrought upon them both by their miseries. Hariśchandra, however, soon discovers from the tenor of her lamentations that it is his wife, and falls into a swoon; as the queen does also when she recognizes her husband. When consciousness returns, they both break out into lamentations, the father bewailing in a touching strain the loss of his son, and the wife the degradation of the king. She then falls on his neck, embraces him, and asks “whether all this is a dream, or a reality, as she is utterly bewildered;” and adds, that “if it be a reality, then righteousness is unavailing to those who practise it’” (verse 210. Rājan svapno 'tha tathyaṁ vā yad etad manyate bhavān | tat kathyatām mahābhāga mano vai mukyate mama | 211. Yady etad evaṁ dharmajña nāsti dharme sahāyatā |). After hesitating to devote himself to death on his son’s funeral pyre without receiving his master’s leave, (as such an act of insubordination might send him to hell) (verses 215 ff.), Hariśchandra resolves to do so, braving all the consequences, and consoling himself with the hopeful
anticipation: verse 224. Yadi dattaṁ yadi hutaṁ guravo yadi toṣitaḥ | paratra sangoṁ bhūyāt putreṇa saha cca tvayā | “If I have given gifts, and offered sacrifices, and gratified my religious teachers, then may I be reunited with my son and with thee (my wife) in another world.”\(^{180}\) The queen determines to die in the same manner. When Hariśchandra, after placing his son’s body on the funeral pile, is meditating on the lord Hari Nārāyaṇa Kṛishṇa, the supreme spirit, all the gods arrive, headed by Dharma (Righteousness), and accompanied by Viśvāmitra.\(^{181}\) Dharma entreats the king to desist from his rash in-

\(^{180}\) In the following verses of the Atharva-veda a hope is expressed that families may be re-united in the next world: vi. 120, 3. Tattra suḥārdāḥ suhrida madaṁti viśaya rogaṁ tanaṁ svāyaḥ | aṣṭaṁ añgair ahrutāḥ svāye tattra pañyama pitarau cha putrāḥ | “In heaven, where our friends, and intimates live in blessedness, having left behind them the infirmities of their bodies, free from lameness or distortion of limbs,—may we behold our parents and our children.” ix. 6, 27. Yā pürvam patiṁ vittāṁ aṭhāyaṁ viṁdate peraṁ | panchaundanaṁ cha tāv ajaṁ dādūta na vi yoshatāḥ | 28. Samudalo koḥ avati punarbhur । pataḥ patiḥ | yo jñā pavachaudanaṁ daksinā- jyotisānaṁ dādāti | “When a woman has had one husband before, and takes another, if they present the aja panchauḍana offering they shall not be separated. 28. A second husband dwells in the same (future) world with his re-wedded wife, if he offers the aja panchauḍana, illuminated by presents.” xii. 3, 17. Svāgamā lokam abhi no nayēsi saṁ jāyayā saha putraṁ ayama | “Mayest thou conduct us to heaven; may we be with our wives and children.” xviii. 3, 23. Svāṁ gachhatu te mano adha pariṇa । upe draça | “May thy soul go to its own (its kindred) and hasten to the fathers.” From the texts cited by Mr. Colebrooke “on the duties of a faithful Hindu widow,” (Misc. Ess. 115 ff.) it appears that the widow who becomes a sātī (i.e. burns herself with her husband’s corpse, or, in certain cases, afterwards) has the promise of rejoining her lord in another life, and enjoying celestial felicity in his society. In order to ensure such a result in all cases it was necessary either that both husband and wife should have by their lives merited equal rewards in another existence, or that the heroism of the wife, in sacrificing herself on her husband’s funeral-pile should have the vicarious effect of expiating his offences, and raising him to the same heavenly region with herself. And it is indeed the doctrine of the authorities cited by Mr. Colebrooke that the self-immolation of the wife had this atoning effect. But in other cases where the different members of a family had by their actions during life merited different kinds of retribution, they might, according to the doctrine of the transmigration of souls current in later ages, be re-born in the shape of different animals, and so rendered incapable of any mutual communication after death. In regard to the absence of any traces of the tenet of metempsychosis from the earliest Indian writings, see Professor Weber’s remarks in the Journ. of the Germ. Or. Soc. ix. 327 ff. and the abstract of them given in Journ. Roy. As. Soc. for 1865, pp. 365 ff.

\(^{181}\) An attempt is here made, verses 234 f., to give the etymology of Viśvāmitra: Viśva-trayaṇa yo mitram karttuṁ na sākitāḥ purū | Viśvāmitras tu te mūṣṭrīṁ ish- tāṇi chāḥ karttum ichhāti | “That Viśvāmitra, whom the three Viṣṇus formerly could not induce to be their friend, wishes to offer thee his friendship, and whatsoever thou desirest.”
tention; and Indra announces to him that he, his wife, and son have
conquered heaven by their good works. Ambrosia, the antidote of
death, and flowers, are rained by the god from the sky; and the king’s
son is restored to life and the bloom of youth. The king, adorned with
celestial clothing and garlands, and the queen, embrace their son.
Harischandra, however, declares that he cannot go to heaven till he
has received his master the Chaṇḍāla’s permission, and has paid him a
ransom. Dharma then reveals to the king that it was he himself who
had miraculously assumed the form of a Chaṇḍāla. The king next
objects that he cannot depart unless his faithful subjects, who are
sharers in his merits, are allowed to accompany him to heaven, at least
for one day. This request is granted by Indra; and after Visvāmitra has
inaugurated Rohitāśva the king’s son to be his successor, Harischan-
dra, his friends and followers, all ascend in company to heaven. Even
after this great consummation, however, Vasishṭha, the family-priest
of Harischandra, hearing, at the end of a twelve years’ abode in the
waters of the Ganges, an account of all that has occurred, becomes vehe-
mently incensed at the humiliation inflicted on the excellent monarch,
whose virtues and devotion to the gods and Brāhmans he celebrates,
declares that his indignation had not been so greatly roused even when
his own hundred sons had been slain by Visvāmitra, and in the follow-
ing words dooms the latter to be transformed into a crane: i. 9, 9.
Tasmād durātmā brahma-devīt prājnānām avaropitaḥ | māch-chhāpapahato
mūḍhaḥ sa vakatevam avāpesyati | “Wherefore that wicked man, enemy
of the Brāhmans, smitten by my curse, shall be expelled from the
society of intelligent beings, and losing his understanding shall be trans-
formed into a Vaka.” Visvāmitra reciprocates the curse, and changes
Vasishṭha into a bird of the species called Āṭi. In their new shapes
the two have a furious fight,182 the Āṭi being of the portentous height
of two thousand yojanas (= 18000 miles), and the Vaka of 3090 yojanas.
They first assail each other with their wings; then the Vaka smites his
antagonist in the same manner, while the Āṭi strikes with his talons.
Falling mountains, overturned by the blasts of wind raised by the

182 On the subject of this fight the Bhūgavata Purāṇa has the following verse:
ix. 7, 6. Traisāṅkavo Harīśchandra Visvāmitra-Vasishṭhayoḥ | yan-nimitam abhūd
guddham pakṣihigro bahu-vārshikam | “The son of Triśanku was Hariśchandra, on
whose account Visvāmitra and Vasishṭha in the form of birds had a battle of many
flapping of their wings, shake the whole earth, the waters of the ocean overflow, the earth itself, thrown off its perpendicular, slopes downwards towards Pātāla, the lower regions. Many creatures perish by these various convulsions. Attracted by the dire disorder, Brahmā arrives, attended by all the gods, on the spot, and commands the combatants to desist from their fray. They were too fiercely infuriated to regard this injunction: but Brahmā put an end to the conflict by restoring them to their natural forms, and counselling them to be reconciled. 1. 9, 28. Na cāpi Kauśika-śreshṭhas tasya rājno parādhyata | swarga-prāptikaro brahmam upakāra-pade sthitaḥ | 29. Taṇo-vighnasya karttārau kāma-krodha-vasāṁ gatau | parityajata bhadram no brahma hi prachuram balam | ‘The son of Kuśika has not inflicted any wrong on Hariśchandra: inasmuch as he has caused the king’s elevation to heaven he stands in the position of a benefactor. 29. Since ye have yielded to the influence of desire and anger ye have obstructed your austere fervour; leave off, bless you; the Brahmanical power is transcendent.’ The sages were accordingly pacified, and embraced each other.”

This interesting legend may be held to have had a double object, viz. first to portray in lively colours the heroic fortitude and sense of duty exhibited by Hariśchandra and his wife in enduring the long series of severe trials to which they were subjected; and secondly, to represent Viśvāmitra in an unamiable light, as an oppressive assertor of those sacerdotal prerogatives, which he had conquered for himself by his austerities,\(^\text{183}\) to place him in striking contrast with the genuine Brähman Vasīśṭha who expresses strong indignation at the harsh procedure of his rival, and to recall the memory of those conflicts between years duration.” On this the Commentator remarks: Viśvāmitro rājasūya-dakṣīṇa-āchhalena Hariśchandrasya saiva-svam apakahita yāt vyāmāsa | tathā cārutev kupito Vasīśṭho’pi Viśvāmitraṁ “tvam ārī bhava” iti sāsāpa | so “pi “ tvam vako bhava” iti Vasīśṭham sāsāpa | tayos cha yuddham ahūd iti prasiddam | “Viśvāmitra under pretence of taking a present for a rajasūya sacrifice, stripped Hariśchandra of all his property, and afflicted him. Vasīśṭha hearing of this, became incensed, and by an intimation turned him into an Ārī. Viśvāmitra retorted the curse and changed Vasīśṭha into a Vāka. And then a battle took place between them, as is well known.” Here it will be seen that the Commentator changes the birds into which the rishis were transformed, making Viśvāmitra the Ārī and Vasīśṭha the Vāka.\(^\text{183}\) It is true that the Brähman rishi Durvāsas also is represented as a very irascible personage. See vol. iv. of this work, pp. 165, 169, 208, 407; and Weber’s Ind. St. iii. 398.
the Brāhmans and Kshattriyas, which were exemplified in the persons of these two sages, of whom the one is said to have been made the “lord of Brāhmans” (*Vaśiṣṭhaḥ iṣaṁ viprāyām, M.Bh. Sāntip. v. 4499*), and the other is declared in the story before us to have been the “enemy of the priests.”

**SECT. X.—Contest of *Vaśiṣṭha* and *Viśvāmitra* according to the *Mahābhārata.*

In the Ādiparvan of the Mahābhārata, verses 6638 ff., we find another legend, in the Brahmanical interest, regarding the same two great personages, which begins with a panegyric on *Vaśiṣṭha,* at the expense of the rival rishi:

6638. *Brāhmaṇo mānasaḥ putro Vaśiṣṭho 'rundhati-patiḥ | tāpasā nirjītau śāsvad ajeyāv amarair api | kāma-krodhāḥ ubhau yasya charanau saṁsvavāhateḥ | yas tu noḥchhoṭanaṁ chakre Kuśikānām udāra-dhīḥ |

*Viśvāmitrāparādhena dhārayan manyam uttamam | 6640. Putra-yaśasāna- | santaptaḥ śaktinām apy aṣakta-vat | Viśvāmitra-vināśaya na chakre karma dāruṇam | nṛpīṁśa cha punar āharttam yaḥ sa putrān Yama-kshayāt |

kṛitāṁ nātichakrāma velām īva mahodadhiḥ | yam prāpya vijitātmā- | nam mahātmānāṁ nāradhipaḥ | 6645. Tasmād dharma-pradhānātmā vedā-dharma-viḍ īṣitaḥ | brahmaṇa |

guṇavaṁ kaśchit purodhāḥ pariśiyatām | kshattriyenābhijātana prithiviṁ jītam iḥhataḥ | pārvam purohitaḥ kāryaḥ pārtha rājyāhḍisiddhaye |

mahām jīghatata rajnā brahma kāryam purassaram | ... 6666. *Kshattriyo |

'ham bhavān vipras tapaḥ-svādhyāya-sādhanāḥ | brāhmaṇesu kuto vīryaṃ prasānteshu dhritātmasu | arbudena gavāṁ yaśaṁ na daśāṁ maya mepśitaṁ | sva-dharmaṁ na prahāsyāṁ neshyaṁ ca balena gām | ... 6679. "Śthitayaṁ" iti tathā ekrutvā *Vaśiṣṭhasya* payasvinī | urdhvānanda-śiro-grīvā prababhau raudra-dārśanā | 6680. *Krodha-rakteka- |

shanā sa gaur gambhā-rava-ghanā-svanā | *Viśvāmitrasya* tat saṁyāṁ vyādṛiśyatā sarvasaḥ | kaśāgra-daṇḍābhikata kāyamanānā tatastataḥ | krodha-raktekshanā krodham bhāya eva samādade | aḍyāya iva madhyahme krodha-dipta-vapur babhau | angāra-varsham mūchantevah mūhur bāladhito
THE BRAHMANS AND KSHATRIYAS.

maḥat | aṣṭijaṭ Pahlavān puchhāṭ prasravaḍ Dravidāṇ Bakān | yoni-
descāḥ cha Yavānān sakṛitat Śavarān bahūn | . . . 6691. Drishtvā tad
mahād aścharyam brahma-tejo-bhavam tadā | Viśvāmitraḥ kshattrabhavān
nirvinno vāhyam abhavit | "ādik balāṁ kshattriyā-balāṁ brahma-tejo-
balāṁ balāṁ viniścītya tapāḥ eva param balam" | sa rājaṁ
śpītaṁ utsṛjya taṁ cha dīptāṁ niṇa-śriyam | bhogāṁ cā prīṣhṭaṁ
kṛtva tapasy eva mano dadhe | sa gatvā tapasā siddhim lokān viśhṭabhya
tejasaḥ | 6695. Tatāpā sargvaṇ dīptaujāḥ brāhmaṇatvam avāṭāvān | api-
bach cha tataḥ somam Indreṇa saha Kūśikaḥ |

6638. "Vaśīṣṭha," a Gandharva informs Arjuna, "was the mind-
born son of Brahmā and husband of Arundhati.184 By his austere fer-
vour, lust and anger, invincible even by the immortals, were constantly
vanquished and embraced his feet. Restraining his indignation at the
wrong done by Viśvāmitra, he magnanimously abstained from exter-
minating the Kūśikas.185 6640. Distressed by the loss of his sons, he
acted, although powerful, like one who was powerless, and took no

184 Arundhati is again mentioned as the wife of Vaśīṣṭha, in the following lines of the M. Bh. Aḍip. 7351 f. addressed to Draupadi: Yathendrāṅi Harīhaye Svāhā chaiva Vībhavasau | Rohīṇi cha yathā Some Damayanti yathā Nale | yathā Viśrava Naḥ Yadhā Vaśīṣṭhaḥ chōpy Arundhati | yathā Nārāyaṇe Lakṣmīṁ tathā tvam bhava bhārtṛśrih | "What Indrāṅi is to Indra, Svāhā to the Sun, Rohīṇi to the Moon,
Dāmayanti to Nala, Bhadrā to Kuvera, Arundhati to Vaśīṣṭha, and Lakṣmī to
Nārāyaṇa, that be thou to thy husbands." She is again noticed in verses 8455 ff.: Swarātā chōpy kalyāṇi sarva-bhūteshu eśūrā | Arundhati maṁtavānaih Vaśīṣṭham
paryāṣaṅktaḥ | visuddha-bhūvam atyaṅyaḥ sādā priya-hite ratam | saptorshi-madhya-
gaiṁ vīrasu avamane cha tam munim | apadyāyeneṇa sa teṇa dūmrāyaṇa-saṁ-prabhā | laksyālaksyā nābhirūpaṇa nimittam iva paśyati | "The faithful and beautiful Arun-
dhati, renowned among all creatures, was suspicious about the great Vaśīṣṭha,
his nature was eminently pure, who was devoted to the welfare of those he loved,
who was one of the seven rishis, and heroic; and she despised the muni. In consequence
of these evil surmises, becoming of the dusky colour of smoke, both to be seen and not
to be seen, devoid of beauty, she looks like a (bad) omen." This version of the last
line is suggested by Prof. Auffrecht. The Commentator explains it thus: "Nimittam |
bharturv laksyāyam " iva paśyati " kapatena | ataḥ eva " nābhirūpa prachtannam-
vesāh | tena hetvā " laksyālaksyā cha " | " She regards as it were i.e. by guile
the 'omen' afforded by her husband's (bodily) marks, hence she assumed a disguise,
and was 'both to be seen and not to be seen.'"

185 As regards the magnanimous character here assigned to Vaśīṣṭha, I quote a
passage from the Vishnupurāṇ, i. 9, 16 ff., where the irascible Durvāsas (to whom
I lately referred, and who is said, in verse 2, to be a partial incarnation of Sīva,
Śanakaśīrṣaṁ, addressing Indra, who, he conceived, had insulted him, thus
speaks of that sage's amiable temper, as contrasted with his own fierce and revengeful
disposition: 15. Nāhaṁ kripāhu-hridayo na cha māṁ bhajate kshamaṁ | anye te mun-
dreadful measures for the destruction of Viśvāmitra. To recover those sons from the abode of Yama, he would not overstep fate, as the ocean respects its shores. Having gained this great self-mastering personage, the kings of Ikshvāku’s race acquired (the dominion of) this earth. Obtaining this most excellent of rishis for their family-priest, they offered sacrifices. This Brāhmaṇa-rishi officiated as priest for all those monarchs, as Vṛihaspati does for the gods. 6645. Wherefore let some desirable, virtuous Brāhmaṇa, with whom righteousness is the chief thing, and skilled in Vedic observances, be selected for this office. Let a well-born Kshattriya, who wishes to subdue the earth, first of all appoint a family-priest in order that he may augment his dominion. Let a king, who desires to conquer the earth, give precedence to the Brahmanical power.” The Gandharva then, at Arjuna’s request, goes on (verses 6650 ff.) to relate the “ancient story of Vaśishṭha” (vaśishṭham ākhyānam purānam) and to describe the cause of enmity between that rishi and Viśvāmitra. It happened that the latter, who was son of Gādhi, king of Kānyakubja (Kanouj), and grandson of Kuśika, when out hunting, came to the hermitage of Vaśishṭha, where he was received with all honour, entertained together with his attendants with delicious food and drink, and presented with precious jewels and dresses obtained by the sage from his wonder-working cow, the fulfilter of all his desires. The cupidity of Viśvāmitra is aroused by the sight of this beautiful animal (all of whose fine points are enumerated in the legend), and he offers Vaśishṭha a hundred million cows, or his kingdom, in exchange for her. Vaśishṭha, however, replies that he is unable to part with her even in return for the kingdom. Viśvāmitra then tells him that he will enforce the law of the stronger: 6665. “I am a Kshattriya, thou art a Brāhmaṇa, whose functions are austere fervour, and sacred study. How can there be any vigour in Brāhmaṇs who are calm and self-restrained? Since thou dost not give up to me, in exchange for a

*aṭṭha S’akra Durvūsasam avehi māṃ | Gautamādīhīr anyais tvaṁ gavam āpūdito mudhā | akṣhanti-stōra-sarvasvaṁ Durvūsasam avehi māṃ | 17. Vaśuḥṭhaḍyaṁ dayāśūraṁ stotraṁ kureddhāṁ uchēkakāṁ | garvaṁ gato ‘si yenaiṣvam māṁ athādṛgānasam- manye | 15. “I am not tender-hearted: patience lodges not in me. Those munis are different: know me to be Durvūss. 16. In vain hast thou been rendered proud by Gautama and others: know me to be Durvūss, whose nature and whose entire substance is inaccessibility. 17. Thou hast become proud through the loud praises of Vaśuḥṭha and other merciful saints, since thou thus contemnest me to-day.”*
hundred million of cows, that which I desire, I shall not abandon my own class-characteristic; I will carry away the cow by force.” Vaśishṭha, confident, no doubt, of his own superior power, tells him to do as he proposes without loss of time. Viśvāmitra accordingly seizes the wonder-working cow; but she will not move from the hermitage, though beaten with whip and stick, and pushed hither and thither. Witnessing this, Vaśishṭha asks her what he, a patient Brāhmaṇa, can do? She demands of him why he overlooks the violence to which she is subjected. Vaśishṭha replies: “Force is the strength of Kṣattriyas, patience that of Brāhmaṇas. As patience possesses me, go, if thou pleasest” (6676. Kṣattriyāṇāṁ balaṁ tejo brāhmaṇāṇāṁ kṣamaṁ balaṁ | kṣamaṁ māṁ bhajate yasmāṁ gamyatāṁ yadi rochate). The cow enquires if he means to abandon her; as, unless he forsakes her, she can never be carried off by force. She is assured by Vaśishṭha that he does not forsake her, and that she should remain if she could. “Hearing these words of her master, the cow tosses her head aloft, assumes a terrific aspect, (6680) her eyes become red with rage, she utters a deep bellowing sound, and puts to flight the entire army of Viśvāmitra. Being (again) beaten with whip and stick, and pushed hither and thither, she becomes more incensed, her eyes are red with anger, her whole body, kindled by her indignation, glows like the noonday sun, she discharges showers of firebrands from her tail, creates Pahlavas from the same member, Drāviḍas and Sākas, Yavanas, Sabaras,” Kānchis, Sarabhās, Paunḍras, Kirātas, Sinhalas, Vaśas, and other tribes of armed warriors from her sweat, urine, excrement, etc., who assail Viśvāmitra’s army, and put it to a complete rout. 6692. “Beholding this great miracle, the product of Brahmanical might, Viśvāmitra was humbled at (the impotence of) a Kṣattriya’s nature, and exclaimed, ‘Shame on a Kṣattriya’s force; it is the force of a Brāhmaṇa’s might that is force indeed.’ Examining what was and was not force, and (ascertaining) that austere fervour is the supreme force, he abandoned his prosperous kingdom and all its brilliant regal splendour; and casting all enjoyments behind its back, he devoted himself to austerity. Having by this means attained perfection, and Brāhmaṇhood, he arrested the worlds by his fiery vigour, and disturbed them all by the blaze of his glory; and at length the Kauśīka drank soma with Indra.” 196

196 See above, p. 342, and note 134.
The same legend is repeated in the Śālayaparvan, verses 2295 ff.:

Tathā cha Kauśikas tāta tapo-nitya jītenāvah | tapasā vai sutaptena brahmānātvan avāptavān | Gādhir nāma mahān aśīt khaṭṭāriyaḥ prathito bhṛva | tasya putro bhavaḥ rājan Viśvāmitraḥ pratāpavān | sa rūjā Kauśikas tāta mahāyogy abhavat kila | sa putram abhisichyātha Viśvāmitram mahātapaḥ | deha-nyāse manāḥ chakro tam uchh prajāpāḥ pra-

jāḥ | “na gantavam mahāprājnā trāhi chāṣmān mahābhayāt” | evam uktāḥ pratyuvācha tato Gādhīḥ prajās tataḥ | “viśvasya jagato goptā bhavishyati suto mama” | 2300. Ity uktvā tu tato Gādhir Viśvāmitraṁ nivesya cha | jagāma trīdīvan rājaṃ Viśvāmitraḥ bhavaḥ nripañ | na sa saknoti prithiśvīḥ yatnavaṇ āpi raksitum | tataḥ suṣravā rūjā sa rākṣha-

sebhyaḥ mahābhayaḥ | niryayaṁ nagarāḥ chāpi chatur-anga-balānvitaḥ | sa yātvā dārām adhivānam Vaśiṣṭhāśravam abhyagat | tasya te saṁiṅkāḥ rūjāṁṣ chakravat tratrālayān bhūn | tatas tu bhagavān vipro Vaśiṣṭhaḥ Brahmāṇāḥ sutaḥ | daḍṛise-tha tataḥ sarvam bhajyānām mahāvandām | tasya kruddāḥ mahārāja Vaśiṣṭhaḥ muni-sattamaḥ | 2305. “Srījaseva Su-

varāṅ ghorān” iti svāṁ gāṁ uvaça ha | tathoktaṁ sa ’ṣrijad dhenuḥ pu-
rushān ghorā-darśanaḥ | te cha tad balam āśādyā bhaṅjanāḥ sarvato diśam | tach chhrutvā vidrūtan saṁyāṁ Viśvāmitras tu Gādhījaḥ | tapaḥ param manyāmānas tapasy eva mano udieh | so ’smiṁs thirsta-varā rājan Sarasvatīyāḥ samāhitaḥ | niyamaṁi choparāsaiṁ cha karshayanah deham at-

manāḥ | jalāhāra vayubhakṣāḥ pariḥārāḥ cha so ’bhavaḥ | tathā sthan-

āda-sāya cha ye chāya niyamaḥ prithāk | asakrit tasya devaṁ tu vrata-
vighnam prachakrire | 2310. Na chāya niyamaś ca bhūdhira apayati mahā-

manāḥ | tataḥ pareṇa yatnena tapaṁ bahu-vidhāṁ tapaḥ | tejāsa bhāṣa-
rākāro Gādhījaḥ samapadyata | tapasā tu tathā yuktāṁ Viśvāmitram Pitāmahaḥ | amanyata mahātejāḥ vara-do varam asya tat | sa tu vavo varāṁ rūjān “syāṁ aham brahmānas to” iti | tathiḥ cha brahmā Viśvāmitrā sarva-loka-pitāmahaḥ | sa labdheva tapasogrāma brahmānātvan mahāyasāḥ | vichāhāra mahisho kriṣṇaṁ kriyākamāṁ evopamaḥ | 2295. So too the Kauśika, constant in austerities, and subduing his senses, acquired Brāhmaṇhood by the severity of his exercises. There was a great Kshattriya named Gādhī, renowned in the world, whose son was the powerful Viśvāmitra. This Kauśika prince (Gādhī) was greatly addicted to contemplation (mahāyogī): and after having installed his son as king, he resolved to abandon his corporeal existence. His subjects, however, submissively said to him, ‘Do not go, o great sage, but deliver
us from our great alarm.' He replied, 'My son shall become the protector of the whole world.' 2300. Having accordingly installed Viśvāmitra, Gādhi went to heaven, and his son became king. Viśvāmitra, however, though energetic, was unable to protect the earth. He then heard that there was great cause of apprehension from the Rākshasas, and issued forth from the city, with an army consisting of four kinds of forces. Having performed a long journey, he arrived at the hermitage of Vaśishṭha. There his soldiers constructed many dwellings. In consequence the divine Brāhmaṇ Vaśishṭha, son of Brāhmaṇ, beheld the whole forest being cut up; and becoming enraged, he said to his cow, (2305) 'Create terrible Savarās.' The cow, so addressed, created men of dreadful aspect, who broke and scattered in all directions the army of Viśvāmitra. Hearing of this rout of his army, the son of Gādhi devoted himself to austerities, which he regarded as the highest (resource). In this sacred spot on the Sarasvatī he macerated his body with acts of self-restraint and fastings, absorbed in contemplation, and living on water, air, and leaves, sleeping on the sacrificial ground, and practising all the other rites. Several times the gods threw impediments in his way; (2310) but his attention was never distracted from his observances. Having thus with strenuous effort undergone manifold austerities, the son of Gādhi became luminous as the sun; and Brāhmaṇ regarded his achievements as most eminent. The boon which Viśvāmitra chose was to become a Brāhmaṇ; and Brāhmaṇ replied, 'So be it.' Having attained Brāhmaṇhood, the object of his desire, by his severe austerities, the renowned sage traversed the whole earth, like a god.'

We have already seen how the power of austere fervour (tapas) is exemplified in the legend of Nahusha (above, pp. 308 ff.). In regard to the sense of this word tapas, and the potency of the exercise which it denotes, I may refer to my articles in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1865, p. 348 f., and for 1864, p. 63, as well as to the fourth volume of this work, pp. 20 ff. and 288; and to pp. 23 and 28 of the present volume. In further illustration of the same subject I quote the following panegyric upon tapas from Manu, xi. 234 ff. where, however, the word cannot have the same sense in all the verses:

Tapo-mūlam idāṁ sarvam daiva-mūnushakaṁ sukham | tapo-madhyanāṁ budhaiḥ proktan tapo 'ntaṁ veda-darsābhīḥ | 235. Brāhmaṇasya tapo jnānam tapah kṣhattrasya rakṣaṇam | vaiśyasya tu tapo vārttā tapah śūdra-
394. EARLY CONTESTS BETWEEN


“234. All the enjoyment, whether of gods or men, has its root, its centre, and its end in tapas; so it is declared by the wise who have studied the Veda. 235. Knowledge is a Brāhmaṇ’s tapas; protection that of a Kshatriya; traffic that of Vaiśya; and service that of a Śūdra. 236. It is by tapas that rishis of subdued souls, subsisting on fruits, roots, and air obtain a vision of the three worlds with all things moving and stationary. 237. Medicines, health, science, and the various divine conditions are attained by tapas alone as their instrument of acquisition. 238. Whatever is hard to be traversed, or obtained, or reached, or effected, is all to be accomplished through tapas, of which the potency is irresistible. 239. Both those who are guilty of the great sins, and all other transgressors, are freed from sin by fervid tapas. 240. Worms, serpents, insects, beasts, birds, and beings without motion attain to heaven through the force of tapas. 241. Whatever sin men commit by thought, word, or bodily acts, by tapas they speedily consume it all, when they become rich in devotion. 242. The gods both accept the sacrifices and augment the enjoyments of the Brāhmaṇ who has been purified by tapas. 243. It was by tapas that Prajāpati the lord created this scripture; and through it that the rishis obtained the Vedas. 244. Such is the great dignity which the gods ascribe to tapas, beholding its transcendent merit.”

I return for a moment to the story of Vasishṭha and his cow. Lassen remarks (Ind. Alt. 2nd ed. i. 631, note) that Atharvan is given
in the Lexicons as a name of Vasishtha (see Wilson's Dictionary, s.v.).
Weber (Ind. St. i. 289) quotes from Mallinātha's Commentary on the
the Kirātārjunīya the following words: Athavanās tu mantrodāhāro
Vasishṭhena kṛitaḥ ity āgamaḥ | "There is a passage of scripture to the
effect that the mantras of the Atharvan were selected by Vasishtha."
In Böhtlingk and Roth's Lexicon, s.v. Atharvan, it is noticed that the
eleventh hymn of the fifth book of the Atharva-veda contains a conver-
sation between Atharvan and Varuṇa about the possession of a wonder-
ful cow bestowed by the latter on the former; and it is remarked that
this circumstance may explain the subsequent identification of Atharvan
with Vasishtha. Prof. Roth, however (Diss. on the A.V., Tübingen,
1865, p. 9), thinks the two sages are distinct. The cow is spoken of
in A.V. vii. 104, as the "brindled cow given by Varuṇa to Atharvan
which never lacked a calf" (priśnṝṁ dhenuṁ Varuṇenā dattāṁ Athar-
vaṇe nitya-vatsāṁ). The following is the curious hymn referred to:

A.V. v. 11, 1. Katham mahe asurāya abhrvāḥ iha katham pitre haraye
tveṣha-nyimrāḥ | priśnṝṁ Varuṇa dakshīnāṁ dādāvān punarmaghatvam.187
manasaḥ 'chikitisth | 2. Na kāmena punarmagho bhavāmi saṁ chakshe kam
priśnṝṁ etām upāyo | kena nu tvam Atharvan kāvyena kena jātena asi
jāta-vedāḥ | 3. Satyam ahaṁ gabhirāḥ kāvyena satyaṁ jātena asmi jāta-
vedāḥ | na me dāso na āryyo mahītvā vrataṁ mimāyā yad ahaṁ ḍha-
rishye | 4. Na tvād anyāḥ kavitaro na medhayā dhītrataro Varuṇa svad-
hāvan | tvāṁ tā viṣṇu bhūwanāṁ vēṭha sa chid nu tvaj jano māyā
bibhāya | 5. Tvāṁ hi anga Varuṇa svadhāvan viṣṇa vēṭha jānīma supra-
ṇīte | kiṁ rajasaḥ enā paro anyad asti enā kiṁ pārena avaram anūra | 6.
Ekaṁ rajasaḥ enā paro anyad asti enā paraḥ skena āruṇasaṁ chid
avāk | tat te viḍvān Varuṇa pra brāvīmi adhvarahasaṁ pāṇayo bhav-
antu | niçhair dasāḥ upa sarpantu bhūmin | 7. Tvāṁ hi anga Varuṇa
bravishi punarmagheśu avadyāni bhūrī | mo shu pānir abhi etāvato bhūr
mā tvā vocaṁ arāḍhasaṁ jānasaḥ | 8. Mā mā vocoṁ arāḍhasaṁ
jānasaḥ puṇas te priśnṝṁ jāriṣo dādāṁ | stotro me viṣvan ā yāṁ
sacchibhir antar viṣvāsān mānushaṁ viṣku | 9. Ā te stotro ni udayāṁ
yantu antar viṣvāsān mānushaṁ viṣku | dehi nu me yad me ādattō asi
yuṣyō me sapta-padaḥ sakhā 'sī | 10. Samāno bandhur Varuṇa samā jā
vedāmāṁ tad yad nāv eshā samā jā | dādāṁ tam yat te ādattō asmi yuṣyās

187 This is the reading proposed by Professor Aufrecht instead of punarmagha tvam,
which is found in Roth and Whitney's edition of the A.V.
to sapta-padaḥ sakhā’ṣmi | 11. Devo devāya grīnate vayodāḥ vipro viprāya stuvate sumedhāḥ | ajjano hi Varuṇa svadhāvann Atharvanam pītaram deva-bandhum | tasmaī u rādhāḥ krīṇahi supraśastaṃ sakhā no asi para- naś cha bandhum |

1. (Atharvan speaks) "How hast thou, who art mighty in energy, declared before the great deity, how before the shining father (that the cow was mine)? Having bestowed a brindled cow (on me) as a sacrificial gift, thou hast resolved in thy mind to take her back. 2. (Varuṇa replies) It is not through desire that I revoke the gift; I drive hither this brindled cow that I may contemplate her. But by what wisdom, o Atharvan, in virtue of what nature, doest thou know the nature of beings? 3. (Atharvan answers) In truth I am profound in wisdom; in truth by my nature I know the nature of beings. Neither Dāsa nor Āryya can hinder the design which I shall undertake. 4. There is none other wiser or sager in understanding than thou, o self-dependent Varuṇa. Thou knowest all creatures; even the man of deep devices is afraid of thee. 5. Thou, o self-dependent Varuṇa, o wise director, knowest all creatures. What other thing is beyond this atmosphere? and what is nearer than that remotest thing, o thou unerring? 6. (Varuṇa replies) There is one thing beyond this atmosphere; and on this side of that one there is that which is near though inaccessible. Knowing that thing I declare it to thee. Let the glory of the niggards be cast down; let the Dāsas sink downward into the earth. 7. (Atharvan rejoins) Thou, o Varuṇa, sayest many evil things of those who revoke their gifts. Be not thou numbered among so many niggards; let not men call thee illiberal. 8. (Varuṇa replies) Let not men call me illiberal; I restore to thee, o worshipper, the brindled cow. Attend with all thy powers at every hymn in my honour among all the tribes of men. 9. (Atharvan answers) Let hymns ascend to thee among all the tribes of men. Give me that which thou hast taken from me; thou art to me an intimate friend of seven-fold value. 10. We two have a common bond, o Varuṇa, a common descent. I know what this common descent of ours is. (Varuṇa answers) I give thee that which I

188 Professor Aufrecht thinks that Dyauṣ, 'the Heaven,' is denoted by mahe asura, and that pītra haraya, if the correct reading, can only mean the Sun, the word hari being several times applied to that great luminary. I am otherwise indebted to Prof. A. for the correct sense of this line, and for other suggestions.
have taken from thee. I am thy intimate friend of seven-fold value, who, myself a god, confer life on thee a god [or priest, devāya] who praisest me, an intelligent sage on thee a sage. (The poet says) Thou, o self-dependent Varuṇa, hast begotten our father Atharvan, a kinsman of the gods. Grant to him most excellent wealth; thou art our friend and most eminent kinsman.”

SECT. XI.—The same, and other legends, according to the Rāmāyana.

The story told in the preceding section is related at greater length in chapters 51–65 of the Bālakāṇḍa, or first book, of the Rāmāyana, of which I shall furnish an outline, noting any important variations from, or additions to, the account in the Mahābhārata, and at the same time giving an abstract of the other legends which are interwoven with the narrative. There was formerly, we are told, a king called Kuśa, son of Prajāpati, who had a son called Kuśanābha, who was father of Gādhi, the father of Viśvāmitra. The latter ruled the earth for many thousand years. On one occasion, when he was making a circuit of the earth, he came to Vaśishta’s hermitage, the pleasant abode of many saints, sages, and holy devotees (chapter 51, verses 11–29), where, after at first declining, he allowed himself to be hospitably entertained with his followers by the son of Brahmā (ch. 52). Viśvāmitra (ch. 53), however, coveting the wondrous cow, which had supplied all the dainties of the feast, first of all asked that she should be given to him in exchange for a hundred thousand common cows, adding that “she was a gem, that gems were the property of the king, and that, therefore, the cow was his by right” (53, 9. Ratnaṁ hi bhagavann etad ratnapārī cha pārthivaḥ | 10. Tasmād me śabalam dehi ma-maishā dharmato dvija). On this price being refused, the king advances immensely in his offers, but all without effect. He then proceeds (ch. 54)—very ungratefully and tyrannically, it must be allowed—to have the cow removed by force, but she breaks away from his attendants, and rushes back to her master, complaining that he was deserting her. He replies that he was not deserting her, but that the king was

169 These are the sections of Schlegel’s and the Bombay editions, which correspond to sections 52–67 of Goresio’s edition.
much more powerful than he. She answers, 54, 14: Na balaṁ kṣat-
triyaśyāhur brāhmaṇāḥ balaṁvatārāḥ | brāhmaṇa brāhma-balaṁ divyāṁ
kṣatrirūch cha balabhattaram | aprameyam balaṁ tubhyāṁ na tvayā bala-
vattaraḥ | Viśvāmitro mahāvīryo tejas tava durāsādama | niyunktavā mām
mahātejas tvam brahma-bala-sambhritām | tasya darpam balaṁ yatnāṁ
nāsyāmi durātmanāḥ | "Men do not ascribe strength to a Kshattriya:
the Brāhmans are stronger. The strength of Brāhmans is divine, and
superior to that of Kshattriyas. 15. Thy strength is immeasurable.
Viśvāmitra, though of great vigour, is not more powerful than thou.
Thy energy is invincible. Commission me, who have been acquired by
thy Brahmanical power, and I will destroy the pride, and force, and
attempt of this wicked prince." 100 She accordingly by her bellowing
creates hundreds of Pahlavas, who destroy the entire host (nāsayanti
balaṁ sarvam, verse 19) of Viśvāmitra, but are slain by him in their
turn. Sakas and Yavanas, of great power and valour, and well armed,
were then produced, who consumed the king’s soldiers,101 but were
routed by him. The cow then (ch. 55) calls into existence by her
bellowing, and from different parts of her body, other warriors of
various tribes, who again destroyed Viśvāmitra’s entire army, foot
soldiers, elephants, horses, chariots, and all. A hundred of the mon-
arch’s sons, armed with various weapons, then rushed in great fury
on Vaśishṭha, but were all reduced to ashes in a moment by the blast
of that sage’s mouth.102 Viśvāmitra, being thus utterly vanquished and
humbled, appointed one of his sons to be regent, and travelled to the
Himalaya, where he betook himself to ansterities, and thereby obtained
a vision of Mahādeva, who at his desire revealed to him the science
of arms in all its branches, and gave him celestial weapons with which,
elated and full of pride, he consumed the hermitage of Vaśishṭha, and
put its inhabitants to flight. Vaśishṭha then threatens Viśvāmitra and

100 Compare Manu, xi. 32: Sva-vīryāḥ rājas-vīryāḥ cha sva-vīryam balavattaram |
tāṃśat svanaiśa vīryena nigrihṇiyād arīṁ duvajāḥ | “Of the two, his own, and a king’s
might, let a Brāhman know that his own is superior. By his own might alone, there-
fore, let him restrain his enemies.”

101 We had been before told that they had, been killed, so that this looks like a
slaying of the slain, as no resuscitation of the army is alluded to.

102 On this the Commentator remarks that “though these princes were Kshattriyas,
they were not actual kings, and had acted tyrannically; so that a very slight expiation
was required for killing them” (kṣatririgatve ’pi prithivī-putītvabhavāt tad-badh
alpa-prāyaścitām ātatāyītvāh cha |).
uplifts his Brahmanical mace. Viśvāmitra, too, raises his fiery weapon and calls out to his adversary to stand. Vaśishṭha bids him to show his strength, and boasts that he will soon humble his pride. He asks:

(56, 4) Kva cha te kṣhattriya-balam kva cha brahma-balam mahat | pāśya brahma-balaṁ divyam mama kṣhattriya-pāṁśana | tasyāstram Gādhiputraśya ghoram āgyeyam udyatam | brahma-dandaṁ tach chhāntam agner cegah ivāmbhasā | ‘‘What comparison is there between a Kṣhattriya’s might, and the great might of a Brāhman? Behold, thou contemptible Kṣhattriya, my divine Brahmanical power.’’ The dreadful fiery weapon uplifted by the son of Gādhi was then quenched by the rod of the Brāhman, as fire is by water.’’ Many and various other celestial missiles, as the nooses of Brahmā, Kāla (Time), and Varuṇa, the discus of Viṣṇu, and the trident of Śiva, were hurled by Viśvāmitra at his antagonist, but the son of Brahmā swallowed them up in his all-devouring mace. Finally, to the intense consternation of all the gods, the warrior shot off the terrific weapon of Brāhman (brāhmāstra); but this was equally ineffectual against the Brahmanical sage. Vaśishṭha had now assumed a direful appearance: (58, 18) Roma-kūpeshu sarveshu Vaśishṭhasya maḥatmanah | marichyah iva nishpetur agner dhūmākulaṁcaḥ iṣṭaḥ | prājvalaṁ brahma-dandaṁ cha Vaśishṭhasya karodyaḥ | vidhūmaṁ iva kālagnir Yama-dandaṁ ivāparaḥ | ‘‘Jets of fire mingled with smoke darted from the pores of his body; (19) the Brahmanical mace blazed in his hand like a smokeless123 mundane conflagration, or a second sceptre of Yāma.’’ Being appeased, however, by the munis, who proclaimed his superiority to his rival, the sage stayed his vengeance; and Viśvāmitra exclaimed with a groan: (56, 23) Dhig balam kṣhattriya-balam brahma-tejo-balam balam | ekena brahma-dandaṁ sarvāstrīḥiḥ hatāni me | ‘‘Shame on a Kṣhattriya’s strength: the strength of a Brāhman’s might alone is strength: by the single Brahmanical mace all my weapons have been destroyed.’’’ No alternative now remains to the humiliated monarch, but either to acquiesce in this helpless inferiority, or to work out his own elevation to the Brahmanical order. He embraces the latter alternative: (56, 24) Taṁ ātaṁ prasamīkṣhayāham prasannendriya-mānasah | tapo mahat samāsthāseye yad vai brahmaṁva-kāraṇam | ‘‘Having pondered well this defeat, I shall betake myself, with composed senses and mind,

123 The Bombay edition has vidhūmaḥ. Schlegel’s and Gorresio’s editions have sadhūmaḥ, ‘‘enveloped in smoke.’’
to strenuous austere fervour, which shall exalt me to the rank of a Brāhmaṇ.” Intensely vexed and mortified, groaning and full of hatred against his enemy, he travelled with his queen to the south, and carried his resolution into effect; (ch. 57) and we are first of all told that three sons Havishyanda, Madhusyanda, and Dṛṇḍhanetra were born to him. At the end of a thousand years Brahmā appeared, and announced that he had conquered the heaven of royal sages (rājarśhis); and, in consequence of his austere fervour, he was recognised as having attained that rank. Viśvāmitra, however, was ashamed, grieved, and incensed at the offer of so very inadequate a reward, and exclaimed: “‘I have practised intense austerity, and the gods and rishis regard me only as a rājarśhi!’ Austerities, it appears, are altogether fruitless” (57, 5. Jitāḥ rājarśhi-lokās te tapasā Kuśikātmana | 6. Anena tapasā tvam hi rājarśhir iti vidamahe | . . . 7. Viśvāmitro yī tach chhṛtvā hriyā kiṃcid avān-mukhaḥ | duḥkṣena mahātā ’visṭaḥ samany-yur idam abravit | tapas cha sumahat taptam rājarśhir iti māṁ vidūḥ | devāḥ sarshi-guṇāḥ sarve nāsti manyo tapas-philam |). Notwithstanding

124 The Vishnu Purāṇa, iii. 6, 21, says: “There are three kinds of rishis: Brāhmaṇr̥ṣhis, after them Dvārakshis, and after them Rājarśhis” (jneyāḥ brahmarśhayāḥ pūrvaḥ teḥhyo devarśhayāḥ punah | rājarśhayāḥ punah teḥhyo rishi-prakṛtyāyas trayeh |). Böhtlingk and Roth, s.v. rishi, mention also (on the authority of the vocabulary called Tīrkaṇḍasēsha) the words māharsēhi (great rishi), pārmarśhi (most eminent rishi), strutarśhi (secondary rishi), and kūḍharśhi, who is explained s.v. to be a teacher of a particular portion (kūḍa) of the Veda. Dvārakshis are explained by Professor Wilson (V.P. i. 6, 21, paraphrasing the text of the Vishnu Purāṇa), to be “sages who are demi-gods also;” Brāhmaṇr̥ṣhis to be “sages who are sons of Brahmā or Brahmans;” and Rājarśhis to be “princes who have adopted a life of devotion.” In a note he adds: “A similar enumeration is given in the Vāyu, with some additions: Rishi is derived from rish, ‘to go to,’ or ‘approach;’ the Brahmarśhis, it is said, are descendants of the five patriarchs, who were the founders of races or gotras of Brahmans, or Kaśyapa, Vasishṭha, Angiras, Atri, and Bhrigū; the Dvārakshis are Nara and Nārāyana, the sons of Dharma; the Bālakhyas, who sprang from Kṛta; Kardama, the son of Pulaha; Kuvera, the son of Pulastra; Achala, the son of Praṭyūsha; Nārada and Parvata, the sons of Kaśyapa. Rājarśhis are Ikshvāku and other princes. The Brahmarśhis dwell in the sphere.of Brahmā; the Dvārakshis in the region of the gods; and the Rājarśhis in the heaven of Indra.” Brahmarśhis are evidently rishis who were priests; and Rājarśhis, rishis of kingly extraction. If so, a Dvārakṣi, having a divine character, should be something higher than either. Professor Roth, following apparently the Tīrkaṇḍaśēsa, defines them as “rishis dwelling among the gods.” I am not aware how far back this classification of rishis goes in Indian literature. Roth, s.v. rishi, brahmaṇr̥ṣhi and dvārakshī does not give any references to these words as occurring in the Brāhmaṇas; and they are not found in the hymns of the R.V. where, however, the “seven rishis” are mentioned. Regarding rājarśhis see pp. 266 ff. above.
this disappointment, he had ascended one grade, and forthwith recommenced his work of mortification.

At this point of time his austerities were interrupted by the following occurrences: King Trisanku, one of Ikshvaku’s descendants, had conceived the design of celebrating a sacrifice by virtue of which he should ascend bodily to heaven. As Vasishtha, on being summoned, declared that the thing was impossible (asakyan), Trisanku travelled to the south, where the sage’s hundred sons were engaged in austerities, and applied to them to do what their father had declined. Though he addressed them with the greatest reverence and humility, and added that “the Ikshvakus regarded their family-priests as their highest resource in difficulties, and that, after their father, he himself looked to them as his tutelary deities” (57, 22. Ikshvakyanam hi sarveśhām purodhāḥ paramā gatiḥ | tasmād anantaram sarve bhavanto daivatam mama), he received from the haughty priests the following rebuke for his presumption: (58, 2) Pratyākhyāto ‘si durbudde guruṇa satyavādinā | taṁ kathāṁ samatikramya sakhāntaram upayīvan | 3. Ikshvakyanam hi sarveśhām purodhāḥ paramā gatiḥ | na chātyakramitum śakyam vachanaṁ satyavādinaḥ | 4. “Asakyan” iti chovācha Vasishtho bhagavān rishiḥ | taṁ vayaṁ vai samāhārttum kratuṁ saktāḥ kathāṁ tava | 5. Bāliśas tvam nara-breshtha gamyatāṁ sva-puram puraḥ | yajane bhagavān saktas traiokyasyāpyi pārthiva | avamānam kathāṁ kartuṁ tasya śaktiṣyāmahe vayaṁ | “Fool, thou hast been refused by thy truth-speaking preceptor. How is it that, disregarding his authority, thou hast resorted to another school (śākha)? 186

3. The family-priest is the highest oracle of all the Ikshvakus; and the command of that veracious personage cannot be transgressed. 4. Vasishtha, the divine rishi, has declared that ‘the thing cannot be;’ and how can we undertake thy sacrifice? 5. Thou art foolish, king; return to thy capital. The divine (Vasishtha) is competent to

186 It does not appear how Trisanku, in asking the aid of Vasishtha’s sons after applying in vain to their father, could be charged with resorting to another śākha (school), in the ordinary sense of that word: as it is not conceivable that the sons should have been of another Śākha from the father, whose cause they espouse with so much warmth. The Commentator in the Bombay edition explains the word śākhaantaram as = yajanādinā rakṣakāntaram, “one who by sacrificing for thee, etc., will be another protector.” Gorresio’s Gauda text, which may often be used as a commentary on the older one, has the following paraphrase of the words in question, ch. 60, 3: Mūlam uterīya kasmīt tvam śākhāv ichchāsī tambitum | “Why, forsaking the root, dost thou desire to hang upon the branches.”
act as priest of the three worlds; how can we shew him disrespect?" Triśanku then gave them to understand, that as his preceptor and "his preceptor's sons had declined compliance with his requests, he should think of some other expedient." In consequence of his venturing to express this presumptuous intention, they condemned him by their imprecation to become a Chandaśa (58, 7. "Pratyākhyāto bhagavata guru-putrais tathaiva cha | anyāṁ gatim gamishyāṁ svasti vo 'stu tapodhanāḥ" | rishi-putrās tu taḥ chhruṭvā vākyam ghorābhisamhitam | sepuḥ parama-sankruddhaś "chandaśatvam gamishyast""). As this curse soon took effect, and the unhappy king's form was changed into that of a degraded outcast, he resorted to Viśvāmitra (who, as we have seen, was also dwelling at this period in the south), enlarging on his own virtues and piety, and bewailing his fate. Viśvāmitra commiserated his condition (ch. 59), and promised to sacrifice on his behalf, and exalt him to heaven in the same Chandāla-form to which he had been condemned by his preceptors' curse. "Heaven is now as good as in thy possession, since thou hast resorted to the son of Kuśika" (59, 4. Guru-śaṇa-kri-taṁ rūpaṁ yad idāṁ tvayi vartate | anena saha rūpeṇa saṣārītra gamishyasi | hastā-prāptaṁ aham manye svargaṁ tava narādhipa | yas tvam Kuśikam āgamyā śaranyaṁ śaranaṁ gataḥ |). He then directed that preparations should be made for the sacrifice, and that all the rishis, including the family of Vaśishṭha, should be invited to the ceremony. The disciples of Viśvāmitra, who had conveyed his message, reported the result on their return in these words: (59, 11) Srutvā te vachanaṁ sarve samāyānti dvijātayaḥ | sarva-desesu chāgachhan varjāyitaḥ Maha-dayam | Vaśishṭhaṁ taḥ chhataṁ sarvaṁ krodha-paryakulakṣham | yad uvācha vacho ghorāṁ śrīnu tvam muni-punava | "kṣhattriyo yājaka yasya chandaśasya viśeshaṁ | katham sadasi bhoktāro havis tasya sura-śayoḥ | brāhmaṇaṁ vā mahāmāno bhuktva chandaśa-bhajanam | katham svargam gamishyanti Viśvāmitreṇa pālitāṁ" | etad vachana-naishthuryyam uhuch saṁrakto lochanāḥ | Vaśishṭhaṁ muni-sārdulā sarve saha-mahodayaḥ | "Having heard your message, all the Brāhmans are assembling in all the countries, and have arrived, excepting Mahodaya (Vaśishṭha?). Hear what dreadful words those hundred Vaśishṭhas, their voices quivering with rage, have uttered: 'How can the gods and rishis 106 con-

106 The rishis as priests (ritoḥ) would be entitled to eat the remains of the sacrifice, according to the Commentator.
sume the oblation at the sacrifice of that man, especially if he be a Chanḍāla, for whom a Kshatriya is officiating-priest? How can illustrious Brāhmans ascend to heaven, after eating the food of a Chanḍāla, and being entertained by Viśvāmitra? ’ These ruthless words all the Vaśishṭhas, together with Mahodaya, uttered, their eyes inflamed with anger.’* Viśvāmitra, who was greatly incensed on receiving this message, by a curse doomed the sons of Vaśishṭha to be reduced to ashes, and reborn as degraded outcasts (mṛitapāḥ) for seven hundred births, and Mahodaya to become a Nishāda. Knowing that this curse had taken effect (ch. 60), Viśvāmitra then, after eulogizing Triśanku, proposed to the assembled rishis that the sacrifice should be celebrated. To this they assented, being actuated by fear of the terrible sage’s wrath. Viśvāmitra himself officiated at the sacrifice as yājāka;** and the other rishis as priests (ritvijāḥ) (with other functions) performed all the ceremonies. Viśvāmitra next invited the gods to partake of the oblations: (60, 11) Nābhagaman yadā tattva bhāgārthāṃ sarva-devatāḥ | tataḥ kopa-saṁvishṭo Viśvāmitro mahāmuniḥ | evam uḍayamya sakrodhhas Triśankum idam abravit | ‘paśya me tapasa vīryam svārjītasya nareśvara | esha tvām svāsarītēna nayām svargaṃ ojasā | dusprāpyam svāsarītēna svargaṁ gachchha nareśvara | svārjītēṃ kinchid āpy asti mayā hi tapasaḥ phalam | ‘When, however, the deities did not come to receive their portions, Viśvāmitra became full of wrath, and raising aloft the sacrificial ladle, thus addressed Triśanku: ‘Behold, o monarch, the power of austere fervour acquired by my own efforts. I myself, by my own energy, will conduct thee to heaven. Ascend to that celestial region which is so arduous to attain in an earthly body. I have surely earned some reward of my austerity.’* Triśanku ascended instantly to heaven in the sight of the munis. Indra, however, ordered him to be gone, as a person who, having incurred the curse of his spiritual preceptors, was unfit for the abode of the celestials;—and to fall down headlong to earth (60, 17. Triśanko gaccha bhūyas tvam nāsi svarga-kritālayaḥ | guru-śaṣa-hato mūḍha pata bhūmim avāk-śirāḥ ). He accordingly began to descend, invoking loudly, as he fell, the help of his spiritual patron. Viśvāmitra, greatly incensed, called out to him to stop: (60, 20) Tato brahma-tapo-yogāt Prajāpatir ivāparaḥ | sasajjās dakshine bhāge saptarshin aparāṇ punaḥ | dakshināṃ diśam āsthaya

---

197 This means as adhvaryu according to the Commentator.
rishi-madhye mahāyaśāḥ | nakśatra-mālām aparām asrijat kroḍha-
māroṣhitaḥ | anyam Indraṁ karishyāmi loko vā syād anindrakaḥ | daiva-
tāny api sa krodhāt srashtām samupachakrame |

 '"Then by the power of his divine knowledge and austere fervour he created, like another Prajāpati, other Seven Rishis (a constellation so called) in the southern part of the sky. Having proceeded to this quarter of the heavens, the renowned sage, in the midst of the rishis, formed another garland of stars, being overcome with fury. Exclaiming, 'I will create another Indra, or the world shall have no Indra at all,' he began, in his rage, to call gods also into being.' The rishis, gods (Suras), and Asuras now became seriously alarmed and said to Viśvāmitra, in a conciliatory tone, that Triśanku, "as he had been cursed by his preceptors, should not be admitted bodily into heaven, until he had undergone some lustration" (60, 24. Ayaṁ rājā mahābhāga guru-sāpa-parikshataḥ | saṣarīro divam yātum nārhaty akrīta-pūvanah |).

The sage replied that he had given a promise to Triśanku, and appealed to the gods to permit his protégé to remain bodily in heaven, and the newly created stars to retain their places in perpetuity. The gods agreed that "these numerous stars should remain, but beyond the sun's path, and that Triśanku, like an immortal, with his head downwards, should shine among them, and be followed by them," adding "that his object would be thus attained, and his renown secured, and he would be like a dweller in heaven" (60, 29. Evam bhavatu bhadrāṁ te tīsthānta evām saśaśāḥ | gagane tāny anekāṇi vaisvānarā-pathāḥ vahih | nakṣatrāṇi muni-kṛṣṇha teṣu | jyotilakṣho jājvalaḥ | avāk-sirās Triśaṅkuḥ cha tīsthānto amara-sannibhāḥ | anuṣṭhāṇaḥ chaitāṁ jyotiṁshi niṁpa-sattamam | kṛitrāṁ kṛitrāṁ kṛitrāṁ cha svarga-loka-gataṁ yathā). Thus was this great dispute adjusted by a compromise, which Viśvāmitra accepted.

This story of Triśanku, it will have been observed, differs materially from the one quoted above (p. 375 ff.) from the Harivaṁśa; but brings out more distinctly the character of the conflict between Vaśishṭha and Viśvāmitra.

When all the gods and rishis had departed at the conclusion of the

186 I follow Schlegel's text, which differs verbally, though not in substance, both from the Bombay edition and from Gorresio's.

189 The last compound word akrītapūvanah, "without lustration," is given by Schlegel and Gorresio. The Bombay edition has instead of it eva topodhana, "o sage rich in austerity."
sacrifice, Visvamitra said to his attendant devotees: (61, 2) *Mahān vighnāḥ pravṛttī 'yaṁ dakṣiṇāṁ āstītī diśam | diśam anyāṁ pratapasyāmas tattra tapasyāmahe tepāḥ | “This has been a great interruption [to our austerities] which has occurred in the southern region; we must proceed in another direction to continue our penances.” He accordingly went to a forest in the west, and began his austerities anew. Here the narrative is again interrupted by the introduction of another story, that of king Ambārīśa, king of Ayodhyā, who was, according to the Rāmāyaṇa, the twenty-eighth in descent from Ikṣvākū, and the twenty-second from Triśāntu. (Compare the genealogy in the Rāmāyaṇa, i. 70, and ii. 110, 6 ff., with that in Wilson’s Vīṣṇu Purāṇa, vol. iii. pp. 260 ff., 280, 284 ff. and 303; which is different.) Visvamitra is nevertheless represented as flourishing contemporaneously with both of these princes. The story relates that Ambārīśa was engaged in performing a sacrifice, when Indra carried away the victim. The priest said that this ill-omened event had occurred owing to the king’s bad administration; and would call for a great expiation, unless a human victim could be produced (61, 8. Prāyaśchittam mahāḥ hy etad naram vā puruṣharaḥabhaḥ | anayāsaśa pāśūṃ śighram yāvat karma pravartate|). After a long search the royal-rishi (Ambārīśa) came upon the Brahman-rishi Richīka, a descendant of Bhṛgu, and asked him to sell one of his sons for a victim, at the price of a hundred thousand cows. Richīka answered that he would not sell his eldest son; and his wife added that she would not sell the youngest: “eldest sons,” she observed, “being generally the favourites of their fathers, and youngest sons of their mothers” (61, 18. Prāyeṇa hi nara-sreṣṭhaḥ jyesṭhāḥ pitrishu vallabhāḥ | mātrīnāṁ cha kanniyāmānaṃ tasmād rakshe kanniyasam | ). The second son, Sūnasāsepa, then said that in that case he regarded himself as the one who was to be sold, and desired the king to remove him. The hundred thousand cows, with ten millions of gold-pieces and heaps of jewels, were paid down, and Sūnasāsepa carried away. As they were passing through Pushkara (ch. 62) Sūnasāsepa beheld his maternal uncle Visvamitra (see Rāmāyaṇa, i. 34, 7,200 and p. 352 above) who was engaged in austerities there with other rishis, threw himself into his arms;

200 Pūrvaśā dhaṅgini chāpi māma Rāgahāvā svrataḥ | nāṁnā Śatyaśatī nāme Richīka pratipāditā | “And I have a religious sister older than myself called Śatyaśati, who was given in marriage to Richīka.”
and implored his assistance, urging his orphan, friendless, and helpless state, as claims on the sage’s benevolence (62, 4. Na me ’sti mātā na pīṭā jñātaya bāndhavaḥ kutaḥ | trāṭum arhasi māṁ saumya dharmena muni-pungava | . . . 7. Na me nātho hy anāthasya bhava bhāvyena che-
tasā |). Viśvāmitra soothed him; and pressed his own sons to offer themselves as victims in the room of Śunaśśeṣa. This proposition met with no favour from Madhusūryaṇḍa201 and the other sons of the royal hermit, who answered with haughtiness and derision: (62, 14) Kathaṁ ātma-sutān hitaṁ trāyase ’nya-sutān vibho | akārṣyam iva pasyaṁaḥ svaa-
māṁsaṁ iva bhajane | “How is it that thou sacrificest thine own sons, and seekest to rescue those of others? We look upon this as wrong, and like the eating of one’s own flesh.”202 The sage was exceedingly wroth at this disregard of his injunction, and doomed his sons to be born in the most degraded classes, like Vaśishṭha’s sons, and to eat dog’s flesh,203 for a thousand years. He then said to Śunaśśeṣa: (62, 19) Pavitra-
pāsair ābaddho rakta-mālīyānulepanaḥ | Vaishnavaṁ yāpam āsādyā vāg-
bhir Agniṁ udāhara | ime cha gāthe ēve divye gāyethāḥ muni-puṭtraka | Ambariṣhāsaṁ yajne ’emiṁaṁ tataḥ siddhiṁ avāpsyasi | “When thou art bound with hallowed cords, decked with a red garland, and anointed with ungueants, and fastened to the sacrificial post of Viṣṇu, then address thyself to Agni, and sing these two divine verses (gāthās), at the sacrifice of Ambariṣha; then shalt thou attain the fulfilment [of thy desire].” Being furnished with the two gāthās, Śunaśśeṣa proposed at once to king Ambariṣha that they should set out for their destination. When bound at the stake to be immolated, dressed in a red garment, “he celebrated the two gods, Indra and his younger brother (Viṣṇu), with the excellent verses. The Thousand-eyed (Indra) was pleased with the secret hymn, and bestowed long life on Śunaśśeṣa” (62, 25. Sa baddho vāgbhir agryābhir abhitueṣṭāva vai surau | Indram Indrānājāṁ chaiva yathāvad muni-puṭtrakāḥ | tasmāi prītaḥ sahaerāksho

201 The word is written thus in Schlegel’s and Gorresio’s editions. The Bombay edition reads Madhuchchanda.
203 Gorresio’s edition alone reads sea-māṁsaṁ-aprittaṁ, “subsisting on your own flesh,” and makes this to be allusion to what the sons had just said and a punishment for their impertinence (64, 16. Yasmat sea-māṁsaṁ uddiṣṭaṁ yuṣhmabhir avomanya māṁ).
rahasya-stuti-toshitaḥ | dirgham āyus tadā prāḍāṃ Cīhunāśeṭhayā Va-
savah |.²⁰⁴ King Ambariśa also received great benefits from this sacri-
fice. Viśvāmitra meanwhile proceeded with his austerities, which he
prolonged for a thousand years.

At the end of this time (ch. 63) the gods came to allot his reward;
and Brahmā announced that he had attained the rank of a rishi, thus
apparently advancing an additional step. Dissatisfied, as it would seem,
with this, the sage commenced his task of penance anew. After a
length of time he beheld the nymph (Apsāras) Menākā, who had come
to bathe in the lake of Pushkara. She flashed on his view, unequalled
in her radiant beauty, like lightning in a cloud (63, 5. Rūpenāprati-
māṁ tattra vidyutaṁ jalade yathā). He was smitten by her charms,
invited her to be his companion in his hermitage, and for ten years
remained a slave to her witchery, to the great prejudice of his austeri-
ties.²⁰⁵ At length he became ashamed of this ignoble subjection, and
full of indignation at what he believed to be a device of the gods to
disturb his devotion; and, dismissing the nymph with gentle accents,
he departed for the northern mountains, where he practised severe
austerities for a thousand years on the banks of the Kauśikī river.
The gods became alarmed at the progress he was making, and decided
that he should be dignified with the appellation of great rishi (māhār-
shi); and Brahmā, giving effect to the general opinion of the deities,
announced that he had conferred that rank upon him. Joining his
hands and bowing his head, Viśvāmitra replied that he should consider
himself to have indeed completely subdued his senses, if the incompar-
able title of Brāhman-rishi were conferred upon him (63, 31. Brah-
marshi-sabdham atulam svārjitaiḥ karmabhiḥ śubhaiḥ | yadi me bhagavān
āha tato 'ham vijitendriyah |). Brahmā informed him in answer, that
he naa not yet acquired the power of perfectly controlling his senses;
but should make further efforts with that view. The sage then began
to put himself through a yet more rigorous course of austerities, stand-
ing with his arms erect, without support, feeding on air, in summer
exposed to five fires (i.e. one on each of four sides, and the sun over-
head), in the rainy season remaining unsheltered from the wet, and in

²⁰⁴ I have alluded above, p. 358, note, to the differences which exist between this
legend of Sūnāśeṭpa and the older one in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.
²⁰⁵ Compare Mr. Leckie’s History of Rationalism, vol. i, p. 86.
winter lying on a watery couch night and day. This he continued for a thousand years. At last Indra and the other deities became greatly distressed at the idea of the merit he was storing up, and the power which he was thereby acquiring; and the chief of the celestials desired (ch. 64) the nymph Rāmbhā to go and bewitch him by her blandishments. She expressed great reluctance to expose herself to the wrath of the formidable muni, but obeyed the repeated injunction of Indra, who promised that he and Kandarpa (the god of love) should stand by her, and assumed her most attractive aspect with the view of overcoming the sage’s impassibility. He, however, suspected this design, and becoming greatly incensed, he doomed the nymph by a curse to be turned into stone and to continue in that state for a thousand years. He then (ch. 65) left the Himālāya and travelled to the east, where he underwent a dreadful exercise, unequalled in the whole history of austerities, maintaining silence, according to a vow, for a thousand years. At the end of this time he had attained to perfection, and although thwarted by many obstacles, he remained unmoved by anger. On the expiration of this course of austerity, he prepared some food to eat; which Indra, coming in the form of a Brāhman, begged that he would give him. Viśvāmitra did so, and though he had none left for himself, and was obliged to remain fasting, he said nothing. to the Brāhman, on account of his vow of silence. 65, 8. Tasyāuchchhvasamanāsya mārāhni dhāmo vyajāyata | 9. Trailokyāṁ yena sambhrāntam āttāpitam ivābhavat | . . . 11. “Bāhubbhiḥ karaṇair deva Viśvāmitro mahāmuniḥ | lobhitaḥ krodhitas chaiva tapasā chābhvārdhato | . . . 12. Na diyate yadi to asya manasā Yad ubhīpsitam | 13. Viśāsayati trailokyāṁ tapasā sa-charācharam | vyākulaś

205 On this the Commentator remarks that this incident shews that anger is more difficult to conquer than even lust (etena kāmād api krodho durgeyaḥ iti sūchitaṃ).

207 The Commentator, however, suggests that the sudden sight of Rāmbhā may at first have excited in him some feelings of this kind (āpūtato Rāmbhā-kāmāna-pravrittyā kāmenāpi tapah-ākṣayah).
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14. Sāgaraḥ kṣubhitāḥ sarve viśīryante cha parvataḥ | prakampate cha vasudhā vāyur vātiha sankulataḥ |
15. Brahman na pratijāyate nāstäko jāyate janaḥ | . . . 16. Buddhiṁ na kurute yāvad nāše deva mahāmuniḥ |
17. Tāvat prasādyo bhagaṁ agnirūpo mahādyutīḥ” | . . . 19. Brahmasre svāgataṁ te 'stu tapasā
smaḥ sutoshitāḥ | 20. Bhāmanyoṁ tapasogreṇa prāptavān asi Kauśika |
dīrgham āyuś che te brahman dadāmi sa-marud-gaṇaḥ |
21. . . . svasti prāpnuhi bhadraṁ te gachha saumya yathāsukkham | . . . 22. . . . brāhmaṁyāṁ yadī me prāptaṁ dīrgham āyuś tathaiva cha |
23. Oṁkāro 'tha vashaṅkāro vedāṁ cha varayantu māṁ | kṣhattra-veda-vidāṁ śreṣṭho brahma-veda-vidāṁ api |
24. Bṛhuṁ-puṭro Vasīṣṭhaṁ māṁ evāṁ vadatu devatāḥ |
25. Tattāḥ prasādito devair Vasīṣṭhaṁ japatāṁ varaḥ | sakhyaṁ cha kāra brahmaśhīr “evam astu” iti chābravit |
26. “Brahmaṁśhīvāṁ na sandehaṁ sarvam sampadyate tava” | . . . 27. Viśvāmitra
'pi dharmatmā labdhī vṛ̣ haṁyā́ṁ uttamam | pūjayaṁā́sa brahmaśhīṁ
Vasīṣṭhaṁ japatāṁ varam | “As he continued to suspend his breath, smoke issued from his head, to the great consternation and distress of the three worlds.” The gods, rishis, etc., then addressed Brahmadeva: “The great muni Viśvāmitra has been allured and provoked in various ways, but still advances in his sanctity. If his wish is not conceded, he will destroy the three worlds by the force of his austerity. All the regions of the universe are confounded, no light anywhere shines; all the oceans are tossed, and the mountains crumble, the earth quakes, and the wind blows confusedly. 15. We cannot, o Brahmadeva, guarantee that mankind shall not become atheistic. . . . 16. Before the great and glorious sage of fiery form resolves to destroy (everything) let him be propitiated.” . . . The gods, headed by Brahmadeva, then addressed Viśvāmitra: “‘Hail Brāhma rishi, we are gratified by thy austerities; o Kauśika, thou hast, through their intensity, attained to Brāhmaṇhood. I, o Brāhma, associated with the Maruts, confer on thee long life. May every blessing attend thee; depart wherever thou wilt.’ The sage, delighted, made his obeisance to the gods, and said: ‘If I have obtained Brāhmaṇhood, and long life, then let the mystic monosyllable (oṁkāra) and the sacrificial formula (vāśāṅkāra) and the Vedas recognise me in that capacity. And let Vasīṣṭha, the son of Brāhma, the most eminent of those who are skilled in the Kṣhattra-veda, and the Brāhma-veda (the knowledge of the Kṣatatriya and the Brahmanical disciplines), address me simi-
Accordingly Vaśishṭha, being propitiated by the gods, became reconciled to Viśvāmitra, and recognised his claim to all the prerogatives of a Brāhman rishi. Viśvāmitra, too, having attained the Brahmanical rank, paid all honour to Vaśishṭha.” Such was the grand result achieved by Viśvāmitra, at the cost of many thousand years of intense mortification of the body, and discipline of the soul. During the course of the struggle he had manifested, as the story tells us, a power little, if at all, inferior to that of Indra, the king of the gods; and as in a former legend we have seen King Nahusha actually occupying the throne of that deity, we cannot doubt that—according to the recognised principles of Indian mythology—Viśvāmitra had only to recommence his career of self-mortification in order to raise himself yet higher than he had yet risen, to the rank of a devarshi, or divine rishi (if this be, indeed, a superior grade to that of brahmarshi), or to any other elevation he might desire. But, as far as the account in the Rāmāyaṇa informs us, he was content with his success. He stood on a footing of perfect equality with his rival Vaśishṭha, and became indifferent to further honours. In fact, it was not necessary for the purpose of the inventors of the legend to carry him any higher. They only wished to account for his exercising the prerogatives of a Brāhman; and this had been already accomplished to their satisfaction.

In the story of Sakuntalā, however, as narrated in the Mahābhārata, Ādiparvan, sixty-ninth and following sections, we are informed that, to the great alarm of Indra, Viśvāmitra renewed his austerities, even long after he had attained the position of a Brāhman, verse 2914: Topyamāṇaḥ kila purū Viśvāmitro mahat tapaḥ | subhrīśmāṃ tāpyāmāsa Sakraṃ sura-gaṇeśvaram | tapasā dīpta-viryyo ‘yāṃ sthānaḥ māṃ chhāvayed iti | “Formerly Viśvāmitra, who was practising intense austereservour, occasioned great distress to Sakra (Indra), the lord of the deities, lest by the fiery energy so acquired by the saint he himself should be cast down from his place.” Indra accordingly resorted to the usual device of sending one of the Apsarasas, Menakā, to seduce the sage by the display of her charms, and the exercise of all her alluresments, “by beauty, youth, sweetness, gestures, smiles, and words” (verse 2920, Ra-pa-yauvana-mādhuryya-cheshṣṭita-smita-bhāshitaḥ), into the indulgence of sensual love; and thus put an end to his efforts after increased sanctity. Menakā urges the dangers of the mission arising from the great power
and irascibility of the sage, of whom, she remarked, even Indra himself was afraid, as a reason for excusing her from undertaking it; and refers to some incidents in Visvāmitra’s history, verse 2923: Mahābhārata Vaśishṭhān yath putrāir uthāv rogyojatat | keṣṭra-jātaś cha yaḥ pṛ- vam abhāvad brāhmaṇo balat | sauchārthaṁ yo na dhīṁ chakre durgamāṁ bahubhir jalaiḥ | yāṁ tāṁ puyatamāṁ loka Kauśikīti vidūr janāḥ | 2925. Bahāra yatrāsa puṣā kāle durgō mahātmanāḥ | dārāṁ Matango dharmātmā rājarśir vyādhataṁ gataḥ | atita-kāle durbhikshe abhyetya punar āśramam | muniḥ Pāreśi nadyāḥ vai nāma chakre tadā prabhūḥ | Matangam yājyāṁchakre yatra pṛita-manaḥ svayam | tvaṁ cha somam bhayāṁ yasya gataḥ pāṭuṁ suresvara | chakrānayaṁ cha lokaṁ vai krud-dho nakshattre-sampāda | pratiśravaṇa-pūrvaṁi nakshatrāṇi chakrā yaḥ | guru-sāpa-hatasyāpi Triśankoḥ saraṇam dadau | “2923. He deprived the great Vaśishṭha of his beloved sons; and though born a Kshat- triya, he formerly became a Brāhman by force. For the purpose of purificati- on he rendered the holy river, known in the world as the Kauśikī, unfordable from the mass of water. 2925. His wife was once maintained there in a time of distress by the righteous rājarshi Matanga, who had become a huntsman; and when the famine was past, the muni returned to his hermitage, gave to the river the name of Pārā, and being gratified, sacrificed for Matanga on its banks; and then thou thyself, Indra, from fear of him wentest to drink his soma. He created, too, when incensed, another world, with a garland of stars, formed agreeably to his promise, and gave his protection to Triśanku, even when smitten by his preceptor’s curse.” Menakā, however, ends by saying that she cannot decline the commission which has been imposed upon her; but begs that she may receive such succours as may ensure her success. She accordingly shows herself in the neighbourhood of Visvāmitra’s hermitage. The saint yields to the influence of love, invites her to become his companion, and as a result of their intercourse Sakuntalā is born. The Apsaras then returns to Indra’s paradise.

SECT. XII.—Other accounts, from the Mahābhārata, of the way in which Visvāmitra became a Brāhman.

In the Udyogaparvan of the Mahābhārata, sections 105–118. a story is told regarding Visvāmitra and his pupil Gālava, in which a different
account is given of the manner in which Viśvāmitra attained the rank of a Brāhman; viz. by the gift of Dharma, or Righteousness, appearing in the form of his rival. M. Bh. Udyogap. 3721: Viśvāmitraṁ tapasyantam Dharmo jijnāsaya puraḥ | abhyāgachhath svayam bhūtvā Vaśishtho bhagavān rishiḥ | . . . . 3728. Atha varsha-saṁte puṁre Dharmāḥ punar upāgamat | Vaśiṣṭhaṁ veśam āsthyā Kausikam bhoganeṣayā | sa drishtvā śirasā bhaktam dhriyamāṇam maharṣiṇā | tishātatā vāyuḥbhakshena Viśvāmitreṇa dhimataḥ | pratigrihyā tato Dharmas tathaivoshkhaṁ tathā navam | bhuktvā "prīto 'smi viptaṁśe" tam uktvā sa munir gataḥ | kṣattrī-bhāvād aparastu brāhmaṇatvam upāgataḥ | Dharmasya vachanāt prīto Viśvāmitras tathaḥ bhavat | "Dharma, assuming the personality of the sage Vaśiṣṭha, once came to prove Viśvāmitra, when he was living a life of austerity;" and after consuming some food, given him by other devotees, desired Viśvāmitra, who brought him some freshly cooked charu, quite hot, to stand still for the present. Viśvāmitra accordingly stood still, nourished only by air, with the boiled rice on his head. "The same personage, Dharma, in the same disguise, reappeared after a hundred years, desiring food, and consumed the rice (still quite hot and fresh), which he saw supported upon the hermit’s head, while he himself remained motionless, feeding on air. Dharma then said to him, ‘I am pleased with thee, o Brāhman rishi;’ and went away. Viśvāmitra, having become thus transformed from a Kshattriya into a Brāhman by the word of Dharma, was delighted.”

In the Anuśāsanaparvan of the Mahābhārata, we have another reference to the story of Viśvāmitra. King Yudhisṛthira enquires of Bhīma (verse 181) how, if Brāhmaṇhood is so difficult to be attained by men of the other three castes, it happened that the great Kshattriya acquired that dignity. The prince then recapitulates the chief exploits of Viśvāmitra: 183. Tena hy amita-vīryena Vaśiṣṭhāsya mahātmanāḥ | hatam putra-satam sadyas tapasā 'pi pitāmahaḥ | yatvadhanas cha bahavo rākṣasās tigma-tejasāḥ | manunāḥ "vishta-dehena erishtāḥ kālāntakopamāḥ | 185. Mahān Kuśika-vānasaḥ cha brahmaraḥ-sa-sankulaḥ | sthāpito nara-loke 'smi vidvān brāhmaṇa-saṁyutaḥ | Rīchākayātmajāsa chaiva Sūnaḥṣepho mahātapāḥ | vinokshito mahāsattrat paśutām api upāgataḥ | Hariśchandra-kratau devaṁs toshayitvā "tma-tejasā | putratām anusamprāpto Viśvāmitrasya dhimataḥ | nābhivādayato jyeshṭhaṁ Devarātāṁ nara-
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The text discusses the destruction of Vaśishta by the brahmins and the aftermath. It mentions how the brahmins, under the leadership of Śriśa, delivered the great and wise family of the Kṣīkās, which was full of brahmans and hundreds of Brahman rishis. Śūnaśēphā, son of Rīchikā, who was on the point of being slaughtered as a victim, and who became his son, after he had, at Hariśchandra's sacrifice, through his own power, propitiated the gods; he cursed his fifty sons who would not do homage to Devarāta, (adopted as) the eldest, so that they became outcastes; through affection he elevated Triśanuk, who forsook by his relations, to heaven, where he remained fixed with his head downwards in the southern heavens; (191) . . . he changed the troublesome nymph Rambhā, known as Panchacūḍā, by his curse into a form of stone; he occasioned Vaśishta through fear to bind and throw himself into the river, though he emerged thence unbound;" and performed other deeds calculated to excite astonishment. Yudhisthīrā ends by enquiring, “how this Kshattriya became a Brahman without transmigrating into another body” (197. Dehāntaram anāsādyā kathām sa brāhmaṇo 'bhavat |). In answer to this question, Bhīṣma (verses 200 ff.) deduces the descent of Vīśvāmitra from Ajamīḍha, of the race of Bharata, who was a pious priest, or sacrificer (yaśad dharma-bhūtāṁ varaḥ), the father of Jahnu, who again was the progenitor of Kūśika, the father of Gāḍhi; and narrates the same legend of the birth of Vīśvāmitra, which has been already extracted from the Vishṇu Purāṇa (see above, pp. 349 ff.). The conclusion of the story as here given is, that the wife of Rīchikā bore Jamadagni, while “the wife of Gāḍhi, by the grace of the rishi, gave birth to Vīśvāmitra, who was a Brahman rishi, and an utterer of the Veda; who, though a Kshattriya, attained to Brahmanhood, and became afterwards also the founder of a Brahman race” (246. Vīśvāmitram chājānayaḥ Gāḍhi-bhūtāḥ yaśasvinī | rishēḥ prasādād rājendram brahmaścēram brahmaṇavādīnaḥ | tato brahmāṇatāṁ yato Vīśvāmitro mahātapaḥ | kshattriyaḥ so 'py atha tathā brahma-vāṁśasya kārakaḥ |).
of which the members are detailed, including the great rishi Kapila. In regard to the mode in which Viśvāmitra was transformed from a Kshattriya into a Brāhmaṇ, we are only told that he belonged to the former class, and that "Rākṣiṅka infused into him this exalted Brāhmaṇhood" (259. Tathaiva kṣatraṁya rājan Viśvämitro mahātapāḥ | Rākṣiṅkenahitam brahma param etad Yudhishṭhīra |).

This version of the story is different from all those preceding ones which enter into any detail, as it makes no mention of Viśvāmitra having extorted the Brahmanical rank from the gods by force of his austerities; and ascribes his transformation to a virtue communicated by the sage Rākṣiṅka.

I have above (p. 296 f.) quoted a passage from Manu on the subject of submissive and refractory monarchs, in which reference is made to Viśvāmitra’s elevation to the Brahmanical order. Nothing is there said of his conflict with Vaśishṭha, or of his arduous penances, endured with the view of conquering for himself an equality with his rival. On the contrary, it is to his submissiveness, i.e. to his dutiful recognition of the superiority of the Brāhmans, that his admission into their class is ascribed. Kullūka, indeed, explains the word submissiveness (vināya) to mean virtue in general; but the contrast which is drawn between Pṛthu, Manu, and Viśvāmitra, on the one hand, and Veṇa, Nahusha, Sudās, and Nimi, the resisters of Brāhmansal prerogatives (as all the legends declare them to have been), on the other, makes it tolerably evident that the merit which Manu means to ascribe to Viśvāmitra is that of implicit submission to the spiritual authority of the Brāhmans.

**SECTION XIII.—Legend of Saudāsa.**

In the reign of Mitrasaha, also called Saudāsa, and Kalmāşhapāda, the son of Sudāsa, and the descendant of Triśanku in the twenty-second generation (see p. 337, above), we still find Vaśishṭha figuring in the legend, as the priest of that monarch, and causing him, by an imprecation, to become a cannibal, because he had, under the influence of a delusion, offered the priest human flesh to eat. I shall not extract the

208 The names in this list differ considerably from those given above, p. 352, from the Harivaṃśa.
version of the story given in the Vishnu Purana in detail (Wilson, V.P. vol. iii. pp. 304 ff.), as it does not in any way illustrate the rivalry of Vasishtha and Visvamitra.

The Mahabharata gives the following variation of the history (Adiparvan, sect. 176): "Kalmashapada was a king of the race of Ikshvaku. Visvamitra wished to be employed by him as his officiating priest; but the king preferred Vasishtha" (verse 6699. Akamayata tam yaJayarthe Visvamitra pratapavan | sa tu rajah mahatmanam Vasishtham rishi-sattamam |). It happened, however, that the king went out to hunt, and after having killed a large quantity of game, he became very much fatigued, as well as hungry and thirsty. Meeting Saktri, the eldest of Vasishtha's hundred sons, on the road, he ordered him to get out of his way. The priest civilly replied (verse 6703): Mama pathah maharaja dharmah esha sanatanah | rajana sarveshu dharmeshu devah pathah dvijataye | "The path is mine, 0 king; this is the immemorial law; in all observances the king must cede the way to the Brähman." Neither party would yield, and the dispute waxing warmer, the king struck the muni with his whip. The muni, resorting to the usual expedient of offended sages, by a curse doomed the king to become a man-eater. "It happened that at that time enmity existed between Visvamitra and Vasishtha on account of their respective claims to be priest to Kalmasha-pada" (verse 6710. Tato yajya-nimittan tu Visvamitra-Vasishthayoh | vairam asit tadah tam tu Visvamitro 'nvapadyata |). Visvamitra had followed the king; and approached while he was disputing with Saktri. Perceiving, however, the son of his rival Vasishtha, Visvamitra made himself invisible, and passed them, watching his opportunity. The king began to implore Saktri's clemency: but Visvamitra wishing to prevent their reconciliation, commanded a Rakshasa (a man-devouring demon) to enter into the king. Owing to the conjoint influence of the Brähman-rishi's curse, and Visvamitra's command, the demon obeyed the injunction. Perceiving that his object was gained, Visvamitra left things to take their course, and absented himself from the country. The king having happened to meet a hungry Brähman, and sent him, by the hand of his cook (who could procure nothing else), some human flesh to eat, was cursed by him also to the same effect as by Saktri. The curse, being now augmented in force, took effect, and Saktri himself was the first victim, being eaten up by the king. The same fate
befell all the other sons of Vasishtha at the instigation of Visvāmitra: 6736. S'aktim taṁ tu mṛitaṁ drishtvā Visvāmitraḥ punaḥ punaḥ | Vasishṭhasyaiva putreshu tad rakṣaḥ sandeśa ha | sa tāṁ S'aktry-avarān putrān Vasishṭhasya mahātmanaḥ | bhakṣhayāmāsa sankrāddhaḥ sīmhāḥ kshudraṃrīgān āva | Vasishṭhō ghatiṁ tārtvā Visvāmitrenā tān sūtān | dhāra- yāmāsa taṁ sokam mahādīr iva medinīṁ | chakre chātma-vināśaya buddhiṁ sa muni-sattamaḥ | na to eva Kauśikochhedam mene matimatāṁ varaḥ | 6740. Sa Meru-kāṭād ātmānaṁ mumocha bhagavān rishiḥ | gīres tasya sīlāyāṁ tu tula-rūśav ivāpatat | na mamāra cha pātena sa yada tena Pāṇḍava | tadā 'gnim iddham bhagavān saṁviveśa mahāvane | tāṁ tadā susamīddho 'pi na dadāha hutaśānaḥ | dīpyamāno 'py āmitra-gna sīlo 'gnir abhavat tataḥ | sa samudram abhiprekkhyā sōkāvishto mahāmuniḥ | baddhāva kaṇṭha sīlāṁ guṛvīṁ nipapāta tadā 'mbhāṣi | sa samudromi-vegena sthale nyāsto mahāmuniḥ | jagāma sa tataḥ kinnāha punar evāśramam prati | 6745. Tato drishtvā ‘srāmam-padaṁ rahitam tāṁ sutair muniḥ | nirvāgāma suduḥkhārttaḥ punar apy āśramāt tataḥ | so 'paśyat saritam pāryāṁ pravṛt-kāle navāmābhasā | vrikshān bahuvidhān pārtha harantim tira-jān bahun | atha chintāṁ samāpade punaḥ kaurava-nandana | "'ambhās asyāṁ nimajjeyam" iti duḥkkha-samavitaḥ | tataḥ pāśais tadā "tmānam gādham baddhāva mahāmuniḥ | tasyāḥ jale mahānadyaḥ nimarṣa/ja suduḥkhītaḥ | atha chhittvā nādi pāsaṁś tasya/i-bala-sūdana | sthala-sthaṁ tam rishim krtvā vipāsaṁ samavāśrijat | 6750. Uttatāra tataḥ pāsair vimuktaḥ sa mahān rishiḥ | Vipāṣeti cha nāmāṣyāḥ nadyāś chakre mahān rishiḥ | . . . 6752. Drishtvā sa punar evarshir nadiṁ hainavatāṁ tadā | chandra-grahavatim bhāmāṁ tasyāḥ srotasya apātyayat | sā tam aggi-samaṁ vipram anuchintya sariṁ varā | tataḥāḥ vidrūta yasa/māch śaatārāt iti viṣrutā | . . . 6774. Saudāso 'hām mahābhāga yāyās te muni-sattama | asmin kāle yād ishtaṁ te brāhi kīṁ karavāṇi te | Vaśishṭhā uvācaḥ | vṛttam etad yathā-kālam gachha rājyam prāsadhi vai | brāhmaṇāṁ tu manushyunāra māvamaṁsthitāḥ kadacchana | rājā uvācaḥ | nāvamāṁṣye mahābhāga kadacchid brāhmaṇarshabhān | tvan-videśe sthītaḥ samyak pujayishyāmy ahaṁ dvijān | Ikṣvākūyaṁ cha yenāham anyaṁ syāṁ dvijottama | tat tvatāḥ prāptum ichhāmi sarva-veda-vidāṁ vara | apatyam īṣitarā mahāyāṁ datum arhasi sattama | "Perceiving Saktri to be dead, Visvāmitra again and again incited the Rākshasa against the sons of Vaśishṭha; and accordingly the furious demon devoured those of his sons who were younger than Saktri, as a lion eats up the small
beasts of the forest. On hearing of the destruction of his sons by Viśvāmitra, Vaśishṭha supported his affliction, as the great mountain sustains the earth. He meditated his own destruction, but never thought of exterminating the Kaṇšikas. 6740. This divine sage hurled himself from the summit of Meru, but fell upon the rocks as if on a heap of cotton. Escaping alive from his fall, he entered a glowing fire in the forest; but the fire, though fiercely blazing, not only failed to burn him, but seemed perfectly cool. He next threw himself into the sea with a heavy stone attached to his neck; but was cast up by the waves on the dry land. He then went home to his hermitage; (6745) but seeing it empty and desolate, he was again overcome by grief and went out; and seeing the river Viḍāsa which was swollen by the recent rains, and sweeping along many trees torn from its banks, he conceived the design of drowning himself into its waters: he accordingly tied himself firmly with cords, and threw himself in; but the river severing his bonds, deposited him unbound (viḍāsa) on dry land; whence the name of the stream, as imposed by the sage. 6752. He afterwards saw and threw himself into the dreadful Sātadra (Sutlej), which was full of alligators, etc., and derived its name from rushing away in a hundred directions on seeing the Brāhman brilliant as fire. In consequence of this he was once more stranded; and seeing he could not kill himself, he went back to his hermitage. After roaming about over many mountains and countries, he was followed home by his daughter-in-law Ādṛśyānti, Sāktri's widow, from whose womb he heard a sound of the recitation of the Vedas, as she was pregnant with a child, which, when born, received the name of Parāśara, verse 6794. Learning from her that there was

209 See above (pp. 327 ff.), the passages quoted from the Brāhmaṇas, about the slaughter of Vaśishṭha's sons. In the Panchavimśa Br. (cited by Prof. Weber, Ind St. i. 32) Vaśishṭha is spoken of as puttra-hataḥ.

210 The Nirukta, ix. 26, after giving other etymologies of the word Viḍāsa, adds a verse: Pāśūḥ asyūn vyāpiṣṭya Vaśishṭaḥṣya suṣumiṣṭaḥ | tasmād Viḍāsa uchyaṭe pūrvam āśiḍ Uruṣṭirī | "In it the bonds of Vaśishṭha were loosened, when he was on the point of death: hence it is called Viḍāsa. It formerly bore the name of Uruṣṭirī." It does not appear whether or not this verse is older than the Mahābhārata. On this text of the Nirukta, Durga (as quoted by Prof. Müller, Rig-veda, ii. Pref. p. liv.) annotates: Vaśishṭhaḥ kila niṃmanajja asyūn muḍārṇuḥputra-maraṇa-sokāritaḥ pā- sair ātmanam baddhaḥ | tasya kila te pāśūḥ asyūn vyāpiṣṭya vyauṣuchyanta uṣa- kena | "Vaśishṭha plunged into it, after binding himself with bonds, wishing to die when grieved at the death of his sons. In it (the river) his bonds were loosened by the water."
thus a hope of his line being continued, he abstained from further attempts on his own life. King Kalmašapāda, however, whom they encountered in the forest, was about to devour them both, when Vasīṣṭha stopped him by a blast from his mouth; and sprinkling him with water consecrated by a holy text, he delivered him from the curse by which he had been affected for twelve years. The king then addressed Vasīṣṭha thus: "'Most excellent sage, I am Saudāsa, whose priest thou art: what can I do that would be pleasing to thee?' Vasīṣṭha answered: 'This which has happened has been owing to the force of destiny: go, and rule thy kingdom; but, o monarch, never contemn the Brāhmaṇs.' The king replied: 'Never shall I despise the most excellent Brāhmaṇs; but submitting to thy commands I shall pay them all honour. And I must obtain from thee the means of discharging my debt to the Ikshvākus. Thou must give me the offspring which I desire.'" Vasīṣṭha promised to comply with his request. They then returned to Ayodhyā. And Vasīṣṭha having been solicited by the king to beget an heir to the throne\(^{211}\) (verse 6787. Rājnas tasyājnayā devi Vasīṣṭham upachakrā | maharṣiḥ saṁvīdaṁ kriyā sămbabhūva tayā saha | devyā divyena vidhīna Vasīṣṭho bhagavān rishiḥ), the queen became pregnant by him, and brought forth a son at the end of twelve years. This extraordinary proceeding, so contrary to all the recognized rules of morality, is afterwards (verses 6888–6912) explained to have been necessitated by the curse of a Brāhmaṇī, whose husband Kalmaśa-pāda had devoured when in the forest, and who had doomed him to die if he should attempt to become a father, and had foretold that Vasīṣṭha should be the instrument of propagating his race (verse 6906: Patnīṁ rītvā anuprāpya sadyas tyakṣhyai jīvitam | yasya charsher Vasīṣṭhasya tvayā putrāḥ vināśitāh | tena sangamya te bhāryā tanayām janayishyaṁ).\(^{212}\)

---

\(^{211}\) The same story is told in the Viṣṇu Pur. iv., 4, 38 (Wilson, vol. 3, p. 310).

\(^{212}\) This incident is alluded to in the Ādip., section 122. It is there stated that in the olden time women were subject to no restraint, and incurred no blame for abandoning their husbands and cohabiting with anyone they pleased (verse 4719. Anāśrityāh kila purā striyaḥ āsan varānane | kīma-chāra-vihārīnyāh svatantrāḥ chāra-hūśiṁ | āśūṁ vyuccharamāṁjanāṁ kaunsāryūt subhaṁ patāṁ | nādharo 'bhūd varūrohe sa hi dharmāḥ purā 'bhavo, compare verse 4729). A stop was, however, put to this practice by Uddālaka Svetaketu, whose indignation was on one occasion aroused by a Brāhmaṇ taking his mother by the hand, and inviting her to go away with him, although his father, in whose presence this occurred, informed him that
The Mahābhārata has a further legend, regarding Viśvāmitra's jealousy of Vasishṭha, which again exhibits the former in a very odious light, and as destitute of the moral dispositions befitting a saint, while Vasishṭha is represented as manifesting a noble spirit of disinterestedness and generosity.

Sūryap. 2360. Viśvāmitrasya viprarserh Vasishṭhasya cha Bhārata | bhṛśaṁ vairam abhūd rājaṁs tapaḥ-spardadhā-kṛitam mahat | āśramo vai Vasishṭhasya sthāṇu-tīrthe 'bhavad mahān | pūrvataḥ pūrvaḥsataḥ chāśīd Viśvāmitrasya dhīmaṁ | . . . 2366. Viśvāmitra-Vasishṭhau tav ahany ahani Bhārata | spardadhāṁ tapaḥ-kṛitāṁ tīvraṁ chakratus tau tapo-dhānan | tattraṁ adhikā-santapto Viśvāmitro mahāmuniḥ | dhriśṭva tejo Vasishṭhasya chintāṁ ati jagāma ha | tasya buddhir ivaṁ hy āśā dharmac-nityasya Bhārata | ivaṁ Sarasvatī tūrṇam mat-sampāṁ tapo-dhānam | ānayishyati vegenas Vasishṭhām japatāṁ varam | thāga-taṁ dvija-sreshṭhāṁ hanishyami nāṁ saṁsāraḥ | 2370. Evaṁ niśchitya bhagavān Viśvāmitro mahāmuniḥ | sasmāra saritāṁ sreshṭhāṁ krodha-, saṁrakta-lochanaḥ | sa dhyāṭa muninā tena vyākulaṁavam jagāma ha | jajne chaṁham mahāvyvyam mahākopaṁ cha bhāvini | tataḥ naṁ vepaṁnāṁ vivarṇā pranajīī tadā | upatasthā muni-varaṁ Viśvāmitro Sarasvati | hata-vīraṁ yathā nāṁ sa 'bhavād duśkhītaṁ bhṛśaṁ | bruhi kum karavāṁti provācha muni-sattamam | tāṁ uvācha muniṁ krudhāno "Vasiśṭhyāṁ śīhram ānaya | yāvaṁ naṁ nihanmy adya" tathā cchiturva | vyathitā nādi | 2375. Pranajīivā tu tataḥ kriyā puṇḍarīka-nilheksanāḥ | there was no reason for his displeasure, as the custom was one which had prevailed from time immemorial (verse 4726. Svetaketosha kilā purā samaksham mātaram putuḥ | jagrāha brāhmaṇaṁ puruṣau "gachhava" iti chābravati | rishis-patturas tataḥ kopaṁ chakrāmaṛaṁ-choditaḥ | mātaram tāṁ tathāh dhriṣṭva niyamānām balād eva | krudhāṁ tāṁ tuḥ pitā dhriṣṭva Svetaketosam uvācha ha | "mā tāta kopaṁ kārṣīma tvam esha dharmaṁ sanātaṁ ")

Svetaketos could not tolerate the practice, and introduced the existing rule (verse 4730. Rishi-pattru 'the tāṁ dharmaṁ Svetaketosam na chakshame | chakrāva chaiva maryūdaṁ imāṁ strī-puṁsayaṁ bhūva | ). A wife and a husband indulging in promiscuous intercourse were therefore thenceforward guilty of sin. But a wife, when appointed by her husband to raise up seed to him (by having intercourse with another man), is in like manner guilty if she refuse (4734. Patyā niyuktā yā chaiva patni puṭrābhatham eva eha | na karishyati tasyaṁ cha bhavishyati tad eva hi | iti tena puraṁ bhīru maryūdaṁ śhāpiita balāt | ). Pāṇḍu, the speaker, then proceeds to give an instance of the latter procedure in the case of Madayanti, the wife of Sandāsa, who, by her husband's command, visited Vasishtha for the purpose in question (4736. Sandāsaṇa cha rambhoru niyuktā puttra-jāmanā | Madayanti jagāmarṣhīṁ Vasishṭham iti nav śrutām | ). Compare what is said above, p. 224, of Angiras, and in pp. 232 and 233 of Dirgatamas or Dirghatapas; and see p. 423, below.
prākampeta bhṛ̤iṣam bhītā vāyunevāhatā latā | . . . 2377. Sā tasya vacha-
naṁ śrutva jñātvā pāpa-chikirṣhitam | Vasiṣṭhahṣya prabhāvam ācha jā-
nanty apratimam bhavi | sa’dhigamy Vaśişṭhāṁ ācha imam artham 
achodayat | yad ukta saritam śreshṭhā Viśvāmitreṇa dhimātā | udbhayoḥ 
sāpyor bhītā vepamānaṃ punaḥ punaḥ | . . . 2380. Taṁ kriśāṁ ācha vivarāṇaṁ 
cha ċīraṇvāḥ chintā-samanvitam | uvaccha rājaṇ dharmātmā Vaśiṣṭhā 
avipadāṁ vṛ̤aṇāḥ | Vaśiṣṭhāḥ uvaccha | “pāhy ātmānaṁ sarīc-echhreṣṭe 
vaḥ māṁ śighra-gāmini | Viśvāmitraḥ sāpeḥ hi tvām mā kriḥās tvam 
vichāraṇam” | tasya tad vachanaṁ śrutvā kriṣṇa-śalasya sā sarit | chintayā-
muṣa Kauravya kiṁ kriśva sukriyam bhavat | tasyāś chintā samutpāṇaṁ 
“Vaśiṣṭhaḥ mayy attva hi | kriṭavān hi dayāṁ nityam tasya kāryyaṁ hitam 
mayaḥ” | atha kule svaka rājaṇ ājapantam rishi-sattamam | juhvānaṁ Kau-
śikam prekṣayā saracavita abhyachintayat | 2385. “Idam antaraṁ” ity eva 
tataḥ sā saritam varā | kūlaṇpadhāram akarot svera vegena sā sarit | tena 
kūlapadāreṇa Maitrāvunāṅg saruyata | āhyamānaḥ sa tushṭaṁ taddā 
rājana Saracavitaṁ | Piṭkāhaṣya sarasah pravīrtpa ’si Saracavita | vyāpt-
taṁ chedāṁ jagat sarvāṁ tavavambhohbir uthamaṁ | tvam evakāsa-ga 
devī meghaḥśatrjīsā payaḥ | sarvāḥ chāpaṁ tvam evci tvatto vayam adhi-
maḥi | pushṭir dyutis tathā kṛ̤śṭiḥ siddhīr buddhir umā tathā | tvam eva 
vānī svāhā tvāṁ tavayattam idaṁ jagat | 2390. Tvam eva sarvābhāteshu 
vavastha chaturvidhāḥ | . . . . 2392. Tam ānitaṁ Saracavitaḥ ċīrṣaṇvā 
koṇa-samanvitah | athāvvesha praharaṇaṁ Vasiṣṭhānta-karaṁ tada | 
taṁ tu krudhāṁ abhīpākayā brahma-bādhyā-bhayād naḍī | apurvā 
Vasiṣṭhāṁ tu prāchāṁ āīsam atandritā | udbhayoḥ kurvati vāyam 
vanchayitvā cha Gādhiṁ tato pavāḥitaṁ ċīrṣṭvan Vasiṣṭhāṁ rishi-
sattamam | 2395. Abrvādā ādhiḥkārāmaḥ Viśvāmiḥ hy amaraḥ-
naḥ | “yasmaṁ mām tvāṁ sarīc-echhreṣṭe vanchayitvā punargataḥ | 
sonitaṁ vaha kalyanī raksha-’gra-mañi-sammatam” | tataḥ Saracavita 
śaptā Viśvāmitreṇa dhimātā | avahadv ehoṇitaṁvānmaṁ toyaṁ samavat-
sāraṁ tada | . . . . 2401. Athājagmapa tato rājan rākṣasās tattva 
Bhārata | tatāra te sonitaṁ sarve pivaṁ saḥkham āsate | . . . . 2402. 
Nyāyaṁ cha hasantāḥ cha yathā svarga-jītas tathā | . . . . 2407. 
tān ċīṛṣṭva rākṣasān rājana munayaḥ saṁśīta-uvalāḥ | paritrāgā 
Sarasavatāḥ pareṇ yatnam prachakire |

“2360. There existed a great enmity, arising from rivalry in their 
austerities, between Viśvāmitra and the Brāhma rishi Vaśiṣṭha. Vaśi-
śṭha had an extensive hermitage in Śthānuṭīrhā, to the east of
which was Viśvāmitra’s. . . . 2366. These two great ascetics were every day exhibiting intense emulation in regard to their respective austerities. But Viśvāmitra, beholding the might of Vaśishṭha, was the most chagrined; and fell into deep thought. The idea of this sage, constant in duty (!), was the following: ‘This river Sarasvatī will speedily bring to me on her current the austere Vaśishṭha, the most eminent of all mutterers of prayers. When that most excellent Brāhmaṇ has come, I shall most assuredly kill him.’ 2370. Having thus determined, the divine sage Viśvāmitra, his eyes reddened by anger, called to mind the chief of rivers. She being thus the subject of his thoughts, became very anxious, as she knew him to be very powerful and very irascible. Then trembling, pallid, and with joined hands, the Sarasvatī stood before the chief of munis. Like a woman whose husband has been slain, she was greatly distressed; and said to him, ‘What shall I do?’ The incensed muni replied, ‘Bring Vaśishṭha hither speedily, that I may slay him.’ 2375. The lotus-eyed goddess, joining her hands, trembled in great fear, like a creeping plant agitated by the wind.” . . . Viśvāmitra, however, although he saw her condition, repeated his command. 2377. “The Sarasvatī, who knew how sinful was his design, and that the might of Vaśishṭha was unequalled, went trembling, and in great dread of being cursed by both the sages, to Vaśishṭha, and told him what his rival had said. 2380. Vaśishṭha seeing her emaciated, pale, and anxious, spoke thus: ‘Deliver thyself, o chief of rivers; carry me unhesitatingly to Viśvāmitra, lest he curse thee.’ Hearing these words of the merciful sage, the Sarasvatī considered how she could act most wisely. She reflected, ‘Vaśishṭha has always shown me great kindness; I must seek his welfare.’ Then observing the Kauśika sage [so in the text, but does not the sense require Vaśishṭha?] praying and sacrificing on her brink, she regarded (2385) that as a good opportunity, and swept away the bank by the force of her current. In this way the son of Mitra and Varuṇa (Vaśishṭha)313 was carried down; and while he was being borne along, he thus celebrated the river: ‘Thou, o Sarasvatī, issuest from the lake of Brahmā, and pervadest the whole world with thy excellent streams. Residing in the sky, thou discharges water into the clouds. Thou alone art all waters. By thee we study.’ [Here the river Sarasvatī is identified with Saras-

313 See above, pp. 316 and 320 f.
vati the goddess of speech.] ‘Thou art nourishment, radiance, fame, perfection, intellect, light. Thou art speech; thou art Svāhā; this world is subject to thee. 2390. Thou, in fourfold form, dwellest in all creatures.’ . . . 2392. Beholding Vasishṭha brought near by the Sarasvatī, Viśvāmitra searched for a weapon with which to make an end of him. Perceiving his anger, and dreading lest Brahmanicide should ensue, the river promptly carried away Vasishṭha in an easterly direction; thus fulfilling the commands of both sages, but eluding Viśvāmitra. Seeing Vasishṭha so carried away, (2395) Viśvāmitra, impatient, and enraged by vexation, said to her: ‘Since thou, o chief of rivers, hast eluded me, and hast receded, roll in waves of blood acceptable to the chief of demons,’ [which are fabled to gloat on blood]. “The Sarasvatī, being thus cursed, flowed for a year in a stream mingled with blood. . . 2401. Rākshasas came to the place of pilgrimage, where Vasishṭha had been swept away, and revelled in drinking to satiety the bloody stream in security, dancing and laughing, as if they had conquered heaven.” Some rishis who arrived at the spot some time after were horrified to see the blood-stained water, and the Rākshasas quaffing it, and (2407) “made the most strenuous efforts to rescue the Sarasvatī.” After learning from her the cause of the pollution of her waters, they propitiated Mahādeva by the most various austerities, and thus obtained the restoration of the river to her pristine purity (2413 ff.).

We have another reference to the connection of the families of Sudās and Vasishṭha in the legend of Paraśurāma, the destroyer of the Kshattriyas, in the 49th section of the Sāntiparvan of the Mahābhārata. Sarvakarman, a descendant of Sudās, is there mentioned as one of those

214 See the remarks on Sarasvatī in my “Contributions to a knowledge of the Vedic Theogony and Mythology No. II.,” in the Journ. R. A. S., for 1866 pp. 18 ff.

215 Paraśurāma was the son of Jamadagnī, regarding whose birth, as well as that of Viśvāmitra and the incarnation of Indra in the person of his father Gādhi, the same legend as has been already given above, p. 349 ff, is repeated at the commencement of the story referred to in the text. In discoursing with his wife Satyavati about the exchange of her own and her mother’s meses, Rikhika tells her, verse 1741: Brahmabhūtāṁ hi sokalam pitus tava kulem bhavet | “All the family of thy father (Gādhi) shall be Brahmanical;” and Vasudeva, the narrator of the the legend, says, verse 1745: Viśvāmitroh cha dāyudāṁ Gādhiḥ Kusikamandanaṁ | yam prāpo brahma-samwittiṁ viśvair brahmagyair yutam | “And Gādhi begot a son, Viśvāmitra, whom he obtained equal to a Brähman, and possessed of all Brahmanical qualities.”
Kshattriyas who had been preserved from the general massacre by Parāśara, grandson of Vaśishṭha: verse 1792. Tathā 'nukampamānena yojuvā 'mita-tejasā | Parāśareṇa dayādaḥ Saudāsasyābhikarṣitah | sarva-karmāṇi kurute śudra-vat tasya vai deviḥ | Savvakarmetā abhi- khyaṭaḥ sa māṁ raksatu ārdhivaḥ | "Savvakarman, the son of Saudāsa, was preserved by the tender-hearted priest Parāśara, who performed, though a Brāhmaṇ, all menial offices for him, like a Śudra; whence the prince’s name;—may this king protect me (the earth)." The same book of the Mahābhārata, when recording a number of good deeds done to Brāhmaṇs, has also the following allusion to Mitrasaha and Vaśishṭha: verse 8604. Rājā Mitrasahās chāpi Vaśishṭhāya mahātmāne | Damaṇṭiṃ priyām dattvā tayā saha dīvaṇi gataḥ | "King Mitrasaha, having bestowed his dear Damayanti on Vaśishṭha, ascended to heaven along with her."²¹⁵

The same passage has two further allusions to Vaśishṭha, which, though unconnected with our present subject, may be introduced here. In verse 8591 it is said: Rantidevaḥ cha Sāṅkṛityo Vaśishṭhāya mahāt- nane | apaḥ pradāya śītosnāḥ nāka-prishṭhe mahiyaṭe | "Rantideva, son of Sankṛiti, who gave Vaśishṭha tepid water, is exalted to the heavenly regions." (See the Bhāg. Pur. ix. 21, 2-18, where the various acts of self-sacrifice practised by this prince are celebrated.) It is said of Vaśishṭha in verse 8601: Avarṣāti cha Parjano sarva-bhūtāni bhāta- kriṣṭ | Vaśishṭha jīva-vāṃśa prajāpatir ivāparah | "When Parjanya failed to send rain, the creative Vaśishṭha, like Brahmā, gave life to all beings."²¹⁶

Vaśishṭha, in short, is continually reappearing in the Mahābhārata. I will here adduce but one other passage. In the Sāntiparvan, verses 10,118 ff. it is said: Tasya Vṛitrārdditasyāṭha mohaḥ āśich chhatakra- toḥ | rathantarena taṁ tatra Vaśishṭhaḥ samabodhayaḥ | Vaśishṭhaḥ uvācha | deva-kreshṭho 'si devendra dāityāsura-nibarhaṇa | trailokyā-bala-

²¹⁵ This appears to refer to the story told above, p. 418 ff., of Kalmāṣhpāḍa (who was the same as Mitrasaha), allowing Vaśishṭha to be the agent in propagating the royal race; for both there (v. 6910) and in the Vīdhū Pur. (Wilson, vol. iii., pp. 308 and 310), the name of the queen is said to have been Madayanti, which is probably the right reading here also, the first two letters only having been transposed. If so, however, it is to be observed that a quite different turn is given to the story here, where it is represented as a meritorious act on the king’s part, and as a favour to Vaśishṭha, that the queen was given up to him; whilst, according to the other account, the king’s sole object in what he did was to get progeny.
samyuktah kasmah ohakra nishidasas esa Brahmah cha Vishnu cha Siva chaiva jagat-pati| Somas cha bhagavahn devah sarve cha paramarshaya| ma karshh kaasnalam Sakra kaashid evetaro yathah | aaryyam yudhah matim krtvah jahi satrun suradhipa| “By reciting the Rathantaraa, Vasishtha encouraged Indra, when he had become bewildered and distressed in his conflict with Vrittra, saying to him, ‘Thou art the chief of the gods, o slayer of the Daityas and Asuras, possessing all the strength of the three worlds: wherefore, Indra, dost thou despise? There are here present Brahma, Vishnu, Siva, the divine Soma, and all the chief rishis. faint not, o Indra, like an ordinary being. Assume a heroic spirit for the fight, and slay thine enemies, etc.’ Strength was thus infused into Indra.

In a later work, the Raja Tarangini, Book IV. verses 619-655 (pp. 188 ff. and note, pp. 521 and 522, of Troyer’s edition, vol. i. and vol. ii. 189, 469, note), a curious echo of these old legends is found still reverberating. A story is there told of a king Jayapida who oppressed his people, and persecuted the Brahmans, and was eventually destroyed by them in a miraculous manner. He is compared to Saudasa in verse 625: Sa Saudasaah ivaneka-loka-praapapaharaakrit | astuta-kriyaa-sauhitvaam scapne ‘pi na samayayau | “Like Saudasa, depriving many persons of their lives, he was not satiated with drenched deeds even in his dreams.” One of the Brahmans stood up on behalf of the rest to remonstrate: Aha sma “Visvmitra va Vasishtho va tapoindhih | tvam Agastya ‘thava kim stha” iti darpe naah nripah | . . . bhavan yatra Hariischarihas Triiisankur Nahusho ‘pi va | Visvmitra-mukhebhyo ‘ham tatraikho bhavitaah kshamaah | vihasyovaha taah raja “Visvmitriadi-kopatah | Hariischarihaah nashtas tvayi krudde tu kim bhavet” | paminatadayann arvih tataah krudhoh bhyadhah dvijaah | “mahi krudde kshamaah eva brahma-dandaah pated na kham” | tach ohrutaa vihasan raja kopad brahmaaham abhravah | “patatu brahma-dandoh sau kim adhyapi vilambate” | nav ayam patito jaalme yatha viprernah bhashto | rajaah kanaka-dando ‘yee vilana-skhalito ‘patat | “The king haughtily asked him: ‘Art thou Visvamitra, or Vasishtha, so rich in devotion? or Agastya? or what art thou?’ . . . The Brahma answered, swelling with indignation: ‘Just as thou art a Hariischaruna, a Triisanku, or a Nahusha, so too have I power to be a Visvamitra, or one of these other rishis.’ The king answered with a smile of contempt: ‘Hariischaruna
and the rest perished by the wrath of Viśvāmitra and the other sages: but what will come of thy wrath?" The Brāhman angrily replied, smiting the ground with his hand, 'When I am incensed, shall not the Brahmanical bolt instantly descend?' The king retorted with an angry laugh: 'Let it descend; why does it not come down at once?' 'Has it not fallen, tyrant?' said the Brāhman; and he had no sooner spoken, than a golden beam fell from the canopy and smote the king," so that he became tortured by worms, and shortly after died; and went, as the story concludes, to hell.

Professor Lassen, who quotes the stories regarding Vasishṭha and Viśvāmitra (Ind. Alt. 2nd ed. i. 718 ff.), makes the following remarks on their import:

"The legend of the struggle between Vaśishṭha and Viśvāmitra embraces two distinct points: one is the contest between the priests and warriors for the highest rank; the other is the temporary alienation of the Ikshvākus from their family priests. Vaśishṭha is represented as the exemplar of such a priest; and the story of Kalmāshapāda is related for the express purpose of showing by an example that the Ikshvākus, after they had retained him, were victorious, and fulfilled perfectly the duties of sacrifice (see above, p. 390): in his capacity of priest he continued to live on, and is the representative of his whole race. We may conclude from the legend that his descendants had acquired the position of family priests to the Ikshvākus, though neither he himself nor his son Śaktri belonged to their number. Triśanku is the first prince who forsakes them, and had recourse to Viśvāmitra. His successor Ambarīsha received support from that personage, as well as from Rīchika, one of the Bhṛigus;—a family whose connection with the Kuśikas appears also in the story of Paraśurāma. The hostility between the Ikshvākus and the family of Vaśishṭha continued down to Kalmāshapāda. Viśvāmitra is represented as having intentionally fostered the alienation; while Vaśishṭha is described as forbearing (though he had the power) to annihilate his rival.

"The conflict between the two rivals with its motives and machinery is described in the forms peculiar to the fully developed epos. To this style of poetry is to be referred the wonder-working cow, which supplies all objects of desire. There is no ground for believing in any actual war with weapons between the contending parties, or in
any participation of degraded Kshatriyas, or aboriginal tribes, in the contest; for all these things are mere poetical creations. Besides, the proper victory of Vasishtha was not gained by arms, but by his rod. The legend represents the superiority of the Brāhmans as complete, since Viśvāmitra is forced to acknowledge the insufficiency of a warrior’s power; and acquires his position as a Brāhman by purely Brahmanical methods.

"From Viśvāmitra are derived many of the sacerdotal families, which bear the common name of Kauśika, and to which many rishis famous in tradition belong. As there were also kings in this family, we have here an example of the fact that one of the old Vedic races became divided, and in later times belonged to both of the two higher castes. It appears impossible that any of the aboriginal tribes should have been among the descendants of Viśvāmitra’s sons, as the legend represents; and the meaning of this account may therefore be that some of his sons and their descendants accepted the position of priests among these tribes, and are in consequence described as accursed."  

SECT. XIV.—Story from the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa about king Janaka becoming a Brāhman.

The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa has the following account of a discussion between Janaka, king of Videha, and some Brāhmans:

xi. 6, 2, 1. Janaka ha vai Vaideho brāhmaṇair dhāvayaadbhir samā-jagāma Svetaketunā Āruneyena Somaśushmena Sātyayajinā Yajnavalkyenā tān ha uvācha "kathāṁ katham agnihotram juhutha" iti | 2. Sa ha uvācha Svetaketur Āruneyo "gharmāv eva samrāḍ aham ajasaun yaśasā visyandamanāv anyo’yasmin juhomi" iti | "kathāṁ tad” iti | adityo vai gharmas taṁ sāyam agnau juhomi agnir vai gharmas tam pratar ādityo juhomi” iti | "kim sa bhavati yaḥ evauṁ juhoti” | "ajasaun eva śriyā, yaśasā bhavaty etayoḥ cha devatayoḥ sāvyuṣyaḥ salokatāṁ jayati” iti | 3. Atha ha uvācha Somaśushmāṇaḥ Sātyayajiniḥ “tejaḥ eva samrāḍ ahaṁ tejasu juhomi” iti | “kathāṁ tad” iti | “Ādityo vai tejas taṁ sāyam agnau juhomi | agnir vai tejas tam pratar āditye juhomi”

217 See also Prof. Müller’s Anc. Sansk. Lit., pp. 80 f., 353 f., 408, 413 ff., 485 f.
218 This passage is referred to and translated by Prof. Müller, Anc. Sansk. Lit. pp. 421 ff.
"Janaka of Vidisha met with some travelling Brähmans, Svetaketu
Aruneya, Somaśushma Sātyayajni, and Yājnavalkya, and said to them, 'How do ye respectively offer the agnihotra oblation?' 2. Svetaketu replied, 'I, o monarch, in sacrificing, throw the one of the two eternal heats which pervade the world with their splendour into the other.' 'How is that done,' asked the king. (S. replied), 'Āditya (the sun) is one heat; in the evening I throw him into Agni (Fire). Agni is the other heat; in the morning I throw him into Āditya.' 'What' (enquired the king) 'does he become who thus sacrifices?' 'He acquires' (replied S.) 'perpetual prosperity and renown; conquers for himself an union with these two deities, and dwells in the same region as they.' 3. Then Somaśushma answered, 'I, o monarch, in sacrificing, throw light into light.' 'How is that done,' asked the king. 'The Sun' (answered S.) 'is light; in the evening I throw him into Fire: and Fire is light; in the morning I throw him into the Sun.' 'What' (enquired the king) 'does he become who thus sacrifices?' 'He becomes' (rejoined S.) 'luminous, and renowned, an eater of food, and conquers for himself an union with these two deities, and dwells in the same region as they.' 4. Then Yājnavalkya said, 'When I take up the fire I lift the agnihotra. All the gods follow the Sun when he sets; and when they see me take up the Fire, they come back to me. Then, after washing and putting down the vessels, and having the Agnihotra Cow milked, beholding them as they behold me, I satisfy them (with sacrificial food). The king answered, 'Thou hast approached very close to a solution of the Agnihotra, o Yājnavalkya; I give thee a hundred milch-cows: but thou hast not discovered the ascent of these two (oblations), nor the course, nor the resting-place, nor the satisfaction, nor the return, nor the world where they reappear(?).' Having so spoken, Janaka mounted his car and drove away. 5. The Brāhmans then said amongst themselves, 'This Rājanya has surpassed us in speaking; come, let us invite him to a theological discussion.' Yājnavalkya, however, interposed, 'We are Brāhmans, and he a Rājanya; if we overcome him, we shall ask ourselves, whom have we overcome? but if he overcome us, men will say to us, a Rājanya has overcome Brāhmans. Do not follow this course.' They assented to his advice. Then Yājnavalkya mounted his car, and drove after the king; and came up to him. Janaka asked, 'is it to learn the agnihotra (that thou hast come), Yājnavalkya?' 'The agnihotra, o
monarch,' said Y. 6. The king rejoined, 'These two obligations, when offered, ascend; they enter the air, they make the air their āhavanīya fire, the wind their fuel, the rays their bright oblation, they satisfy the air, and thence ascend. 7. They enter the sky, they make the sky their āhavanīya fire, the sun their fuel, the moon their bright oblation; they satisfy the sky, they return thence. 8. They enter this earth, they make this earth their āhavanīya fire, Agni their fuel, the plants their bright oblation; they satisfy the earth, they ascend thence. They enter man, they make his mouth their āhavanīya fire, his tongue their fuel, food their bright oblation; they satisfy man. (He who, thus knowing, eats, truly offers the agnihotra). 9. They ascend from him, they enter into woman [the details which follow are better left untranslated], they satisfy her. The man who, thus knowing, approaches his wife, truly offers the agnihotra. The son who is then born is the world of re-appearance. This is the agnihotra, o Yājnavalkya; there is nothing beyond this.' Y. offered the king the choice of a boon. He replied, 'Let me enquire of thee whatever I desire, o Yājnavalkya.' Henceforward Janaka was a Brāhmān.'

By Brāhmān in the last sentence we have, I presume, to understand a Brāhman. Even if it were taken to dignify a priest of the kind called Brāhmān, the conclusion would be the same; as at the time when the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa was written, none but Brāhmans could officiate as priests.

Janaka's name occurs frequently in the Mahābhārata. In the Vana-parvan of that poem (8089) he is called a rājarshi. In the Śānti-parvan, verse 6640, it is said: Aṭrāpy udāharantī tam itiḥāsam purātanam | gitaṁ Videha-rājena Janakena praśāmyatā | "anantaṁ vata me vittaṁ yasya me nāsti kinchana | Mithilāyāṁ pradīptāyāṁ na me dahyati kinchana" | "They here relate an ancient story,—the words recited by Janaka the tranquil-minded king of Videha:

'Though worldly pelf I own no more,
Of wealth I have a boundless store:
While Mithilā the flames devour,
My goods can all defy their power.'"

The Commentator explains brahmā by brahmishṭhaḥ, "Most full of divine knowledge."

Prof. Müller remarks in his article on Caste (Chips from a German Workshop, ii. 338): "That king Janaka of Videha possessed superior knowledge is acknowledged by one of the most learned among the Brāhmans, by Yājnavalkya himself; and in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, which is believed to have been the work of Yājnavalkya.
The same sentiment is ascribed to the same royal rishi in verse 7891: 
\textit{Api cha bhavati Maitihlena gitañ nagaram upāhitam agnīa 'bhīvīkshya} | 
\textit{'na khalu mama hi dahyate 'ttra kincit'} svayam idam āha sma bhūmi-
pālañ | ‘And these words were repeated by the king of Mithilā when he beheld the city enveloped in fire, ‘nothing of mine is burnt here;’} | 
\textit{—so said the king himself.’}

Another “ancient story” of Janaka is related in verses 7882–7983 of the same book. It is there stated that this king was constantly engaged in thinking on matters connected with a future life; and that he had a hundred religious teachers to instruct him on different points of duty (verse 7884). He was, however, visited by the rishi Pancha-
sikha\textsuperscript{221} (verses 7886, 7888), a pupil of Āsuri (verse 7890), who so confounded the king’s hundred instructors by his reasoning, that they were abandoned by their pupil, who followed this new teacher (7898. \textit{Upetya śatam āchāryān mohayāmāsa hetuhit} | 7899. \textit{Janakas tv abhisāmraktaḥ Kāpilyānudarāsanāt | utsrijya śatam āchāryyān prishthato ‘nujagāma tam).} –Panchasikha appears also, at verse 11839, as his instructor. At verse 10699 Janaka is again brought forward as receiving religious information from Parāśara; in verses 11545–11836 as being taught by the rishi Yājnāvalkya the principles of the Yoga and Sāṅkhya philosophies; and in verses 11854–12043 as holding a conversation with a travelling female mendicant (\textit{bhikşukā}), named Sulabhā, who sought to prove him, and to whom he declares himself to be a pupil of Pancha-
sikha (here said to belong to the family of Parāśara, verse 11875), and an adept in the systems just mentioned; and from whom, in answer to some reproaches he had addressed to her regarding her procedure, he learns that she belongs to the Rājanya class, like himself, of the family of the rājarshi Pradhāna, that she had obtained no suitable husband, and wandered about, following an ascetic life, and seeking final emancipation (verses 12033 ff.).

A further story in illustration of Janaka’s indifference to worldly objects is told in the Āśvamedhikaparvan, verses 887 ff.

\textsuperscript{221} See Prof. Wilson’s Sāṅkhya-kārikā, p. 190; and Dr. Hall’s Preface to his edition of the Sāṅkhya-pravachana-bhūshya, pp. 9 ff.
Sect. XV.—Other instances in which Brāhmans are said to have been instructed in divine knowledge by Kshatriyas.

Two other cases in which Brāhmans are recorded to have received instruction from Kshatriyas are thus stated by Professor Müller: 222

"For a Kshatriya to teach the law was a crime (eva-dharmatikrama), and it is only by a most artificial line of argument that the dogmatic philosophers of the Mīmāṃsā school tried to explain this away. The Brāhmans seem to have forgotten that, according to their own Upanishads, Ajātaśatru, the king of Kāśi, possessed more knowledge than Gārgya, the son of Balāka, who was renowned as a reader of the Veda, and that Gārgya desired to become his pupil, though it was not right, as the king himself remarked, that a Kshatriya should initiate a Brāhman. They must have forgotten that Pravāhaṇa Jaivali, king of the Panchālas, silenced Svetaketu Āruṇeya and his father, and then communicated to them doctrines which Kshatriyas only, but no Brāhmans, had ever known before." I subjoin two separate versions of each of these stories. The first is that of Ajātaśatru:

Kaushitakī Brāhmaṇa Upanishad, iv. 1. Atha ha vai Gārgyo Bālākir anūchānaḥ saṁspasṭaḥ āsa | sa vasad Uśīnare ṣu savasan Matsyaḥ Kuru-panchālēshu Kāśi-videhesv iti | sa ha Ajātaśatruḥ Kāṣyam āvrajya uśācā "brahma te bravaṇi" iti | tam ha uśācā Ajātaśatruḥ "sahāsaṃ daṇḍaṃ" iti "etasyāṁ vāchī | 'Janako Janakoḥ iti vai u janāḥ dhāvanti" iti | . . . . 19. Tatāḥ u ha Bālākis tāśnīṁ āsa | tam ha uśācā Ajātaśatruḥ "etavād nu Bālāko" iti | "etavād" iti ha uśācā Bālākiḥ | tam ha uśācā Ajātaśatruḥ "mrishā vai khalu mā saṇvādayishthāḥ "brahma te bravaṇi" iti | yo vai Bālāko eteṣām puruṣāh "nartā yasya vai tat karma sa vai veditavyaḥ" iti | tataḥ u ha Bālākiḥ samit-pañiḥ pratichakrame "upāyāṁ" iti | tam ha uśācā Ajātaśatruḥ "pratiloma-rūpam eva tad manye yat kṣatriyo brāhmaṇam upanayeta ehi eva tvā jñapayishyāmi" iti | tam ha pāṇīv abhipadya pravaṇavāja |

"Now Gārgya Bālāki was renowned as a man well read in the Veda. He dwelt among the Uśīnaraś, Matsyas, Kuru, Panchālas, Kāśis, and Videhas, travelling from place to place. He came to

Ajātasatru, the Kāśya, and said, ‘Let me declare to thee divine knowledge.’ Ajātasatru said, ‘We bestow on thee a thousand (cows) for this word.’ Men run to us crying, ‘Janaka, Janaka.’ The learned man accordingly addresses Ajātasatru in a series of statements regarding the object of his own worship, but is silenced by the king’s display of superior knowledge on every topic. The story ends thus: 19. ‘Then the son of Balāka remained silent. Ajātasatru said to him, ‘Dost (thou know only) so much, o Balāki.’ ‘Only so much,’ he answered. The king rejoined, ‘Thou hast vainly proposed to me, let me teach thee divine knowledge.’ He, son of Balāka, who is the maker of these souls, whose work that is,—he is the object of knowledge.’ Then the son of Balāka approached the king with fuel in his hand, and said, ‘Let me attend thee (as thy pupil).’ The king replied, ‘I regard it as an inversion of the proper rule that a Kshatriya should initiate a Brāhmaṇa. (But) come, I will instruct thee. Then, having taken him by the hand, he departed.”

Satarapatha Brāhmaṇa, xiv. 5, 1, 1 (= Brhadāraṇyaka Upanishad, ii. 1, 1, p. 334 of Cal. edit.). Driptabālāki ha anvāchāno Gārgyaḥ āsa | sa ha uvācha Ajāṭasatrum Kāśyam “brahma te bravāní” iti | sa uvācha Ajāṭasatruḥ “saŋasram etasyāṁ vāchi daśmaṁ ‘Janako Janakaḥ’ iti vai anāḥ dhāvati” iti | . . . 12. Sa ha tiṣṭhām āsa Gārgyaḥ | 13. Sa ha uvācha Ajāṭasatrum “elavādu nu” iti | “etavād hi” iti | “na etavatā viditaṁ bhavati” iti | sa ha uvācha Gārgyaḥ “upa tvā ayānī” iti | 14. Sa ha uvācha Ajāṭasatruḥ “pratilomaṁ vai tad yad brāhmaṇaḥ kṣatriyam upeyadr ‘brahma me vakṣhyati’ iti | vy eva tvā jñāpayish-yāmi” iti | tam pāṇāv ādāya uttasthau |

“Driptabālāki Gārgyya was well read in the Veda. He said to Ajāṭasatru, the Kāśya, ‘Let me declare to thee divine knowledge.’ Ajāṭasatru replied, ‘We give thee a thousand (cows) for this word. Men run to me calling out, ‘Janaka, Janaka.’’ At the end of their conversation we are told: 12. ‘Gārgya remained silent. 13. Then Ajāṭasatru asked him, ‘(Dost thou know) so much only?’ ‘Only so much,’ he replied. ‘But this,’ rejoined Ajāṭasatru, ‘does not comprehend the whole of knowledge.’ Then said Gārgya, ‘Let me come to thee (as thy disciple).’ Ajāṭasatru answered, ‘This is an inversion of the proper rule, that a Brāhmaṇa should attend a Kṣatriya with the view

223 See Prof. Cowell’s Translation of the Upanishad, pp. 167 ff.
of being instructed in divine knowledge. (But) I will teach thee.' He took him by the hand, and rose."

The second story is that of Pravāhaṇa Jaivali:

Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, xiv. 9, 1, 1 (= Brhadāraṇyaka Upanishad, vi. 2, 1, p. 1030 of Cal. edit.). Svetaketur ha vai Āruṇeyah Panchālānām parishadam ājagāma | sa ājagāma Pravāhaṇaṁ Jaivalin pariḥrayamānām | tam udikshya abhyavāda "kumāra" iti | sa "bhoḥ" iti pratiṣūś-rāva | "anuṣishṭo no asi pitṛā" | "om" iti ha uvāca | 2. "Vettha yathā imāḥ prajāḥ prayatyo vipratipadyante" iti | "na" iti ha uvāca | "vettha yathā imaṁ lokam punar āpadyante" iti | "na" iti ha eva uvāca | "vettha yathā 'sau lokāḥ evam bahūbhīḥ punāḥ punāḥ pra- yadbhir na sampūryyate" iti | "na" iti ha eva uvāca | 3. "Vettha yathākhyām āhūtyāṁ hūtāyām āpaḥ purusha-vācho bhūtvā samut-thāya vadanti" iti | "na" iti ha eva uvāca | "vettha u devayānasā va pathāḥ pratipadam pitriyānasā va yat kriyā devayānam va panthānam pratipadyate pitriyānaṁ va | 4. Api hi naḥ risher vahāḥ śrutam (R.V. x. 88, 15 = Vāj. S. 19, 47) 'deo śrīt aśriṇāvam pitriṇām ahaṁ dev-vāṁ uta marttyānāṁ | talbhām idāṁ visvam ejat sameti yad antaraḥ pitaram mātaraṁ cha" iti | "na aham ataḥ ekanchana veda" iti ha uvāca | 5. Atha ha enaṁ vasatyā upamantayāyāñchakre | anāditya vasatiṁ kumārāḥ pradaṁrāva | sa ājagāma pitaram | taṁ ha uvāca "iti vāva kila no bhavān purā 'nusishṭān avocohaḥ" 224 iti | "kathaṁ suṃ- dhāḥ" iti | "panchā ma praśnān rājanyabanādh aprākṣhī tato na ekan- chana veda" iti ha uvāca | "katamo te" iti | "ime" iti ha pratīkāny udājahāra | 6. Sa ha uvāca | "tathā nas tvam tata jānīthāḥ yathā yad aham kinchā veda sarvam aham tat tubhyam avocaham | prehi tu tatra pratītya brahmācharyyāṁ vatsyāva" iti | bhavān eva gachhato" iti | 7. Sa ājagāma Gautamo yatra Pravāhaṇaṁ Jaivaler āsa | tasmai āsanaṁ aharīyaṁ 225 udakam āhārayāncakrāḥ | atha ha asmai arghaḥ 226 chākara | 8. Sa ha uvāca "varam bhavate Gautamāya dadmaḥ" iti | sa ha uvāca "pratijñāto me esha varaḥ | yām tu kumārasya ante vācam abhāskathās tāṁ me brūhi" iti | 9. Sa ha uvāca "dīveshu vai Gautama tad vareshu | mānuśaṁ brūhi" iti | 10. Sa ha uvāca "vijnāyate ha ati hiranyaṁ apāttaṁ go-aścānam das- nāṁ pravarāṇān parīdhanānāṁ | mā no bhavān bahor anantaṁsa

224 The text of the Brhadāraṇyaka Up. reads avocah.
225 The Brh. Ār. reads āhārya.
226 The Brh. Ār. reads arghya.
aparyantasya abhy avadanyo bhud' iti | "sa vai Gautama tirtha
evahasai" iti | "upaimy ahum bhavantam" iti "vachha ha esa eva
puuve upayanti" | 11. Sa ha upayana-kirttâ\textsuperscript{227} uvâcha | "tathâ nas
tuâm Gautama mā parâdhas tava cha pitamahâh yatâh | iyam vidyâ
ita\h\h pûrvañ na kasmimîchana brâhmañe uvâsa | tâm tu ahum tuhhyâm
vakshyâmi | ko hi tuv evam bhuvañ tam arhati pratyâkhyâtum" iti |

"Śvetaketu Āruñeya came to the assembly of the Panchâlas. He
came to Prâvâhañça Jaivali, who was receiving service from his
attendants. Seeing Śvetaketu, the king said, 'o youth.' 'Sire,' he
answered. (King) 'Hast thou been instructed by thy father?'
(Śvetaketu) 'I have.' 2. (K.) 'Dost thou know how these creatures,
whcn departing, proceed in different directions?' (S.) 'No.' (K.)
'Dost thou know how they return to this world?' (S.) 'No.' (K.)
'Dost thou know how it is that the other world is not filled with those
numerous beings who are thus constantly departing?' (S.) 'No.'
3. (K.) 'Dost thou know after the offering of what oblation the
waters, acquiring human voices, rise and speak?' (S.) 'No.' (K.)
'Dost thou know the means of attaining the path which leads to the
gods, or that which leads to the Pitris; by what act the one or the
other is gained? 4. And we have heard the words of the rishi:
(R.V. x. 88, 15 = Vaj. S. 19, 47) "I have heard of two paths for
mortals, one to the pitris, another to the gods. By these proceeds
every moving thing that exists between the father and the mother (i.e.
between Dyaus and Pitrivî, heaven and earth)."
' 'I know none of
all these things,' answered Śvetaketu. 5. The king then invited him
to stay. The youth, however, did not accept this invitation, but
hastened away, and came to his father, to whom he said, 'Thou didst
formerly declare me to be instructed.' 'How now (my) intelligent
(son) ?' asked his father. 'The Râjanya,' replied the son, 'asked me
five questions, of which I know not even one.' 'What were the
questions?' 'They were these,' and he told him the initial words of
each of them. 6. The father then said, 'Be assured, my son, that I
told thee all that I myself know. But come, let us proceed thither,
and become (his) pupils. 'Do thou thyself go,' rejoined the son. 7.
Gantama accordingly arrived (at the abode) of Prâvâhañça Jaivali, who
cause a seat to be brought, and water and the madhuparka mess to be

\textsuperscript{227} The text of the Brîh. Ār. Up. reads kîrîtyâ uvâsa.
presented: 8. and said, 'We offer thee a boon, Gautama.' Gautama replied, 'Thou hast promised me this boon: explain to me the questions which thou hast proposed to the youth.' 9. The king replied, 'That is one of the divine boons; ask one of those that are human.' 10. Gautama rejoined, 'Thou knowest that I have received gold, cows, horses, female slaves, attendants, raiment; be not illiberal towards us in respect to that which is immense, infinite, boundless.' 'This, o Gautama,' said the king, 'thou rightly desirest.' 'I approach thee (as thy) disciple,' answered Gautama. The men of old used to approach (their teachers) with words (merely). He (accordingly) attended him by merely intimating his intention to do so. 228 'Do not,' then said the king, 'attach any blame to me, as your ancestors (did not). This knowledge has never heretofore dwelt in any Brāhman; but I shall declare it to thee. For who should refuse thee when thou so speakest?''

Chhāndogya Upanishad, v. 3, 1. Svetaetur ha Āruṇeyoḥ Panchalānāṁ samitim evāya | taṁ ha Pravāhan caivalir uvācha "kumāra anna tvā 'śishat pitā" iti | "anu hi bhagavāḥ" iti | 2. "Vettha yad ito 'dhi praṇāh prayanti" iti | "na bhagavāḥ" iti | "vettha yathā punar ācarrante" iti | "na bhagavāḥ" iti | "vettha pathor deva-yānasya pitri- yānasya cha vyāvarttane" iti | "na bhagavāḥ" iti | 3. "Vettha yathā 'sau loko na sampūryyate" | "na bhagavāḥ" iti | "vettha yathā pan- chayāṁ ahutav āpāḥ purusha-vachaso bhavanti" iti | "naiva bhagavāḥ" iti | 4. "Ata nu kim anusishṭo 'vachathāḥ | yo hi imāni na vidyāt ka- thāṁ so 'nusishṭo braviti"-iti | sa ha āyastaḥ pitur arddham evāya | taṁ ha uvācha "anusishya vāva kila mā bhagavan abradī 'anu tvā 'śisham'" iti | 5. "Pancha mā rājanyabandhuh praśnān aprākṣhit teshāṁ na skanchana asakaṁ vivaktum" iti | sa ha uvācha "yathā mā tvām tuṭā etāṁ avado yathā 'ham eshāṁ na skanchana veda yady aham imān adevishyāṁ katham te na avakshyām" iti | 6. Sa ha Gautamo rājno’rddham evāya | tasmai ha práptaya arhaṁ chakāra | sa ha prātaḥ sabhāgaḥ udyāya | taṁ ha uvācha "mānushasya bhagavan Gautama vi- tasya varaṁ vrinīthāḥ" iti | sa ha uvācha "tava eva rājan mānusham vittam | yām eva kumārasya ante vācham abhāshathās tām eva me brṛhi" iti | 7. Sa ha kriroḥṛi bhāhūva | taṁ ha "chiraṁ vasu" ity ājnāpayān-

228 Or, "by merely intimating, not performing, the respectful mode of approach by touching his feet," according to the Commentator.
chakara | taṁ ha uvāca “yathā mā tvāṁ Gautama avado yathā iyaṁ na prāk tvatthaḥ purā brāhmaṁ nāṁ gachhati tasmād u sarveshu lokeshu kshattrasya eva praśāsanam abhūd” iti | tasmai ha uvāca |

1. Svetaketu Āruneya came to the assembly of the Panchālas. Pravāhaṇa Jaivali asked him, ‘Young man, has thy father instructed thee?’ ‘He has, sire,’ replied Svetaketu. 2. ‘Dost thou know,’ asked the king, ‘whither living creatures proceed when they go hence?’ (S.) ‘No, sire.’ (King) ‘Dost thou know how they return?’ (S.) ‘No, sire.’ (K.) ‘Dost thou know the divergences of the two paths whereof one leads to the gods, and the other to the pitṛis?’ (S.) ‘No, sire.’ 3. (K.) ‘Dost thou know how it is that the other world is not filled?’ (S.) ‘No, sire.’ (K.) ‘Dost thou know how at the fifth oblation the waters acquire human voices?’ (S.) ‘I do not, sire.’ 4. (K.) ‘And hast thou then said “I have been instructed?” for how can he who does not know these things allege that he has been so?’ The young man, mortified, went to his father, and said, ‘Thou didst tell me, I have instructed thee, when thou hadst not done so. 5. That Rājanya proposed to me five questions, of which I could not solve even one.’ The father replied, ‘As thou didst then say to me regarding these five questions, I know not one of them,—(so I ask thee whether) if I had known them, I would not have told them to thee?’ 6. Gautama went to the king, who received him with honour. In the morning, having received his share (of attention), he presented himself before the king, who said to him, ‘Ask, o reverend Gautama, a present of human riches.’ He replied, ‘To thee, o king, belongs wealth of that description. Declare to me the questions which thou proposedst to the youth.’ 7. The king was perplexed and desired him to make a long stay: and said to him, ‘As thou hast declared to me, o Gautama, that this knowledge has not formerly reached the Brāhmans (who lived) before thee, it has therefore been among all peoples a discipline inculcated by the Kshattriya class alone.’ He then declared it to him.

Sect. XVI.—Story of King Viśvantara and the Svyāparaṇa Brāhmans.

Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, vii. 27. Viśvantaro ha Saunadhmanaḥ Svyāparanān parichakshāno viśyāparanāṁ yajnam ājahre | tad ha anubuddha Svyāparanāṁ taṁ yajnam ājagnuḥ | te ha tad-antarvedy āsāńchakriye | taṁ ha drīśṣvā
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vācha "pāpasya vai ime karmanā karttāraḥ āsate apātāyai vācho
vaditāro yath chhāyāparṇaḥ imān utthāpayata ime me 'ntarvedim āsi-
shata" iti | "tathā" iti tān utthāpayanēchakruḥ | te ha utthāpymānāḥ
ruruve ṛṣe "ye tebhya Bhātavirebhyaḥ Asitamrigāḥ Kasyopānām som-
pitam abhiṣijyuyāḥ Pārīkṣhitasya Janamejayasva vikāsyaye yajne tais te
tattra vīravantaḥ āsūḥ | kah svit so 'smāka asti viro yath imān somapītham
abhijeshyah" iti | "ayam aham asmi vo vīraḥ" iti ha uvāca Rāmo Mā-
yaveyaḥ | Rāmo ha аsa Mārgaveyo 'nūchānaḥ S'yāparṇīyaḥ | teshāṁ ha
utīshthatām uvāca "api nu rājann itthāmvidaṁ veder utthāpayanti"
iti | "yas tvam kathāṁ vettiha brhmabandho" iti | 28. "Yatra Indraṁ
devataḥ paryacṛjan Viṣvarūpam Ṭvasṭhräm abhyamaṃsta Viśrītram
astītra yatīn sālōrekhaḥ prādār Arumaghaṁ avadhid Brihaspatoh
pratyavaddhā" iti | "tattva Indraḥ somapīṭhena vyārīhyata | Indrasya
anu vyṛiddhiḥ kshattram somapīṭhena vyārīhyata | api Indraḥ somapīṭhe
'bhavat Tvashtur āmushya somam. | tad vyṛiddham eva adyāpi kshattram
somapīṭhena | sa yas tam bhakshaṁ vidyād yath kshattrasya somapīṭhena
vyṛiddhasya yena kshattram samṛīhyate kathāṁ tam veder utthāpayanti"
iti | "vettiha brhmama tvam tam bhaksham" | "veda hi" iti | "tath vai
no bhrahmaṇa brūhi" iti | "tasmai vai te rājann" iti ha uvāca | 29.
Trayaṇām bhakshānām ekam āharīhyanti somaṁ vā daḍhi vā apo vā | sa
yadī somam brhmamaṇām sa bhakshaḥ | brhmamaṇāṁ tona bhakṣeṇa
jīnīshyasi | brhmamaṇa-kalpas te praṇ āyam ājanīshyate ādaśīi āpiṣyāi āva-
sāyī yathā-kāma-prayāpyaḥ | yadā vai kshattriyāya pāpam bhavati
brhmaṇa-kalpo 'syā praṇāyam ājayate īśivaro ha asmād ādiyito vā tritiyo
vā brhmamaṇatām abhyupaitoh sa bhrahmanbandhavena jīyāshataḥ | atha
yadi daḍhi vaisyānāṁ sa bhakshaḥ | vaisyāṁs tona bhakṣeṇa jīnīshyasi
vaisya-kalpas te praṇāyam ājanīshyate 'nyasa dalī-krīḍa anyasya ādyo
yathā-kāma-jyeyah | yadā vai kshattriyāya pāpam bhavati vaisya-kalpo
'sya praṇāyam ājayate īśivaro ha asmād ādiyito vā tritiyo vā vaisyatām
abhyupaitoh sa vaisyatāyā jīyāśitaḥ | atha yady apaḥ śudrāḥ sa
bhakshaḥ | śudrāṁs tona bhakṣeṇa jīnīshyasi | śudra-kalpas te praṇā-
yām ājanīshyate 'nyasa preshyāḥ kāmottāpyo yathākāma-vadhyah | yadā
vai kshattriyāya pāpam bhavati śudra-kalpo 'syā praṇāyam ājayate |
īśivaro ha asmād ādiyito vā tritiyo vā śudratām abhyupaitoh | sa śudra-
tayā jīyāśitaḥ | 30. Era vai te traya bhakshāḥ rājann" iti ha uvāca
"yesāṁ āsāṁ na āyat kshattriyā yajamānāḥ atha asya esha svō 'bhak-
shaḥ" ityādi |
“Visvantara, the son of Sushadman, setting aside the Syaparnas, was performing a sacrifice without their aid. Hearing of this the Syaparnas came to the ceremony, and sat down within the sacrificial enclosure. Observing them, the king said, ‘Remove these Syaparnas, doers of evil deeds, and speakers of impure language, who have sat down within my sacrificial enclosure.’ Saying, ‘So be it,’ they removed them. When they were being removed, they exclaimed, ‘The Kasyapas found champions in the Asitamrigas who conquered them from the Bhuta-viras the soma-draught at the sacrifice which Janamejaya, the son of Parikshit, was performing without their (the Kasyapas’) aid. Who is the champion who will conquer for us this soma-draught?’ ‘I am your champion,’ cried Rama Margaveya. This Rama was a learned man, belonging to the Syaparna race. When the Syaparnas were moving away, he said, ‘Do they, o king, remove from the sacrificial enclosure a man who possesses such knowledge [as I]?’ ‘How dost thou possess it, Brâhman?’ asked the king. 28. (Rama answered) ‘When the deities rejected Indra, who had killed Tvashtra, prostrated Vrittra, given over the Yatis to the wolves, slain the Arurmaghas, and contradicted Brijaspati, then he (Indra) forfeited the soma-draught. In consequence of his forfeiture, the Kshattras (Kshatriya) class lost it

229 Prof. Weber (Ind. St. i., 215) thinks the words “doers of evil deeds” appear to refer to some variety of ceremonial peculiar to the Syaparnas, and the words “speakers of impure language” to a difference in their dialect; and he is inclined to derive the patronymic of Rama, Margavya, from the impure caste of Margavas mentioned in Manu, x. 34; by which supposition, he thinks, a ground would be discovered for the reproaches which Visvantara addresses to the Syaparna family. In reference to the story of Janamejaya, alluded to in this passage, Weber remarks (Ind. Stud. i. 204): ‘The same work (the Aitareya Brâhma, vii., 27) makes mention of a dispute which this king had with the sacerdotal family of the Bhuta-viras, a branch of the Kasyapas; and which was adjusted by the intervention of the Asitamrigas, who belonged to the same race.’ A Syaparna is alluded to in S’ P. Br. x., 4, 1, 10 (quoted by Prof. Weber, Ind. St. i., 215): Etad ha soma vai tud vidvut Syaparnah Sataka yanah abha ‘yad vai me idam karma samapasyata mama eva prajya Salevanam rajano bhavishyanty mama brhma nano mama vaisyas | yat tu me etuat karmanah samuhi tena me ubhayatho Salevan prajya ‘tireksheyate’ iti | ‘Knowing this Satakayana, the Syaparna, said, ‘If this my rite had been completed, my offspring would have become the kings of the Salvas, mine their Brâhmans, mine their Vaisyas. But as (only) so much of the rite has been completed, my offspring shall, in both respects, excel the Salvas.’’ See also Ind. St. x. 18.

230 See Dr. Haug’s note, p. 487, where he states why he cannot follow Sâyana in rendering abhyamaadista by “killed.” Prof. Weber (Ind. St. ix. 326) defends Sâyana’s interpretation.
also. (But Indra recovered a share in the soma-draught, having stolen Tvashṭrī’s soma.) Hence at present also the Kṣatriyas are excluded from the soma-draught. Why do they remove from the sacrificial enclosure a man who knows that (other) draught which (properly belongs) to the Kṣatriyas who are excluded from the soma-draught, and by which they are rendered prosperous? ‘Dost thou, o Brāhmaṇ, know that draught?’ asked the king. ‘I know it,’ answered Rāma. ‘Declare it then to us,’ rejoined the prince. ‘I declare it to thee, o king, said the other. 29. ‘Of the three draughts they shall bring one, either soma, or curds, or water. If he (the priest, bring) the soma, that is the draught of the Brāhmaṇs, and with it thou shalt satisfy the Brāhmaṇs. One like a Brāhmaṇ shall be born in thy line, a receiver of gifts, a drinker (of soma), a seeker of food,231 a rover at will.’ Whenever the offence (of drinking the Brāhmaṇ’s draught)232 is chargeable to a Kṣatriya, one like a Brāhmaṇ is born in his line, who in the second or third generation from him has the power of becoming a Brāhmaṇ, and likes to live as a Brāhmaṇ. Next, if (the priest bring) curds, that is the Vaiśya’s draught; with it thou shalt satisfy the Vaiśyas. One like a Vaiśya shall be born in thy line, one who is tributary to another, who is to be used (lit. eaten) by another, and who may be oppressed at will. Whenever the offence (of consuming the Vaiśya’s portion) is chargeable to a Kṣatriya, one like a Vaiśya is born in his line, who in the second or third generation from him has the power of becoming a Vaiśya, and is desirous of living as a Vaiśya. Next, if (the priest bring) water, that is the Śūdra’s draught; with it thou shalt satisfy the Śūdras. One like a Śūdra shall be born in thy line, servant of another, who may be expelled and slain at pleasure.

the offence (of drinking the Śūdra’s draught) is chargeable against a Kṣatriya, one like a Śūdra is born in his line, who in the second or third generation from him has the power of becoming a Śūdra, and desires to live like a Śūdra. 30. ‘These, o king, are the three draughts, which the Kṣatriya when sacrificing should not desire. His own proper draught is as follows: Let him squeeze the descending branches

231 Prof. Weber (Ind. Stud. ix. 326) would prefer to translate ātasavya (überall-)wohnend, ‘dwelling everywhere.’

232 Dr. Haug translates ‘when there is any fault on the Kṣatriya (who, when sacrificing, eats the Brāhmaṇa portion),’ etc. See the beginning of par. 30 below.
of the nyagrodha (Indian fig) tree, with the fruits of the udumbara, the āsvattha, and the plaksha trees, and drink these juices. This is his own proper draught.

The continuation may be read in Dr. Haug's translation, pp. 486 ff. After the priest has given the king a deal of further information the result is told in par. 34, as follows:

Tam evam etam bhaksham prabhuce Rāmo Mārgaveyo Viśvantarāya Saushadhanāya | tasmin ha uvācha prakte “sahasram u ha brahmaṇa tubhyaṁ dadmāḥ | eśyāparṇaṁ u me yajnaṁ” iti |

“This draught did Rāma Mārgaveya declare to Viśvantara the son of Sushadman. When it had been declared the king said, ‘Brāhmaṇa, we give thee a thousand (cows): and my sacrifice (shall be performed) with (the aid of the) Śyāparṇaṣ.’”

Sect. XVII.—Story of Matanga who tried in vain to raise himself to the position of a Brāhmaṇa.

The legend of Matanga, which is narrated in the Anuśāsana-parvan or the Mahābhārata, verses 1872 ff., is introduced by a question which Yudhishthīra addresses to Bhīṣma, verse 1867: Kshattriya yadi vā vaisyaḥ śudro vā rājasattamaḥu brahmaṇyaṁ prāpyāyad yena tad me vyākyātyum arhasi vā tapasā vā su mahata karnaṇā vā brūtena vā brahmaṇyaṁ atha cheś ichhet tad me brūhi samāsataḥ | Bhīṣmaḥ uvācha 1870. Brahmaṇyaṁ tāta dusḥprāpyaṁ varṇaṁ kṣattrādhibhis ṭribiḥ | paraṁ hi sarva-bhūtaṁ ēthānam etad Yudhishthīra | bahvēs tu sam- saran yonir jāyamāṇah punah punah | paryāye tāta kasmīṁśchid brāhmaṇo nāma jāyate | “Explain to me the means—whether it be intense austere-fervour, or ceremonies, or Vedic learning—whereby a Kshat- triya, a Vaiśya, or a Sudra, if he desire it, can attain to the state of a Brāhmaṇa. Bhīṣma replies (1870), The state of a Brāhmaṇ is hard to be acquired by men of the other three classes, the Kshattriyas, etc.; for this Brāhmaṇhood is the highest rank among all living creatures. It is only after passing through numerous wombs, and being born again and again, that such a man, in some revolution of being, becomes a Brāhmaṇ.” Bhīṣma proceeds to illustrate this principle by the case of Ma- tanga, who was apparently the son of a Brāhmaṇ, was distinguished for his good qualities, and was esteemed to be himself of the same class as his
father (verse 1873: dvijateḥ kasyachit tātu tulya-varṇan sutas tv abhut | Matango nāma nāmā vai sarvaiḥ samudito guṇaiḥ |) He was, however, discovered to be of spurious birth in the following manner: He happened to be sent somewhere by his father to perform sacrifice, and was travelling in a car drawn by asses. On his way he repeatedly pierced on its nose with the goad the colt which was conveying him along with its mother. Feeling for the wound thus inflicted on her offspring, the she-ass said: “Be not distressed, my son, it is a Chaṇḍāla who is on the car. There is nothing dreadful in a Brāhman; he is declared to be kindly, a teacher who instructs all creatures: how then can he smite any one? This man of wicked disposition shows no pity to a tender colt, and thereby indicates his origin; for it is birth which determines the character” (verse 1876. Uvācha ma śuchaḥ puttra chaṇḍālas tv adhitisthati | brāhmāne dārunam nāsti maitro brāhmaṇa uchyate | āchāryaḥ sarva-bhūtanāṁ sāstā kim praharishyati | ayaṁ tu pāpa-prakṛitir bālo na kurute dayām | sva-yonim mānayaty esa bhāvo bhāvair niyachhati |). Overhearing this colloquy, Matanga instantly got down from the car and besought the she-ass, whom he honoured with the epithet of “most intelligent,” to tell him how she knew him to be a Chaṇḍāla and how his mother had been corrupted. The she-ass informs him that his mother when intoxicated had received the embraces of a low-born barber, and that he was the offspring of this connection and consequently no Brāhman (verse 1882. Brāhmanyāṁ varśhalena tvam mat-tāyāṁ nāpitena ha | jātas tvam asi chaṇḍālo brāhmasyaṁ tena te ’nasat |). On receiving this unwelcome revelation, Matanga returned home, and being questioned by his reputed father about the cause of his speedy reappearance, he told him what he had heard; and expressed his determination to enter on a course of austerities. He does so accordingly with such effect that he alarms the gods, and receives the offer of a boon from Indra. He asks for Brāhmanhood; but Indra tells him that he must perish if he continues to make that request, as the high position he seeks cannot be obtained by one born as a Chaṇḍāla (verse 1895). Matanga, however, continues his exercises for a hundred years, when Indra repeats his former determination, and supports it by reasons, explaining (1901 ff.) that a Chaṇḍāla can only become a Śūdra in a thousand births, a Śūdra a Vaiśya after a period thirty times as long, a Vaiśya a Rājanya after a period sixty times the length, a Rā-
janya a Brāhman after a period of sixty times the duration, and so on, a Brāhman only becoming a Kāṇḍapṛīṣṭha, a Kāṇḍapṛīṣṭha a Japa, a Japa a Srotriya, after immense intervals. Indra therefore advises Matanga to choose some other boon. But the devotee is still dissatisfied with the god's decision, and renews his austerities for a thousand years. At the end of that period he receives still the same answer, and the same advice. But though distressed he did not yet despair; but proceeded to balance himself on his great toe; which, although reduced to skin and bone, he succeeded in doing for a hundred years without falling. At length, when he was on the point of tumbling, Indra ran up and supported him; but continued inexorably to refuse his request; and though further importuned, would only consent to give him the power of moving about like a bird, and changing his shape at will, and of being honoured and renowned (verses 1934 ff.).

The assertion here made of the impossibility of a Kshatriya becoming a Brāhman until he has passed through a long series of births is of course in flagrant contradiction with the stories of Viśvāmitra, Vitahavya, and others.

Matanga (or a Matanga) is mentioned in a passage already quoted in p. 411 as a rājarshi who supported Viśvāmitra's family and for whom that sage sacrificed. He is also named in the Sabhā-parvan, verse 340, as sitting in Yama's assembly along with Agastya, Kāla, and Mrītyu, etc., etc.; in the Vana-parvan, 8079, as a great rishi (maharshi); and in the Stānti-parvan, 10875, as one of certain sages who had acquired their position by austerities (see above, p. 132). His disciples, he himself, and his forest are mentioned in the Rāmāyaṇa, iii. 73, 23, 29, 30.

Sect. XVIII.—Legend of the Brāhman Paraśurāma, the exterminator of the Kshatriyas.

As Paraśurāma belonged to the race of the Bhrigus, it may be advisable to premise some particulars regarding that family.

In his Lexicon, s.v., Professor Roth tells us that the Bhrigus were a class of mythical beings, who, according to the Nirukta, xi. 19, belonged to the middle or aërial class of gods ("mādhyamiko deva-gaṇaḥ" i.e. Nairuktāḥ). They were the discoverers of fire and brought it to men
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(R.V. x. 46, 2, etc.)\(^{233}\) He adds, however, that this race has also a connection with history, as one of the chief Brahmanical families bears this name, and allusions are made to this fact even in the hymns of the Rig-veda (vii. 18, 6; viii. 3, 9, 16; viii. 6, 18; viii. 91, 4). Bṛṇgu is also, as Prof. Roth observes, the name of a rishi representing a family, who is mentioned in Atharva-veda, v. 19, 1, as suffering injury at the hands of the Śrīnjayas (see above, p. 286). As regards his birth, it is said in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, iii. 34, that first the Sun, and then Bṛṇgu arose out of the seed which had issued from Prajāpati,\(^{234}\) that Bṛṇgu was adopted by Varuṇa, and was consequently called Vāruṇi, etc. (Tasya yad retasaḥ prathamam udādyata tad asāv ādityo 'bhavat | yad devityam āṣīt tad Bṛṇgur abhavat | taṁ Varuṇa nyagrihyता | tasmāt sa Bṛṇgur Vāruṇiḥ). He is accordingly called by this name in the S.P. Br. xi. 6, 1, 1, where he is said to have conceived himself to be superior in knowledge to his father Varuṇa (Bṛṇgur ha vai Vāruṇir Varuṇam pitarām vidyayā 'timene); and also in the Taittirīya Upanishad (Bibl. Ind. p. 123: Bṛṇgur vai Vāruṇir Varuṇam pitarām upasassāra).\(^{235}\) The preceding story of Bṛṇgu's birth is developed and modified in the Anuśāsana-parvan of the Mahābhārata, verse 4104 ff.: 

Vaiśishṭhaṁ uvācha | api chedam purā Rāma śrutam me Brahma-darśanam | Pitāmahasya yad vṛttam Brahmānaḥ paramātmanaḥ | devasya mahatas tātā Varuṇaṁ bibhratas tanum | aśvavyas vāruṇe Rāma Rudrasyeśasya vai prabhoḥ | "Vaiśishṭha said, 4104: I have also heard, o Rāma (i.e. Paraśurāma), of this vision of Brahmā, of that which occurred regarding Pitāmah, Brahma, the supreme spirit, the great god (i.e. Mahādeva), Rudra, Īša, the lord, assuming the body of Varuṇa, and invested with the dominion of Varuṇa." After this singular description of Mahādeva as identified with Brahmā, Brahma the supreme spirit, and Varuṇa, the speaker goes on to tell us that the munis, the gods headed by Agni, the embodied portions of the sacrifice, and the Vedas, etc., assembled on the occasion referred to, and then proceeds, verse 4112: 

Eśa Brahmā Sīvo Rudro Varuṇo 'gniḥ Prajāpatiḥ | kṛttyate bhagvān devaḥ sarva-bhūta-patiḥ śivah | tasya yajnah 

\(^{233}\) See my article on "Manu, the progenitor of the Āryyan Indians" in Journ. R. A. S. for 1863, p. 415 f.; and above, pp. 168 and 170.

\(^{234}\) The commencement of the story, of which this is part of the sequel, is given above, p. 107 f.

\(^{235}\) See Ind. Stud. ii. 231, and Journ. of the Gorman Or. Soc. ix. 240.
Paśupates 'tapaḥ krātava eva cha | śikṣāh dīpta-vratā devā dīṣak cha sa-
dīğṭevarāḥ | deva-patnyāḥ cha kanyāḥ cha devānām chaiva mātaraḥ |
ajagmuḥ sahitās tattra tadā Brīgu-kulōdvaḥ | 4115. Yajnam Paśu-
pateḥ prītaḥ Varunaśya mahātmanāḥ | Svayambhūvas tu tāḥ dṛṣṭātvā
tetaḥ samapatad bhūvi | tasya śukrasya visyandāt pāṃśūn sangrihiya
bhūmitaḥ | prāṣyat Paśā karābhyaśām vai tasmīn eva hūtāśane | tatas
tasmin sampravṛtte sattre jvalita-pāvake | Brahmaṇo jhūvatas tattra
prādurbhavo babhava ha | skanna-mātram cha tach cihukram śruveṇa
parigrihiya saḥ | ajya-vad mantrataś chāpi so 'juhoḍ Bṛigu-nandana |
tatas tu janayāmāsa bhūta-grāmaṁ cha viryavān | . . . . 4121. Sukre
hute 'gnau tasmiṁs tu prāduraśasṁs trayāḥ prabhō | purushaḥ vapushā
yuktāḥ svaḥ svaḥ prasava-jair-gunaḥ | "bhṛig" ity eva Bṛiguḥ pār-
vam angaṛēbhyo 'ngirā 'bhavat | angāra-sāmśrayaḥ chaivo Kaviṁ ity
aparo 'bhavat | saha jvalālbhir utpanno Bṛiguḥ tasmād Bṛiguḥ smṛitaḥ |
. . . . 4140. "Varuṇaḥ oṣevāra devo labhataṁ kāmaṁ ṣpitaṁ" | nisar-
gād Brahmaṇaḥ chāpi Varuṇo yūdasāṃpaṭiḥ | jagrāha vai Bṛiguṃ pār-
vam apatyaṁ sūrya-vaṃchasam | Ikaro 'ngirasaṁ chāgner apatyārtham
akalpayat | Piṭāmhas te apatyaṁ vai Kaviṁ jagrāha tattva-vit | tadā
sa Varuṇaḥ khyāto Bṛiguḥ prasava-karma-kṛit | Āgneyas tv Aṅgirāḥ
sṛmān Kaviṛ Brahmaḥ mahāyaśaḥ | Bhāravāvṛtvasa loke loka-san
tāna-lakṣaṇau | ete hi prasavāḥ sarve prajānāṁ patayaṁ trayāḥ |
sarvaṃ santānam eteṣām idam ity upadhāraya | Bṛigos tv puttraḥ
saptāṃ sarve tuṣyāḥ Bhṛigor guṇaḥ | Chvaevano Vajraśritshaḥ cha
Suchir Auvras tathāiva cha | Sukro Vareṇyaḥ cha Vikhuḥ Savanas
chetai saṇta te | Bhārgavāḥ Varuṇaḥ sarve yeshāṁ vāṃśo bhavān api |
"4112. Thiś adorable and gracious god, lord of all creatures, is known
as Brahmā, Śiva, Rudra, Varuṇa, Agni, Prajāpati. This Paśupati (had)
a sacrifice.336 Austere-servour, Oblations, Consecration, (Dīkṣāḥ) that
godess with brilliant rites, the Points of the compass, their regents,
the wives, daughters and mothers of the gods came all together with
joy (4115) to this sacrifice of Paśupati the great Varuṇa. When Svay-
ambhū (Brahmā) saw these goddesses his seed fell to the ground.
Pūshan in consequence collected the particles of dust which were thus
moistened, and threw them into the fire. When the sacrifice with its
blazing fires had begun, there was seen an apparition of Brahmā offering
an oblation. Collecting with the sacrificial ladle that which had fallen,
he cast it, like butter, with sacred texts, into the fire. And thence the powerful god generated all beings. .... 4121. When the seed had been cast into the fire, there arose three men endowed with bodies, and with their own respective qualities derived from their generation. Bhṛigu sprang first from ḍhrīk (the blazing of the fire), Angiras from the cinders, and Kavi⁴²⁷ from a heap of cinders. Bhṛigu was so named because he was produced together with flames." The god, called Mahādeva, Varuṇa, and Pavana, claimed these three men as his own, and the fruit of his sacrifice (verse 4133 f.). Agni and Brahmā also claimed them (4135 f.). The other gods, however, entreated Brahmā to accede to the wishes of Agni and Varuṇa: "4140. 'And let Varuṇa, the lord, the god, also receive the object of his desire.' By the gift of Brahmā, Varuṇa, lord of sea-monsters, first received for his offspring Bhṛigu brilliant as the sun. And Īśvara (Mahādeva) appointed Angiras to be Agni's son. And Pitāmaha, who knows the reality of things took Kavi as his offspring. Then Bhṛigu, the progenitor of creatures, was named the son of Varuṇa, Angiras the son of Agni, and the glorious Kavi the son of Brahmā. The Bhārgava and the Āngiras are distinguished in the world as the propagators of mankind. For all these three lords of creatures were propagators. Know the whole of this world to be their offspring. Bhṛigu had seven sons, all equal to their father in good qualities, Chyavana, Vajrasūrisha, Suchi, Aurva, Sukra, Vareṇya, Vibhu, and Savana. These were all Bhārgavas, and Varuṇas, to whose race you (Parsurāma) yourself also belong."

In another passage of the M. Bh. Ādip. 869, it is similarly said: Bhṛigu mahāshrī ḍhagavān Brahmaṇa vai Scayambhuva | Varuṇasya kratau jātaḥ pāvakād iti nāḥ śrutam | "We have heard that the great and venerable rishi Bhṛigu was produced by Brahmā from fire at the sacrifice of Varuṇa."

The Nirukta, iii. 17, has the following etymology of Bhṛigu: Archi- shi Bhṛiguḥ sambhavā | Bhṛiguḥ bhṛijyamāno na dehe | "Bhṛigu was produced in the flame; though roasted, he was not consumed."

The Taitt. Br. i. 8, 2, 5, has a different account: Indraṣya suṣhuvā- nasya tretāḥ indryaṁ viryyaṁ parāpatat | Bhṛiguḥ tritīyaṁ abhavat |

⁴²⁷ In the M. Bh. Ādip. v. 2606, Kavi is said to be Bhṛigu's son (Bhṛigok puttrah Kavī veḍāun Sukraḥ). On the other hand he, or another person of the same name, is said in the Anuśasana-p. 4150, to be, along with Kavi, a son of Kavi.
“While Indra was continuing to pour out Soma, his manly vigour fell in three portions. The third became Bṛigu.”

Bṛigu is declared in the Vishnū P. (see above, p. 65) to have been one of the nine Brahmās, mental sons of Brahmā. The Bhāg. P. iii. 12, 23, says he sprang from the skin of the creator (Bṛiguṃ tuvaḥ). The M. Bh. Ādip. 2605, on the contrary declares: Brahmano hridayam bhītvā nissrito bhagavan Bṛiguḥ | “The venerable Bṛigu, having split Brahmā’s heart, issued forth” (Weber, Ind. St. ii. 231). So, too, the Vāyu P. i. 9, 100: Bṛiguṣ tu hridayāj jajne rishiḥ Salilajmananāḥ | “Bṛigu was produced from the heart of the Water-born (Brahmā);” and adds, verse 103: Ity ete mānasāḥ putrāḥ vijneyāḥ Brahmanāḥ sutāḥ | Bṛigu-ādayas tu ye sriśṭaḥ navāte brahma-vādinaḥ | 104. Gṛihamedhinaḥ purūnas dharmas tāḥ prāk pravarttitaḥ | “These were the mind-born sons of Brahmā. Bṛigu, and the others, nine in all, who were created, were declarers of sacred knowledge and ancient householders; by them was duty of old established.” Manu mentions Bṛigu (i. 35, see above, p. 36) as one of his own ten sons. He also speaks of him (i. 59, 60, above, p. 38) as commissioned by himself (Manu) to promulgate his code. In Manu, v. 1, however, the sage is said to have sprung from fire (iddam uchur mahātmānam anala-prabhavam Bṛigum). As, however, he had been previously declared to be one of Manu’s ten sons, and is so called also in the third verse of book v. and the second of book vii., where he is styled Mānavo Bṛiguḥ, Kullūka thinks it necessary to explain this other alleged descent from fire by saying that that had been the sage’s origin in a previous mundane era (Kalpa): Yadyapi prathamāḥḥūye dāsa-prajāpati-madhya “Bṛiguḥ Nāradam eva cha” iti Bṛiguḥ-śriśṭir apī Manutāḥ eva ukta tathāpi kalpa-bhedena agni-prabhavatvam uchyate | tathā cha sṛutiḥ “tasya yad retasaḥ prathamaḥ dedipyate tāt asāv adityo ’ḥvavat | yad deviśīyaṃ āśā Bṛigur” iti | ataḥ eva bhrasṛṣṭaḥ retasaḥ utpannatvāḥ Bṛiguḥ | “Though the creation of Bṛigu, as one of the ten Prājāpātis, is declared, in the 35th verse of the first book, to have proceeded from Manu, still he is here said to have been produced from fire, from the difference in the manner of his birth in the different Kalpas. And so the Veda says (in the passage quoted above from the Ait. Br.). Hence he is called Bṛigu, because he sprang from the seed which fell (bhrasṛṣṭet).233

233 See Prof. Wilson’s note, Vishnū Purāṇa, vol. i. p. 100 ff., in the course of
Professor Roth (Lit. and History of the Veda, p. 135) says: "The Bharigus are one of the most important Vedic families, to which Jamadagni, Chyavana, Aurva, Apnavâna, and other rishis are assigned. Many conjectures might be formed in connection with the part which these several Bharigus play in the later legends; but it seems to me unsafe to draw any conclusions till we are in possession of the intermediate links, and especially till we have learnt more precisely from the Vedic hymns themselves the relations of these families to each other. Nevertheless I will remark that Sunahsepha, the adopted son of Visvamitra, is, according to the Purânas, a Bharigu; and consequently the Bharigus appear in intimate connection with the enemy of Vasîshtha; and further, that Sagara, who was reared by the Bharigu Aurva, is restrained by Vasîshtha in his war of extermination against the Sakas and other barbarous tribes. His enemies, when hard pressed, had resorted to Vasîshtha as an intercessor." (See above, p. 337, and Wilson's Vishnu Purâna, vol. iii. p. 291.)

The story of Parasurâma and the Kshatriyas is briefly mentioned in the second section of the Adiparvan of the Mahabharata (verses 272–280), where the events referred to are said to have occurred in the interval between the Tretâ and Dvâpara ages (Tretâ-dvâparayoh sandhau Râmâ āstra-bhritāṁ varah | asakrit pärthivam kshattram jâghânâmar- sha-choditaḥ | sa sarvaṁ kshattram utsâdyā sva-viryaṇânala-dyutiḥ |). The history is more fully told in other parts of the Mahâbhârata. In the 178th–180th sections of the Adiparvan there is a legend in which no mention is made of Parasurâma, or the slaughter of the Kshatriyas; but in which we have the following particulars: Parâsara was son of Saktri, and grandson of Vasîshtha, as we have seen above, p. 417. When he heard of the way in which his father had met his death, he determined to execute a general slaughter of all creatures (v. 6800); 229 but his grandfather restrained him by narrating the history of the which he says, "The Vâyu has also another account of their (the Prajâpatis) origin, and states them to have sprung from the fires of a sacrifice offered by Brahmâ; an allegorical mode of expressing their probable original—considering them to be in some degree real persons—from the Brahmanical ritual, of which they were the first institutors and observers."

229 Reference is made in the commencement of the Vishnu Purâna to the same circumstance (Wilson's Vishnu Purâna, vol. i. pp. 7 ff.) Parâsara is the narrator of the Vishnu Purâna (ibid. p. 11).
Bhirugus and Kshattriyas, as follows: There was a king named Krištviryya, by whose liberality the Bhirugus, learned in the Vedas, who officiated as his priests, had been greatly enriched with corn and money (verse 6809. Yājju yeda-vidāṁ loka Bhirugunāṁ pārthivavarshabhāḥ | sa tān agra-bhujas tata dhānyena cha dhānena cha | somānte tar-payaṁāsa vipulena viśāmpate |). After he had gone to heaven, his descendants were in want of money, and came to beg for a supply from the Bhirugus, of whose wealth they were aware. Some of the latter hid their money under ground, others bestowed it on Brāhmans, being afraid of the Kshattriyas, while others again gave these last what they wanted. It happened, however, that a Kshattriya, while digging the ground, discovered some money buried in the house of a Bhirugus. The Kshattriyas then assembled and saw this treasure, and, being incensed, slew in consequence all the Bhirugus, whom they regarded with contempt, down to the children in the womb (verse 6809. Avamany a tataḥ krodhād Bhirugūṁs tān saranyagatān | nijaṅkhuḥ parameshvāsāḥ sarvāṁs tān niśitaḥ saraiḥ | a-garbād avakṛntantaḥ cheruḥ sarvāṁ vasundharmān |). The widows, however, fled to the Himālaya mountains. One of them concealed her unborn child in her thigh. The Kshattriyas, hearing of its existence from a Brāhmaṇ informant, sought to kill it; but it issued forth from its mother's thigh with lustre, and blinded the persecutors. After wandering about bewildered among the mountains for a time, they humbly supplicated the mother of the child for the restoration of their sight; but she referred them to her wonderful infant Aurva into whom the whole Veda, with its six Vedāngas, had entered (verse 6823. Shaṅ-angās chākhilo vedāḥ inam garbhastham eva ha | viveṣa Bhirugun-vantasya bhūyāḥ priya-chikirshavā |), as the person who (in retaliation of the slaughter of his relatives) had robbed them of their eyesight, and who alone could restore it. They accordingly had recourse to him, and their eyesight was restored. Aurva, however, meditated the destruction of all living creatures, in revenge for the slaughter of the Bhirugus, and entered on a course of austerities which alarmed both gods, asuras, and men; but his progenitors (Pitṛis) themselves appeared, and sought to turn him from his purpose by saying that they had no desire to be revenged on the Kshattriyas: 6834. Nānītāir hi tātā Bhirugubhir bhāvitaṁmahiḥ | badho hy upeshitah sarvaiḥ kshattriyanāṁ vihīṁsatam | ayusā viprakrishṭena yadda nah
kheda āviṣat | tada ’smābhīr badhāṣ tātā kṣhattriyaṁ īpsitaḥ svayam | nikhatāṁ yac cha vai vittaṁ kenachiḥ Bhrigu-veśmaṇi | vairāyaiva tada nyayam kṣhattriyāṁ kopayishūbhiḥ | kiṁ hi vittena naḥ kāryyaṁ sar-gepsūnāṁ dvijottāma | . . . 6841. Mā badhīḥ kṣhattriyāṁs tāta na lokāṁ sapta putrākā | dūṣhayantaṁ tapas-tejāḥ krodham utpatitaṁ jahi | “6834. It was not from weakness that the devout Bhrigu overlooked the massacre perpetrated by the murderous Kṣhattriyas. When we became distressed by old age, we ourselves desired to be slaughtered by them. The money which was buried by some one in a Bhrigu’s house was placed there for the purpose of exciting hatred, by those who wished to provoke the Kṣhattriyas. For what had we, who were desiring heaven, to do with money?” They add that they hit upon this device because they did not wish to be guilty of suicide, and concluded by calling upon Aurva to restrain his wrath; and abstain from the sin he was meditating, verse 6841: “Destroy not the Kṣhattriyas, o son, nor the seven worlds. Suppress thy kindled anger which nullifies the power of austere-fervour.” Aurva, however, replies that he cannot allow his threat to remain unexecuted. His anger, unless wreaked upon some other object, will, he says, consume himself. And he argues on grounds of justice, expediency, and duty, against the clemency which his progenitors recommend. He is, however, persuaded by the Pitrīs to throw the fire of his anger into the sea, where they say it will find exercise in assailing the watery element, and in this way his threat will be fulfilled. “It accordingly became the great Hayaśiras, known to those who are acquainted with the Veda, which vomits forth that fire and drinks up the waters” (Mahād Hayaśiro bhātā yat tad veda-viḍo vidvuh | tam aṅgim udgirad vaktrat pibaty čo mahodadhau). It is worthy of remark that in a legend, one object of which, at least, would seem to be to hold up to abhorrence the impiety of the Kṣhattriyas in oppressing the Brāhmans, we should thus find a palliation of the conduct of the oppressors, coming from the other world. But here the principle of the nothingness of mundane existence asserts itself; and the final superiority of the Brāhmans is vindicated, while their magnanimity is exemplified.

The next version of this legend, which I shall quote, is that given in the 115th–117th sections of the Vanaparvan. Arjuna, son of Kṛṭavīrya, and king of the Haihāyas, had, we are told, a thousand arms.
He obtained from Dattatreya an aerial car of gold, the march of which was irresistible. He thus trod down gods, Yākshas, rishis, and oppressed all creatures (10137. *Āvyāhata-gatiḥ chaiva rathas tasya mahāt-
manah | ratheṇa tena tu tādā vara-dānena viryyavān | mamardda devān
yakṣhāṁs cha rishīṁs chaiva samantataḥ | bhūtāṁs chaiva sa sarvāṁs tu
pādayāmāsa sarvataḥ []). The gods and rishis applied to Vishnu, and he along with Indra, who had been insulted by Arjuna, devised the means of destroying the latter. At this time, the story goes on, there lived a king of Kānyakubja, called Gādhi, who had a daughter named Satyavati. The marriage of this princess to the rishi Rīchika, and the birth of Jamadagni, are then told in nearly the same way as above narrated in page 350. Jamadagni and Satyavati had five sons, the youngest of whom was the redoubtable Paraśurāma. By his father's command he kills his mother (who, by the indulgence of impure desire, had fallen from her previous sanctity), after the four elder sons had refused this matricidal office, and had in consequence been deprived of reason by their father's curse. At Paraśurama's desire, however, his mother is restored by his father to life, and his brothers to reason; and he himself is absolved from all the guilt of murder; and obtains the boon of invincibility and long life from his father. His history now begins to be connected with that of king Arjuna (or Kārtavīrya). The latter had come to Jamadagni's hermitage, and had been respectfully received by his wife; but he had required this honour by carrying away by force the calf of the sage's sacrificial cow, and breaking down his lofty trees. On being informed of this violence, Paraśurāma was filled with indignation, attacked Arjuna, cut off his thousand arms, and slew him. Arjuna's sons, in return, slew the peaceful sage Jamadagni, in the absence of Paraśurāma. The narrative thus proceeds:

10201. *Dādāha pitarāmaḥ chāgnau Rāmaḥ para-purasanayaḥ | pratijñāna
badhaṁ chāpi sarva-kshattrasya Bhārata | sa kruddho 'tibalaḥ sankhye
sastraṁ ādāya viryyavān | jaghnivān Kārtavīryasya sutān eko 'ntak-
opanaḥ | Teshāṁ chāṇugataḥ ya cha kshattriyāḥ kshattriyarchabhaḥ |
tāṁs cha sarvān avāmpidhnaḥ Rāmaḥ praharatāṁ varah | trissaptakrītvaḥ prithiviṁ kritva niḥkshattriyāṁ prabhuḥ | samantapanchako
pancha chakāra raudhirān hradan | 10205. Sa teshu tarpaṇyāmaḥ Bhṛ-
gūn Bhṛgu-kulōcvahāḥ | sākshād dadarasā charchikāṁ sa cha Rāmaṁ
nyavedyat | tato yajnena mahata Jāmađagnyaḥ pratāpavān | tarpaśya-
māsa devendram rītvigbhyāḥ pradadau mahīm | vedatā chāpy adadād hai-
mīn Kaśypaśya mahātmame | daśa-vyāmāyatatāṃ kriśvā navoteśdhāṃ viśāṃpate | tāṃ Kaśyapasyaśumarater brāhmaṇāḥ khaṇḍaśas tadā | vyā-
bhaajas te tadā rājan prakhyātāḥ Kaṅḍavāyaṇāḥ | sa pradāya mahīm
tasmā Kaśypaśya mahātmame | asmin mahendre śailendre vacaty amita-
vikramaḥ | evam vairam abhūt tasya khaṭṭriyair loka-vāsībhīḥ | prithivi-
chāpi vijitā Rāmeṇāmita-tejasā |

"Rāma, after performing, on his return, his father's funeral obsequies, vowed to destroy the whole Khaṭṭriya race; and executed his threat by killing first Arjuna's sons and their followers. Twenty-
one times did he sweep away all the Khaṭṭriyas from the earth, and formed five lakes of blood in Samantapanchaka; (10,205) in which he satiated the manes of the Brāhugas, and beheld face to face (his grand-
father) Rīchīka, who addressed himself to Rāma. The latter gratified
Indra by offering to him a grand sacrifice, and gave the earth to the
officiating priests. He bestowed also a golden altar, ten fathoms long
and nine high, on the mighty Kaśyapa. This, by his permission, the
Brāhmans divided among themselves, deriving thence the name of
Kaṅḍavāyaṇa. Having given away the earth to Kaśyapa, Paraśu-
rāma himself dwells on the mountain Mahendra. Thus did enmity
arise between him and the Khaṭṭriyas, and thus was the earth con-
quered by Rāma of boundless might."

The means by which the Khaṭṭriya race was restored are described
in the following passage from the Ādiparvan, verses 2459 ff.:

Trissapta-kriśvāḥ prithiviṃ kriśvā niḱkhaṭṭriyāṃ purā | Jāma-
dagnyas tapas tepe Mahendre parvatottame | 2460. Tadā niṃkhaṭṭriya
loke Bhārgavena kriśe sati | brāhmaṇān khaṭṭriyaḥ rājan sutārthino
'bhiḥkramuḥ | tābhīḥ saha samāśetur brāhmaṇāḥ samsita-vratāḥ | rītāv
ritau nara-vyāghra na kāmād nāṇritau tathā | tebhyaḥ cha lebhivo garb-
haṃ khaṭṭriyās taḥ sahasraśaḥ | tataḥ sushwicet rājan khaṭṭriyaṃ
vīryavattarān | kumārāṃs cha kumārīs cha punāḥ khaṭṭrābhīvīd-
dhyaye | evam tadā brāhmaṇaḥ khaṭṭram khaṭṭriyasu tapasvībhīḥ |
jātaḥ vṛiddhaḥ cha dharmena sudirghenāyushānvitam | chatvāro 'pi tato
varnāḥ bābhuvur brāhmaṇottarāḥ |

"2459. Having one and twenty times swept away all the Khaṭṭ-
triyas from the earth, the son of Jamadagni engaged in austerities ou
Mahendra the most excellent of mountains. 2460. After he had cleared the world of Kshattriyas, their widows came to the Brāhmans, praying for offspring. The religious Brāhmans, free from any impulse of lust, cohabited at the proper seasons with these women, who in consequence became pregnant, and brought forth valiant Kshattriya boys and girls, to continue the Kshattriya stock. Thus was the Kshattriya race virtuously begotten by Brāhmans on Kshattriya women, and became multiplied and long-lived. Thence there arose four castes inferior to the Brāhmans."

This restoration of the Kshattriyas and their rule is said to have been followed by a state of great virtue, happiness, and prosperity. As one exemplification of the religious perfection which prevailed, it is said that "the Brāhmans did not sell their sacred lore, nor recite the Vedas in the vicinity of Śūdras" (verse 2474. Na cha vikrīnata brahma brāhmaṇaḥ cha tadā nṛipa | na cha śūdra-samābhyaśe vedān uchharaṇyanty uṭa |).

Another version of this legend is given in the Śāntiparvan, section 49. The birth of Jamadagni as the son of Rīchika and Satyavatī is related very much as in the Vishnu Purāṇa (see above, p. 349 f.); but Rīchika tells his wife that the whole of her father’s race shall become Brāhmanical (verse 1741. Brahma-bhūtaṁ hi sakalam pitus tava kulaṁ bhavet); and of Viśvāmitra, the son of Gādhi, we are told that he "had the character of a Brāhman, and was possessed of all Brahmanical qualities" (1745. Viśvāmitraṁ cha dāyādaṁ Gādhīḥ Kuśika-nandanaḥ | yam praṇa brahma-samitaṁ viśvair brahma-guṇair yutan |). Jamadagni was father of the dreadful Parasurāma, "who became perfect in science, thoroughly versed in archery, and the slayer of the Kshattriyas, himself violent as flaming fire. By propitiating Mahādeva he obtained, among other weapons, the irresistible axe (paraśu)" (1747. Sarva-vidyānta-gaṁ śreṣṭhaṁ dhanur-vedasya pāragam | Rāmaṁ kshattriya-hantāram pra-diṭtam iva pāvakaṁ | toshayitvā Mahādevam parvate Gandhamādane | astrāṁ varayāmāsa paraśum chātitejasam |), from which his name is derived. Arjuna, son of Kṛitavrīya, king of the Haihayas, is here also represented as having a thousand arms, but in opposition to the previous account he is described as a "dutiful and religious monarch, who at an aśvamedha (horse-sacrifice) bestowed on the Brāhmans the earth with its seven continents and mountains, which he had conquered by his
arms and weapons" (verse 1751. Chakravartti mahātejā viprāṇām āśva-
medhike | dadagu sa prithiviṃ sarvāṃ sapta-deviṃ sa-parvatāṃ | sva-
bāhva-astra-balendāja jītvā prama-parama-viṣ |). He had, however, at
the solicitation of Agni permitted that voracious deity to consume his
towns, villages, forests, etc.; and as the hermitage of Āpava (Vāśishṭhā)
had been destroyed in the conflagration, Arjuna was doomed by the
sage’s curse to have his arms cut off by Parāśurāma. The story proceeds:

Verse 1769. Arjuna sa mahātejā bālī nityaṃ śaṃstvitaḥ | brah-
manyāś ca sarvāṇi dātā śuraḥ ca Bhārata | 1760. Nachintayat tadā
śāpaṁ tena dattam mahātmanā | tasya putrās tu balināḥ śaṃstvita
pitur badhe | nimittyād avaliptaḥ vai nriśamsā chaiva sarvādā | Jama-
dagni-āhenaṃ te vatsam ānīnyu Bharatarshabha | ajanātāṃ Kṛttva-
viryena Haihayendrena dhīmata | tannimmata abhūd yuddhāṃ Jamadgner
mahātmanāḥ | tato rjumasya bāhuṁ tān cchittvā Rāma ruchiṇa naivaḥ |

. . . . 1766. Tataḥ piti-baddhāmaraśād Ramaḥ prama-manyumān |
niḥkṣhatriyāṁ pratiśrutiya mahāṁ sāstram agrīhata | tataḥ sa Bhṛgub-
śārdalaḥ Kṛttvārasya viryavān | vikramyā vijaghaṇāśu putṛnaṃ paut-
trām ca sarvāḥ | sa Haihay-a-sahprasāi hatvā prama-manyumān | cha-
kāra Bhṛgavo rājan mahāṁ sūna-kardamām | sa tathā "su mahātejāh
kṛitvā niḥkṣhatriyāṁ mahāṁ | 1770. Kṛṣpayā parayā "vishṭo vanam eva
jaṅgama ha | tato varsha-sahareshu samavatiesha keshuchit | kshepan sam-
prāptavāṃs tattra prakrityā kopanaḥ prabhuḥ | Viśvāmitrasya pauttras
tu Raibhya-pattra mahātapaḥ | Parāvasur mahārāja kṣiptaḥ (kṣiptvā
"ha ?) jana-sāmasādī | "ye tu Yayeśi-patane yajne santāḥ samāgataḥ | Pra-
tarddāna-prabhrityayo Rāma kiṃ kṣhatriyāḥ na te | mithyā-pratijno Rāma
tvaṁ kathhase jana-sāmasadī | bhāyāt kṣhatriya-virāṇām parvataṃ samu-
pāritvaḥ | sā punaḥ kṣhatriyā-saṭaḥ prathiv śarvataṃ triṇa" | 1775.
Parāvasor vacchāḥ śrutvā śastrāṁ jagrāha Bhṛgavaḥ | tato ye Kṣh-
triyāḥ rājan satasaḥ tena varjitaḥ | te vijriddhāḥ mahāṅvīryāḥ prithivi-
patayo bhavan | sa punas tān jaghaṇāśu bālān api nardhipa | garbh-
āthsās tu mahī vyāptā punar evabhavat tādā | jātaṃ jātaṃ sa garbhāṃ tu
punar eva jaghāna ha | arakshaṁ tu sūnaṃ kāmśchit tadā kṣhatriya-
yoshitaḥ | triśapta-kṛteṣāḥ prithivim kṛitvā niḥkṣhatriyāṁ prabhuḥ | dakhinām aśvamedhaṅte Kasyapayādaddū tādā | sa kṣhatriyaṅām
seśhārthaṁ kareṇodāśya Kasyapāḥ | 1780. Sruk-pragrahavata rājaṁ
rato vākyam athāravat | "gachha tiram samudrasya dakhiniṁ a mahāmune | na te mad-vishaye Rāma vastrayam iha karhichit" | tataḥ
EARLY CONTESTS BETWEEN

Sûryârakâṁ desaṁ sâgaras tasya nirmame | sahasâ Jâmadagnyasya so
parânta-mahîtalam | Kaśyapas tâm mahârâja pratigrihyà vasundharàm | krútâ brahmâna-saṁsthâm vai pravîshṭàh sumahâvânam | tataḥ sûdrâs cha vaîkyaś cha yathâ-śvair-prachârināḥ | avartanta dvijâgyânâm
dârshu Bharatarañabhà | arâjâke jîva-loke durbalaḥ balavattaraś | 1785. Priyante na hi vitteshu prabhutovaṁ kaśyacht tadā | tataḥ kâlena
prîthivî priyamânâ durâtmabhîḥ | viparyayena tenâśu prâviveśa râsîtalam | arakshyamânâ vihîvat kshattriyair dharmà-râkhîbîḥ | tâm
drishyâ dravatîm tattra santrâsât sa mahâmanâḥ | âruṇâ dhàrayamâsa
Kaśyapaḥ prîthivîm tataḥ | dhritâ tenoruna yena tenorvîti mahâ smûtâ | râkshanârthâm saumuddâsyà yayahâ prîthivî tadā | prasâdyà Kaśyapaṁ
devâ varayamâsa bhûmipam | prîthivy uvâcha | 1790. "Santi brahmân
mayâ guptâ strīsu kshattriya-pungâvâḥ | Haihayânâm kulo jâtâs te
saṁrakshantu mâm mune | asti Paurava-dāyâdo Vidâratha-sutâḥ prabhâ |
piṅkshâî saṁvardhîto vipra piṅkshavaty atha parvate | tâtha 'nukampa-
mânâna yajvanâ 'py amityajâsa | Parâsârenâ dâyâdâh Saudâsasyâ-
bhîrakshîtaḥ | sarva-karmâni kuruto sûdrâ-vat tasya sa dvijâ | Sarva-
karmety abhikhyâtaḥ sa mâm rakshatu pârthivâḥ | . . . . 1799. Eto
kshattriya-dâyâdâs tattra tattra pariśritâḥ | dyokâra-HEMA-kârâdi-jâtiṁ
nityân samâsritâḥ | 1800. Yadi mâm abhirakshânti tadâ sthâsyâmi
nîchâlaâ | eteshâm pitaraś chaiva tathaiva cha pitâmahâḥ | mad-artham
nihatâḥ yuddhe Rûmeṇâkrishta-karmâṇa | teshâm apachitiś chaiva mayâ
dârya mahâmune | na hy ahaṁ kâmaye nityam atîrântena rakshañam |
varitamânena varitewayà tat khipram saṁvidhîyatâm" | tataḥ prîthivyà
nirdishâtâṁ tân samânyâ Kaśyapaḥ | abhyashinçhâd mahîpâlân kshat-
triyân vîrya-sammatân |

"Being of a meek, pious, kind, and charitable turn of mind, the
valiant Arjuna thought nothing of the curse; but his sons, who were
of an arrogant and barbarous disposition, became the cause of its
resulting in his death. Without their father’s knowledge they took
away Jâmâdagni’s calf; and in consequence Paraśurâma attacked
Arjuna and cut off his arms.” His sons retaliated by killing Jâma-
dagni. 1766. Paraśurâma incensed at the slaughter of his father,
having vowed in consequence to sweep away all Kshattriyas from
the earth, seized his weapons; and slaying all the sons and grandsons
of Arjuna, with thousands of the Haihayas, he turned the earth into a
mass of ensanguined mud. 1770. Having thus cleared the earth of
Kshattriyas, he became penetrated by deep compassion and retired to the forest. After some thousands of years had elapsed, the hero, naturally irascible, was taunted by Parāvasu, the son of Raibhya and grandson of Viśvāmitra, in a public assembly in these words: ‘Are not these virtuous men, Pratardana and the others, who are assembled at the sacrifice in the city of Yayāti,—are they not Kshattriyas? Thou hast failed to execute thy threat, and vainly boastest in the assembly. Thou hast withdrawn to the mountain from fear of those valiant Kshattriyas, while the earth has again become overrun by hundreds of their race.’ Hearing these words, Rāma seized his weapons. The hundreds of Kshattriyas who had before been spared had now grown powerful kings. These, however, Paraśurāma now slew with their children, and all the numerous infants then unborn as they came into the world. Some, however, were preserved by their mothers. Having twenty-one times cleared the earth of Kshattriyas, Rāma gave her as a sacrificial fee to Kaśyapa at the conclusion of an aśvamedha. 1780. Making a signal with his hand, in which he held the sacrificial ladle, Kaśyapa, in order that the remaining Kshattriyas should be spared, said to Paraśurāma, ‘Go, great muni, to the shore of the southern ocean. Thou must not dwell in my territory.’ Sāgara (the ocean) created for him a country called Sūrpāraka on the remotest verge of the earth. Having received dominion over the earth, Kaśyapa made it an abode of Brāhmans, and himself withdrew to the forest. Śudras and Vaiśyas then began to act lawlessly towards the wives of the Brāhmans; and, in consequence of there being no government, the weak (1785) were oppressed by the strong, and no one was master of any property. The Earth, being distressed by the wicked, in consequence of that disorder, and unprotected according to rule by the Kshattriyas, the guardians of justice, descended to the lower regions. Perceiving her moving from place to place in terror, Kaśyapa upheld her with his thigh (āru). From this circumstance she derives her name of āru.²⁴⁰ The goddess Earth then propitiated Kaśyapa, and supplicated him for protection, and for a king. ‘I have,’ she said, ‘preserved among females many Kshattriyas who have been born in the race of the Haihayas; let them be my protectors. There is the heir of the Pauravas, the son of Vidūratha, who has been brought up by bears

²⁴⁰ Āru really means ‘the broad,’ signifying the same as prathivī.
on the mountain Rikshavat: let him protect me. So, too, the heir of Saudasa has been preserved by the tender-hearted and glorious priest, Parasara, who has performed, though a Brahman, all menial offices (sarvasvarman) for him, like a Sudra;—whence the prince’s name Sarvakarman.” After enumerating other kings who had been rescued, the Earth proceeds All these Kshattriyas’ descendants have been preserved in different places, abiding continually among the classes of dyokaras and goldsmiths. If they protect me, I shall continue unshaken. Their fathers and grandfathers were slain on my account by Rama, energetic in action. It is incumbent on me to avenge their cause. For I do not desire to be always protected by an extraordinary person [such as Kasyapa]; but I will be content with an ordinary ruler. Let this be speedily fulfilled.’ Kasyapa then sent for these Kshattriyas who had been pointed out by the Earth, and installed them in the kingly office.”

This reference to the bestowal of the Earth upon Kasyapa is founded on an older story which occurs both in the Aitareya and the Satapatha Brha mañas. The passage in the first-named work is as follows, viii. 21. Etam ha vai Aindreya mahbhishhekeya Kasyapo Vishvakarmanam Bhawanaam abhishhecha | tasmad u Vishvakarma Bhawanaḥ samantam sarvataḥ prithivin jayan paryāya aśvena cha madhyena yē | bhūmir ha jagav ity udāharanti “na mā martaṇyaḥ kaśchana dātum arhati Viśvakarman Bhauvana māṁ didāsi tha | nimankhyo ’ham sarilasya madhye moghas te esha Kasaṣyapaśā sangaraḥ” iti | “With this great inauguration like that of Indra did Kasyapa consecrate Viśvakarman Bhauvana, who in consequence went round the Earth in all directions, conquering it; and offered an asvamedha sacrifice. They relate that the Earth then recited this verse:

“Me may no mortal give away; but thou, oh king, dost so essay; Deep will I plunge beneath the main; thy pledge to Kasyapa is vain.”

The Satapatha Brha maña, xiii. 7, 1. 15, says: Taṁ ha Kasyapo yā-jayānehakāra | tad api bhūmiḥ slokaṁ jagau “na mā martaṇyaḥ kaśchana dātum arhati Viśvakarman Bhauvana mandaḥ āsītha | upamankhyati syā sarilasya madhye mṛśhaṁśaṁ te sangaraḥ Kasyapāya” iti | “Kasyapa officiated for him at this sacrifice. Wherefore also the Earth recited this verse: ‘No mortal may give me away. Viśvakarman, son of
Bhauvana, thou wast foolish (in offering to do so). She will sink into the midst of the waters. Thy promise to Kaśyapa is vain."

The story is also related in the Bhagavata Purāṇa in a similar way. I note the chief points and variations. When Gādhi’s daughter was demanded in marriage by the rishi Rīḍhika, the king considered that the suitor was not a fit husband for a daughter of his noble race; and said, "Give me a thousand horses white as the moon, each with one black ear, as a marriage gift for the maiden; for we are Kuśikas" (ix. 15, 5. Varam visadrisām matvā Gādhir Bhārgavam aorovit | 6. Ekataḥ sāyama-karnā-nāṁ hayānāṁ chandra-varahāsam | sahasraṁ diyaṭāṁ sulkāṁ kanyāyāḥ Kuśikāḥ vayam |). The youngest offspring of their union was, we are told, "Paraśurāma, who is declared to have been a portion of Vāsudeva (Vishnu in the form of Krishna), and who exterminated the Haihayas. Thrice seven times he swept away from this earth all the Kshattriyas, that depraved and impious race, full of passion and darkness, with which she was burthened. He destroyed them, though the offence which they had committed was but insignificant (v. 14. Yam ahur Vāsudevaṁśaṁ Haihayānaṁ kulāntakam | trisaptakritvo yaḥ imāṁ chakre nihkhattriyāṁ mahīṁ | dūṣṭāṁ kshatttram bhuvō bhūram abrahamgyam anīnasat | rajasa-tamo-viditam aham phalguny api krīte 'mhasi |). King Arjuna, who had been endowed with miraculous powers, took Rāvana prisoner, then released him, and afterwards carried away by force Jamadagni’s cow and calf. Paraśurāma, in revenge, after a terrible battle, and the defeat of the king’s army, cut off Arjuna’s arms and head, and recovered the cow and calf. When his father was informed of the king’s death, he said to Paraśurāma: "Rāma, Rāma, thou hast committed sin, in that thou hast causelessly slain the lord of men, who is composed of all the deities. It is by longsuffering that we, the Brāhmans, have acquired respect; the same means whereby the deity, the instructor of all worlds, attained the highest rank of godhead. By

It will be observed that there are some varieties of reading in the verse, as given in the two Brāhmaṇas. Manuda āsitha in the S’ P’ Br. looks like a corruption of the mām didāsitha of the Aitareya. The story of Arjuna, Parasurāma, and the Kshattriyas is briefly told again in the Āśvamedhika-parvan, but without any new circumstances of particular interest.

See above, p. 350, and note 146. None of the passages I have quoted from the Mahābhārata allude to Paraśurāma being an incarnation of Vishnu.

Compare the passages quoted above in p. 300 from the Vishnu Purāṇa, and from Manu.
patience the fortune of Brahmā shines like the splendour of the Sun. Hari, the lord, is speedily pleased with those who are patient. The murder of a king who has been formally inaugurated is worse than that of a Brähman. Go and expiate thy sin by visiting holy places, with thy mind intent upon Achyuta (Vishṇu)" (ix. 15, 38. Rāma Rāma mahābhāga bhavān pāpam akārashīt\[\textsuperscript{244}\] abadhitā nara-devaṁ yat sarva-devamayaṁ vṛ̥thaṁ | vayaṁ hi brāhmaṇaṁ tāta kshamayaṁ rhaṇatāṁ gataḥ | yayaṁ loka-gurur devaṁ pārames̄hyam ayat pādam | kshamayaṁ rochate laukhmī varī yathā prabhā | kshamināṁ āśu bhagavāṁs tuh-yate Harir īśvaraḥ | rājno mūrdhaḥbhishiktasya badho brahma-badhād guruḥ | tīrtha-asaṁśeyā cāmīho jahy angāchyuta-chetanaḥ []). On his return from this pilgrimage Rāma was desired by his father to kill his mother (on grounds similar to those stated in the account quoted above, p. 450, from the Mahābhārata), as well as his brothers, and executed the order; but at his intercession they were all restored to life. During his absence in the forest, his father Jamadagni was slain, and his head cut off, notwithstanding the entreaties of his wife, by the sons of Arjuna, in revenge for the loss of their own father. Parasurama, hearing his mother's outcries, hastened back to the hermitage, and laying hold of his axe, proceeded to avenge this outrage: ix. 16, 17. Gatvā Māhishmatiṁ Rāmo brahma-ghna-vihata-śriyam | teṣāṁ sa śīrshaḥ bhrīḥ rājan madhye chakre mahāgirirm | 18. Tad-raṅkena nādāṁ ghorāṁ abrahamanya-bhayāvahām | hetūṁ kṛtvā pīṭha-śraddhaṁ kshattre 'mangalakāriṁ | . . . . 20. Pīṭha kāyena sandhīya śīraḥ ādāya barhiṣṭaḥ | sarvadevamayaṁ devam āmnānam ayajād makhāḥ | 21. Daduṣ prāchīṁ dīsim hotre brahmaṅo daksināṁ dīsam | adhvarvaṁ pratīcchīṁ vai udgatre uttarāṁ dīsam | 22. Anyebhyo 'vāntara-dīsāḥ Kaśyapāya ṣha madhyuta- ṇa | āryācarītaṁ upadrāṣṭre sadasyebhyas tataḥ param | 23. Tataḥ chāvakrītha-snaṅa-vidhātāsosha-kilovīśaḥ | Sarasvatīyaṁ brahmaṁ-nadyāṁ rejo vyabhraṁ ivāṁsūmān | . . . . 26. Asto 'dyaṁ Mahendrādram nyastadānāṁ praśantādāṁ | upagīyamāna-charitaḥ Siddha-gandharva-chāraṇāṁ | 27. Evam Bhrigusu viśvētāṁ bhagavān Harir īśvaraḥ | avatīrya param bhūram bhavo 'han bahuśo nripān | "17. He went to the city of Māhishmati, which had been robbed of its glory by those Brähman-slayers, and raised in the midst of it a great mountain composed of their heads. With their blood he formed a dreadful river, which struck

\[\textsuperscript{244}\] So in the Bombay edition. Burnouf's text has the usual form akārashīt.
fear into the impious; justifying his action against the oppressive Kshattriyas by their murder of his father. . . . 20. He then united his father’s head to his body, laying it on the sacred grass; and offered a sacrifice to the divine Spirit, who is formed of all the deities. On this occasion he gave the eastern region of the earth to the hotri priest, the south to the brahman, the west to the adhvaryu, and the north to the udgātri. To others he gave the intermediate regions (south-east, south-west, etc.), to Kaśyapa the central; on the upadrashti he bestowed Āryāvarita, and on the Sadasyas what was beyond. Having then cleansed all his impurity by the avabhrītha ablation in the Sarasvatī, the river of Brahmā, he shone like the sun unobscured by clouds. . . . 26. Having laid aside his weapons, he sits to this day in tranquillity of mind on the mountain Mahendra, whilst his exploits are celebrated by the Siddhas, Gandharvas, and Chāranas. Thus did the universal Spirit, the divine lord, Hari, become incarnate in the Bhrigus, and destroy numerous kings who were a burden to the earth.” It is singular that sin requiring expiation should be, as it is in this narrative, imputed to Paraśurāma, while he is at the same time declared to have been a portion of Vīśṇu, the supreme Spirit.

The story of Paraśurāma is also told in the Droṇaparvan of the Mahābhārata, verses 2427 ff., after those of many other kings and warriors, to illustrate the truth that death must sooner or later overtake even the most pious and distinguished personages. The earlier incidents are briefly narrated; but some of the details, as the slaughter of the Kshattriyas, are dwelt on at greater length than in the other accounts. Some of the victims of the hero’s vengeance are described as “haters of Brāhmans” (brahma-dvīṣām, verse 2431). The Kshattriyas who were slain are described as of various provinces, viz. Kāśmīras, Daradas, Kuntis, Kshudrakas, Mālavas, Angas, Vangas, Kalingas, Vidhehas, Tāmrālīptakas, Rakhovāhās, Vītihotras, Trigarttas, Mārtri-kāvatas, Sīvis, and other Rājanyas (Sīvin anyāṁ cā ṛajanyāṁ, verse 2437). At verse 2443 the narrative proceeds: Nirāśayam prithivīṁ kriteś śiṣteśa-Jana-sankulām | Kaśyapaya dadasau Rāmo haya-medhe mahāmakhe | trisaptā-vārāṁ prithivīṁ kriteś nihkshattriyāṁ prabhuh | iṣṭvā kratu-saṁtair viro brāhmaṇe-bhayo hy amanyata | septa-dvīpāṁ vasumatim Mārchiḥ ’priṅnata dvijaḥ | Rāmam provācha “nirgachha vasudhāto mamājnaya | sa Kaśyapasya
eçanāt prātārya saritāmpatim | iṣuvatāir yudhāṃ kresṭhaḥ kurvan
brāhmaṇa-sāsanam | adhyāvasad giri - kresṭhaṁ Mahendram pareto-
ttanaṁ | “2443. Having freed the earth from Dasyus (or robbers), and
filled her with respectable and desirable inhabitants, he gave her to
Kasyapa at an aśvamedha. Having twenty-one times cleared the earth
of Kshattriyas, and offered hundreds of sacrifices, he destined the earth
for the Brāhmans. The Brāhmaṇ, the son of Marīchi (i.e. Kasyapa),
received the earth, and then said to Rāma, ‘Depart out of her by my
command.’ Having repelled the ocean by his arrows, and established
the rule of the Brāhmans, Rāma dwelt on the mountain Mahendra.”

The Anuśāsanaparvan of the same poem has another “ancient story”
about Parasurāma, which, like the preceding passage from the Bhāga-
vata Purāṇa, advert to the pollution incurred by that warrior from his
numerous deeds of blood. It begins as follows: verse 3960. Jāmadag-
yena Rāmeṇa tīvra-roṣhānvilena vai | triserṭa-kṛitraḥ prāthīvī kṛita
niḥkṣhattriyā purā | tato jītvā mahāṁ kṛitśnāṁ Rāmo rājīva-lochanāḥ |
ājāhāra kratuṁ viṁ brahmaṇa-kṣhattrena pājitam | vājī-mvedha mahāraja
sava-kāma-samanvitan | pāvanaṁ sarva-bhūtānāṁ tejo-dyuti-vivarddha-
nam | vipāpmā sa cha tejasā tena kratu-phalena cha | navātmano ‘tha
laghutāṁ Jāmadagnya ‘dhyagaohhata | sa tu kratu-varenśtvā mahātma
dakhiṇavatā | 3965. Paprachhāgama - sampannān rishin devām cha
Bhārgavaḥ | “pāvanaṁ yat param nṛṇāṁ ugro karmayi varttatam |
tad uchyatām mahābhāgāḥ” iti jāta-gṛṅīo ‘bravī | ity uktāḥ veda-
sāstra-jnās tam uchus te maharāhayaḥ | “Rāma viprāḥ satkriyantāṁ
veda-prāmānya-darśanat | bhūyascha viprāshi-gaṇaḥ prasātvayaḥ pāva-
nam prati | to yad brāyur mahāprājnās tach chaiva samudāhara |
“3960. Rāma, son of Jamadagni, having thrice seven times cleared
the world of Kshattriyas, and conquered the whole earth, performed
the horse-sacrifice, venerated by Brāhmans and Kshattriyas, which
confers all objects of desire, which cleanses all creatures, and augments
power and lustre; and became thereby sinless and glorious. He did
not, however, feel relieved in his mind, but after offering the most
excellent of sacrifices, at which presents were bestowed, he (3965) en-
quired of the rishis skilled in the scriptures, and of the gods, what was
that which most perfectly cleansed those men who had committed
deeds of violence; for he felt compunction for what he had done. The
rishis skilled in the Vedas and Śastras replied, ‘Let the Brāhmans be
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the objects of your liberality, as the authority of the Vedas requires; let the Brähman-rishis be further consulted in regard to the means of lustration; and do whatever these wise men may enjoin.’” Paraśurāma accordingly consulted Vaśishṭha, Agastya, and Kaśyapa. They replied that a sinner was cleansed by bestowing cows, land, and other property, and especially gold, the purifying power of which was very great. “Those who bestow it, bestow the gods,” a proposition which is thus compendiously proved: “for Agni comprehends all the gods; and gold is of the essence of Agni” (verse 3987. Devatās te prayachchanti ye suvarṇāṁ dadaty atha | Agnir hi devatāṁ sarvaḥ suvarṇāṁ cha tadātmakam). In regard to the origin of this precious metal, Vaśishṭha tells a very long story, which he had heard Prajāpati relate, how it was born by the goddess Gangā to Agni, by whom she had been impregnated, and was thus the son of that god. “Thus was gold born the offspring of Jātavedas (Agni). That which is produced in Jambūnada is the best, and a fit ornament even for the gods. It is called the chief of gems and of ornaments, the most pure of all pure things, the most auspicious of all auspicious objects; and one with the divine Agni, the lord Prajāpati” (verse 4099. Evaṁ suvarṇaṁ utpannam apatyam Jātavedasaḥ | tatra Jambūnadaṁ bhisthāṁ devānāṁ api bhūšaṇam | 4001. Ratnānāṁ uttamaṁ ratnam bhuśaṇānāṁ tathottamaṁ | pavitraṁ cha pavitrāṇāṁ mangalānāṁ cha mangalam | yat suvarṇaṁ sa bhagavān Agnir iva praśāpaṭiḥ |). It must be highly consolatory for those who are disposed to be liberal to the Brähman, to be assured that the gold which they bestow has such a high mystical, as well as current, exchangeable value. “Paraśurāma,” the story concludes, “after being thus addressed by Vaśishṭha, gave gold to the Brähmans, and was freed from sin” (verse 4183. Iby uktāḥ sa Vaśishṭḥena Jamadagnyaḥ pratāpavaṁ | dadau suvarṇaṁ viprobhyo vyamucchaya cha kilvishāt).

It is interesting to remark how the different distinctive principles of Indian religion and sentiment severally assert themselves in turn, and thus, occasionally, come into conflict with each other, as in the story of Paraśurāma. The primary object of this legend is no doubt to illustrate the vengeance which inevitably overtakes all those who violate the sacredness of the Brähmanical prerogative, and the meritorious character of those who act as its defenders. No sooner, however, is this end ac-
complished, and the impious foes of the priesthood swept away again and again from the face of the earth, than a revulsion of feeling takes place, and the higher principles of the sacredness of life, and of the blessedness of mercy, come forward to claim recognition, and a deep sense of the pollution of bloodshed calls aloud for atonement. In the Bhāgavata, as we have seen, Jamadagni imputes it as a crime to the avenger of the Brāhmans that he had slain a king; and even goes the length of declaring that in doing so he had incurred greater guilt than if he had murdered a Brāhman.

In the same book of the Mahābhārata, verses 7163 ff., an extravagant description is given of the prerogatives and powers of the Brāhmans; and Arjuna is again brought forward, in verses 7187 ff., as at first scouting their pretensions, but as ultimately conceding their unapproachable superiority: “The magnificent and mighty Kārttavirya (Arjuna), possessing a thousand arms, was lord of this whole world, living in Māhishmati. This Haihaya of unquestioned valour ruled over the whole sea-girt earth, with its oceans and continents” (verse 7187. Sahasra-bhyua-bhrīt śrīmān Kārttaviryo 'bhavat prabhuh | asya lokasya sarvasya Māhishmatyām mahābalaḥ | sa tu ratnā- karavatīṁ sadvipaṁ sāgarāmbaram | saśasa prāthiśvaṁ sarvāṁ Haihayaṁ satya-vikramaḥ). He obtained boons from the muni Dattātreya, a thousand arms whenever he should go into battle, power to make the conquest of the whole earth, a disposition to rule it with justice, and the promise of instruction from the virtuous in the event of his going astray. 7196. Tathā sa ratnam āsthāya jvalanārka-samadhyutim | abhvid viṃrasammyohāt “ko nu asti sadrīśo mama | dhairyye viṃrōya yaśah-sauryyo vikramaṃ vajrasā ’pi vā” | tad-vākyante ’ntarikehe vai vāg uvāchāśaririnī | “na tvam mūḍha vijānīshe brāhmaṇaṁ kshattriyad varam | sahito brāhmaṇenaha kshattriyah śāsti vai prajaḥ” | Arjuna uvāca | kuryām bhātāni tushito ‘ham krūdho nāśāṁ tathā naye | karmanā manasa vāhā na mato ’sti varo dvijaḥ | 7200. Purvo brāhmottaro vādo dvitīyaḥ kshattriyottaraḥ | tvayoktau hetuyuktau tav viśeshas tattra dṛśyate | brāhmaṇaṁ saṁśrītaḥ kshattrajam na kshtrram brāhmaṇaśritam | śrītaḥ brāhmopadhaḥ viprāḥ khādanti kshattriyaṁ bhuvī | kshattrisyeṣho āśrito dharmāḥ prajānāṁ pariśālanaṁ | kshattrād vṛttir brāhmaṇaṁ taṁ katham brāhmaṇaḥ varaḥ | sarva-bhū-gradhānāṁ tāṁ bhāikṣha-vṛttin aham sadā | ātma-sambhāvitān viprān
THE BRAHMANS AND KSHATTRIYAS.

sthāpayāmy ātmano vāṣe | kathitaṁ hy anayā satyam āyatraṁ kanyayā divi | vibhāgyaṁ avasāṁ sarvāṁ brāhmaṇāṁś charma-vāsāsaḥ | 7205. Nā cha māṁ chaiva rāṣṭrāṁ triśu lokēṣu kachana | deve vā mānusho vā 'pi tasmāṁ jyeshṭho devīāṁ aham | atha brāhmaṁtvam lokāṁ karishye kshattriyottamam | na hi me saṁyugo kaśchit soḍhum utahate balam | Arjunasya vachas āruttvā vitrastā 'bhūd niśāchari | athainam antarikshaṁ thās tato Vāyur abhāshata | "tyajainām kaluṣāṁ bhāvam brāhmaṇe-bhyo namaskuru | eteshāṁ kurvataḥ pāpaṁ rāṣṭra-kshobho bhaviṣhyati | atha vā tvām mahīpāla samayishyanti vai devīāḥ | nirasiṣhyanti te rāṣṭrād hatotsāham mahābalāḥ" | 7210. Tuṁ rājā "kas tvam" ity aha tatas tam prāha Māruṇaḥ | "Vāyur vai deva-dūto 'smi hitaṁ tvām pra-brāvīṁ aham" | Arjunaṁ uvācha | "aḥo tvaya 'dvā yipṛeshu bhaktirāgah pradarśitaḥ | yādṛiṣam prithivi-bhataṁ tādṛiṣam bruḥi vā devijam | vāyām vā sadṛiṣam kichid bruḥi tvam brāhmaṇottamam | apām vā sadṛiṣa vaṁśa sūryasya nabhaso 'pi vā | "Then ascending his chariot glorious as the resplendent sun, he exclaimed in the intoxication of his prowess, ‘Who is like me in fortitude, courage, fame, heroism, energy, and vigour?’ At the end of this speech a bodiless voice in the sky addressed him: ‘Thou knowest not, 0 fool, that a Brāhman is better than a Kshattriya. It is with the help of the Brāhman that the Kshattriya rules his subjects.’ Arjuna answers: ‘If I am pleased, I can create, or, if displeased, annihilate, living beings; and no Brāhman is superior to me in act, thought, or word. The first proposition is that the Brāhmans are superior; the second that the Kshattriyas are superior; both of these thou hast stated with their grounds, but there is a difference between them (in point of force). The Brāhmans are dependant on the Kshattriyas, and not the Kshattriyas on the Brāhmans; and the Kshattriyas are eaten up by the Brāhmans, who wait upon them, and only make the Vedas a pretence. Justice, the protection of the people, has its seat in the Kshattriyas. From them the Brāhmans derive their livelihood: how then can the latter be superior? I always keep in subjection to myself those Brāhmans, the chief of all beings, who subsist on alms, and who have a high opinion of themselves. For truth was spoken by that female the Gāyatrī in the sky. I shall subdue all those unruly Brāhmans clad in hides. 7200. No one in the three worlds, god or man, can hurl me from my royal authority; wherefore I am
superior to any Brāhmaṇ. Now shall I turn the world in which Brāhmaṇs have the upper hand into a place where Kṣatryptias shall have the upper hand: for no one dares to encounter my force in battle.’ Hearing this speech of Arjuna, the female roving in the night became alarmed. Then Vāyu, hovering in the air, said to Arjuna: ‘Abandon this sinful disposition, and do obeisance to the Brāhmaṇs. If thou shalt do them wrong, thy kingdom shall be convulsed. They will subdue thee: those powerful men will humble thee, and expel thee from thy country.’ The king asks him, ‘Who art thou?’ Vāyu replies, ‘I am Vāyu, the messenger of the gods, and tell thee what is for thy benefit.’ Arjuna rejoins, ‘Oh, thou displayest to-day a great warmth of devotion to the Brāhmaṇs. But say that a Brāhmaṇ is like (any other) earth-born creature. Or say that this most excellent Brāhmaṇ is something like the wind. But fire is like the waters, or the sun, or the sky.’”

Vāyu, however, goes on to answer this spirited banter by adducing various instances in which the superiority or terrible power of the Brāhmaṇs had been manifested: 7124. Tyaktvā mahītvaṁ bhūmis tu sparādhāyā nga-nyapasya ha | nāśaṁ jagāma tāṁ vipra vyāshāmbhayata Kaśyapaḥ | “The earth, being offended with King Anga, had abandoned her form and become destroyed: but the Brāhmaṇ Kaśyapa supported her.” This is afterwards told more at length, verse 7232: Imāṁ bhūmiṁ dvijatibhyo dīsaṁ vai dakhīnāṁ purā | Ango nāma nṛīpo rājaṁ tataḥ chintāṁ mahā yayau | dhāraṇīṁ sarva-bhūtaṁ ayam prāpya varo nṛpaḥ | katham ichehā māṁ dātaṁ dvijaṁ bhāmacaḥ sūtām | sa ’haṁ tyaktvā gamisyāmi bhūmitvaṁ Brahmānaḥ padam | ayaṁ sa-rāshstro nripatīr mā bhād” iti tato ’gamat | 7235. Tatas tāṁ Kaśyapo drīṣṭvā vrojanīṁ prīthivīṁ tadā | praveśe maḥīṁ sadyo mukte ’’tmānaṁ samāhitaḥ | riḍāhā sā sarvato jājne triṇaṣādhi-samanvitā | . . . 7238. Athāgamya mahārāja namākṛitya cha Kaśyapam | prīthivī Kaśyapaṁ jajne svatā tasya mahātmaṁ | esha rājann ādiśo vai brahmānaḥ Kaśyapo ’bhavat | anyam pra-braḥi va tvam cha Kaśyapāt kṣatryptiam varan | “King Anga wished to bestow this earth on the Brāhmaṇs as a sacrificial fee. The earth then reflected, ‘How does this excellent king, after having obtained me, the daughter of Brahmā, and the supporter of all creatures, desire to give

243 The drift of the last line is not very clear, unless it be a reply by anticipation to line 225, which will be found a little further on.
me to the Brāhmans? I shall abandon my earthly form, and depart to the world of Brahmā. Let this king be without any realm.' Accordingly she departed. 7235. Beholding her going away, Kaśyapa, sunk in contemplation, entered into her, leaving his own body. She then became replenished, and covered with grass and plants, etc., etc. 7238. She afterwards came and did obeisance to Kaśyapa, and became his daughter. Such was the Brāhmaṇa Kaśyapa: Declare, on your part, any Kshattriya who has been superior to him."

Further illustrations of the tremendous power of the Brāhmans are the following:

7215. Āpibat tejasā hy āpāh svayam evāngirāḥ purā | sa tāh piban
ksitram ivā nātiripata mahāmanāḥ | apārayad mahāughena mahīṁ sar
vām cha pārthiva | taminn ahaṁ cha krūdhā vai jagat tyākta tato
gataḥ | vyatishtham agnihatro cha chiram Angiraso bhayāt | atha saptaś
cha bhagāsān Gautamena Purandaraḥ | Ahalyāṁ kāmayāno vai āhar
mārtham cha na hiṁsitaḥ | yathā samudro nripate purño mriṣṭās cha
vārīṇā | brāhmaṇaṁ abhiṣaptaḥ san babhāva lavanodakaḥ | . . . 7223.
Dūndakānāṁ mahād vājyam brāhmaṇena vināśitam | Tālejāṅgham mahā
kshattram Aurvēṇaikena nāśitam | . . . 7225. Agnīṁ tvam yajase nīt
yaṁ kasmād brāhmaṇaṁ Arjuna | sa hi sarvasya lokasya havya-vāt kīṁ
na vṛtsi tam | . . . 7241. Bhadrā Somasya duḥhitā rūpeṇa paramā
matā | yasyāṁ tulyam patiṁ Somaḥ Utathyaṁ samapāṣyata | sā cha
tivarāṁ tapas tepe mahābhāga yaśasvinī | Utathāyrthe tu chārvāṁ
daraṁ niyamam āsthitā | tataḥ āhūya sodathyam dadāv Atrir yaśas
vinīṁ | bhārīyaṁte sa tu jagrāḥa vidhivad bhūri-dakṣīṇāḥ | tām tv
akāmayata śṛṁaṁ Varuṇaḥ pūrvaṁ eva ha | sa cāgamyā vanaprasthaṁ
Yamunāyāṁ jaḥara tāṁ | 7245. Jaleśvaras tu ĥritvā tāṁ anayat svap
varam pratī | paramādbhuta-sankāṣam shat-sahasra-sataṁ hradam | na
hi ranyataram kineḥ tasmād anayat purottamam | prasādaṁ āparbhiś
tva divyaṁ kāmaṁ cha sōbihitam | tatra devas tavyā sārdhāṁ rene rājan
ejalvarāḥ | athākhyāyam Utāthāya tataḥ patny-avamarādham | tuch
ehruṭvā Nāradāṁ sarvam Utathya Nāradaṁ tādā | provācha "gachha
brūhi tvām Varuṇam parushaṁ vachāḥ | madvākyaṁ muncha me bhārīy
yāṁ kasmāt tāṁ ĥritavān asi | lokāpalo 'si lokānāṁ na lokasya vilūm
pakaḥ | Somana dattā me bhāryātvaya chāpahritā 'dya vai" | . . .
7251. Hai śrutaṁ vachas tasya tatas tāṁ Varuṇo 'bravit | "mamaśā
supriya bhūrur naṁ avahāḥ utsarṣṭham utsahe" | ity ukto Varuṇenātha Nā-

“Angiras, too, himself formerly drank up the waters by his own might. Drinking them up like milk he was not satisfied; and filled the whole earth with a great flood. When he was thus wroth, I abandoned the world and departed, and dwelt for a long time in the anuḥotra. The divine Purandara (Indra), who had a passion for Ahalyā, was cursed by (her husband) Gautama; but, from motives of religion, he was not injured.246 The sea, which is filled and purified by water, being cursed by the Brāhmins, became salt.” 7228. The great king-

246 See above pp. 121 and 310; and also pp. 107–113. In this same Aṃuśasana Purva, verses 2262 ff., there is found another story (told to illustrate the frailty of the female sex) of Indra being enamoured of Ruchi, the wife of the rishi Devārmaṁ, and of the method which that sage’s disciple, Vipula, (to whose care his preceptor’s wife had been entrusted during her husband’s absence,) devised to preserve his charge from being corrupted by the licentious immortal who was in the habit of assuming manifold Protean disguises in order to carry out his unworthy designs, and to save the female from being “licked up by the king of the gods, as a mischievous dog licks up the butter deposited at the sacrifice” (Yathā Ruchiṁ naivalikhe devendro Bhṛgu-sattama | kṛtatā upahite nyastam haviḥ śeva durātmavān), a respectful comparison, truly, to be applied to the chief of the Indian pantheon! The plan which Vipula adopted to save the virtue of his master’s wife against her will was to take possession of her body with his own spirit, and to restrain her movements by the force of Yoga, and compel her to say the contrary of what she desired. The story ends by his re-entering his own body, reproaching Indra with his disgraceful behaviour, and compelling him to retire abashed.
dom of the Daṇḍakas was overthrown by a Brāhman; and the great Kshatriya family of the Tālajanghas was destroyed by Aurva alone. 7225. And why dost thou, o Arjuna, worship Agni (who is) a Brāhman? for knowest thou not that he bears the oblations of the whole world?" The story of Utathya; of the race of Angiras, is afterwards told: "7241. Bhadrā was the daughter of Soma, and considered to be a person of great beauty. Sonā regarded Utathya as a fitting husband for her. She practised severe austerities in order to gain him. Atri (the father of Soma, according to the Vishṇu Purāṇa, Wilson, 1st ed. p. 392) then sent for Utathya, and gave her to him, and he married her in due form, presenting large gifts. 7245. The god Varuṇa, however, who had formerly been enamoured of her, came and carried her off from the abode of the hermit, who was living on the banks of the Yamunā, and took her to his own city, to a very wonderful lake of six hundred thousand (yojanas). No city was more delightful than that, adorned as it was by palaces and apsarases, and rich in celestial objects of enjoyment. There the god enjoyed her society. His wife's dishonour being made known to Utathya by Nārada, he requested the latter to go and deliver a severe message to Varuṇa: 'I command thee to let my wife go, who was given to me by Soma; wherefore hast thou carried her away? Thou art a guardian of the world, not a robber.' 7251. Varuṇa answered, 'She is my beloved; I cannot bear to give her up.' Nārada, in no very gratified humour, reported this answer to Utathya, and said, 'Varuṇa took me by the throat, and cast me out. He will not give up thy wife. Take whatever measures thou esteemeth proper.' Utathya was greatly incensed (7255), and stopped up and drank all the sea. Still Varuṇa, though urged by his friends, would not give up the female. Utathya then desired the earth to try some other stratagem; and the lake above described was turned into a salt wilderness, and the ocean swept away. The saint then addressed himself to the countries and to the river: 'Sarasvati, disappear into the deserts; and let this land, deserted by thee, become impure.' After the country had become dried up, Varuṇa submitted himself to Utathya, and brought back Bhadrā. The sage was pleased to get his wife, and released both the world and Varuṇa from their sufferings. 7263. He said to the latter (7262) 'This, my wife, was gained by my austerities in spite of thy remonstrances.' 7263. 'Such, o king, I say, was
the Brähman Utathya; tell me of any Kshattriya superior to him.’"

A story is next told (verses 7265 ff.) of the gods being conquered by the Asuras or Dānavas, deprived of all oblations, and stripped of their dignity, and of their coming to earth, where they saw the sage Agastya, and applied to him for protection. The succour they implored was granted to them by the sage, who scorched the Dānavas, expelled them from heaven and earth, and made them fly to the south. Thus were the gods reinstated in their dominion.

We have then, verses 7280–7290, the following legend of Vāśishṭha:

The Ādityas were performing a sacrifice, bearing Vāśishṭha in their remembrance, when they were attacked by the Dānavas, called Khalins, who came in tens of thousands to slay them:

Verse 7284. Tatas tair ardhiḥ devah saranaṁ Vāsavaṁ yauḥ | sa cha tair vyathiḥa Sakro Vāśishṭhaṁ saranaṁ yauau | tato ‘bhayaṁ dadau teḥhyo Vāśishṭho bhagavan rishiḥ | tadda tān duḥkhitan jnātva ānriśaṁsyā paro munih | ayatnenādahat sarvān Khalināḥ svena tejasā |

. . . . 7289. Evaṁ sendrāḥ Vāśishṭhena rakshitās tridivaukasaḥ | Brahma-datta-vaṛā śchaiva haṭaḥ dāityaḥ mahātmanāḥ | etat karma Vāśishṭhasya kathitaṁ hi mayā ‘nagha | bravīmy aham brāhi vā tvam Vāśishṭhāt kṣhattrīyaṁ varam |

"The gods being distressed by them, resorted to Indra; and he too, being harassed by them, went to Vāśishṭha for help. This reverend and benevolent sage gave them all his protection; and being aware of their distress, without any exertion, burnt up all the Dānavas . . . . 7289. Thus were the gods, including Indra, preserved by Vāśishṭha, and the Daityas, even although they had obtained a boon from Brahmā, were slain. Such was the exploit of Vāśishṭha: can you tell me of any Kṣhattriya who was superior to him?"

A further tale is told of the prowess of the sage Atri, who interposed to deliver the gods and restore light to the celestial luminaries:

Verse 7292. Ghora tanasy ayudhyanta sahitāḥ deva-dānavaḥ | avidhyataśarais tattra Svabhānāḥ Soma-bhāskarau | aha te tanasa prastāh vihan-nyante sma dānavaḥ | devaḥ nripati-sōrdula sahaiva Balibhis tadā | asuvravi bādhyaṁnās te kīṁga-prāṇaḥ divaukasāḥ | apaśyanta tapasyantam Atriṣv vipraṁ tapodhanam | . . . . 7297. Te ‘bruwaṁi ‘chandramāḥ bhava | timira-gīnaḥ cha savitā dasyu-hantā cha no bhava” | evam uktas tadā ‘irir vai tamo-nuḥ abhavat saśi | apaśyat saumya-bhāvāḥ cha soma-
vat-priya-darśanaḥ | drīṣṭvā nātiprabhaṁ somaṁ tathā sūryam cha pār-
thiva | prakāśam akarod Atris tapasā svena saṁyuga | 7300. Jagad
vitimiraṁ cāpi prakāśam akarot tadaḥ | vyajayeś satrū-samghāṁ ča
devānāṁ svena tejasā | ... 7303. Devīnāgini-devītyena japatā charma-
vāsasā | phala-bhaksena rājarāha paśya karmāttṛityā kriyam | ... 7304. ... brūhi vā tvam Atritaḥ kshatriyam varam |

"The gods and Dānavas fought together in dreadful darkness; when
Svarbhānu pierced with his arrows the sun and moon. Enveloped in
gloom the gods were slaughtered by the Dānavas, together with the
Balis. Being thus slain and exhausted, the celestials beheld the Brāh-
man Atri employed in austerities;" and invoked his aid in their ex-
tremity. He asked what he should do. They reply, verse 2297:
"'Become the moon, and the gloom-dispelling sun, the slider of the
Dasyus.' Atri then became the gloom-dispelling moon, and in his
character as such looked beautiful as Soma. Perceiving the sun and
moon to be shorn of their brightness, Atri threw light upon the conflict,
(7300) freed the world from darkness, by the power of his austere-
fervour, and vanquished the enemies of the gods. ... 7303. Behold
the deed done by Atri, the Brāhman, attended by Agni, the mutterer
of prayers, clad in a skin, and living upon fruits. ... 7304. 'Tell
me of any Kshatriya superior to Atri.'"

This story is founded on some verses of the Rig-veda, v. 40, 5:
Yat tvā sūryya Svarbhānus tamasa'vidhyad āsuraḥ | aśeṣṭra-vid yathā
mudgho bhuvanāni adidhayuh | 6. Svarbhānor adha yad Indra māyāḥ avo
divo varttamānāḥ avāhan | gālham sūryam tamasā 'pavretena turīyena
brahmaṇā 'vindad Atriḥ | 8. Grāvno brahmaṇa yujjānāḥ saparyyaṁ kirṇā
devān namanopāśikshan | Atriḥ sūryasya divi chakshur adhāt Svarbhānor
apa māyāḥ aghukshat | 9. Yaṁ vai sūryaṁ Svarbhānus tamasa'vidhyad
āsuraḥ | Atryas tam anv avindan nahi anye aśaknwan |

"When Svarbhānu of the Asura race pierced thee, o Sun, with
darkness, all worlds appeared like a man who is bewildered in a region
which he does not know. 6. When, Indra, thou didst sweep away
the magical arts of Svarbhānu, which were operating beneath-the sky, Atri
discovered by the fourth text the Sun, which had been hidden by the
hostile darkness. 8. Applying the (soma-crushing) stones, performing
worship, serving the gods with reverence and praise, the priest Atri
placed the eye of the Sun in the sky, and dispelled the illusions of
Svarbhānu. 9. The Atris discovered the Sun which Svarbhānu had pierced with darkness. No others could."

We have next a curious legend about the sage Chyavana, of the race of Bhṛgū.

7306. Āsvinoḥ pratisāṁkrutya Chyavanaḥ Pākaśasanam | provācha sahito devāḥ "somapaū Āsvinau kuru" | Indraḥ uvācha | "asmābhīr nindītāv etau bhavatām somapau katham | devāir na sammitiav etau tasmād maicām vadasva naḥ | Āsvīhyām saha nechhamaḥ somam pātum mahātrata | yad anyad vakṣhyase vipra tat kariṣyāma te vachoḥ | Chyavanaḥ uvācha | "pibetām Āsvinau somam bhavaddhīḥ sahitāv ubhau | ubhāv etāv api surau sūryya-putterau sūresvāra | 7310. Kriyātām mad-vacho devāḥ yathā vai samudāḥhirantam | etad vaiḥ kuryataṁ kreo bhaved naitad akuryatām" | Indraḥ uvācha | "Āsvīhyām saha somaṁ vai na pāṣyāmi devijottama | pibanto anyo yathākāmāṁ nāham pātum ihotsaḥ" | Chyavanaḥ uvācha | "na chet karisāhya vaiho mayoktam bāla-sūdana | mayā pramathitaḥ sadyaḥ somaṁ pāṣyāi vai makhe" | tataḥ karma samārabdhāṁ hitāya sahasā āsvīnoḥ | Chyavanaṁ tato maṇtrair abhiḥhitāḥ surā 'bhavan | tat tu karma samārabdhāṁ drishyendraḥ krodha-mūrchatāḥ | uḍāmya vipulaṁ śailāṁ Chyavanāṁ samuḥpādravat | 7315. Tathā vajrena bhagavāṁ amarshākula-lochanaḥ | tam āyatantam ārātu saṁtvāvāva Chyavanāṁ tapasā 'nviṭāḥ | adhiḥ sīkta-vā 'stambhaḥ yat tva sa-vajraṁ somaṁ-parvatam | athendrasya mahāghoraṁ so 'svijat satrum eva ha | Mayāṁ nāmaḥuti-mayaṁ vyādātāya maheśuṁ niḥ | . . . . 7319. Jīvā médicaḥ tasya sarve devāḥ sa-vāsavaḥ | timer āsyaṁ anupraptāḥ yathā mataśyāḥ mahāravaye | te sammanḍrya tato deva Madasyāśya samīpaṇaḥ | abruvan sahitāḥ S'akraṁ pranamaṁ vaijātaye | Āsvīhyāṁ saha somaṁ cha pibāma vigata-jvarāḥ | tataḥ sa pranataḥ S'akraḥ chakāra Chyavanāśya tat | Chyavanaḥ kritavān etāv Āsvinau soma-pāyināu | tataḥ pratyāharaṁ karma Mayaṁ cha vyabhajad muniḥ |

"Having given a promise to that effect, Chyavana applied, along with the other gods, to Indra, to allow the Āsvins to partake in the soma juice. Indra answered, 'How can they become drinkers of the soma, seeing they are reviled by us, and are not on an equality with the gods? We do not wish to drink soma in their company; but we shall accede to your wishes in any other respect.' Chyavana repeats his request, and urges that the Āsvins also are gods, and the offspring of the Sun. 7310. He adds that it will be well for the gods if they accede to this
demand, and ill if they do not. Indra rejoins that the other gods may drink with the Āśvins if they please, but he cannot bring himself to do it. Chyavana retorts that if he does not, he shall be chastised by the sage, and made to drink soma (with them) at the sacrifice. A ceremony was then instantly begun by Chyavana for the benefit of the Āśvins; and the gods were vanquished by sacred texts. Indra, seeing this rite commenced, became incensed, uplifted a vast mountain (7315), and rushed with his thunderbolt, and with angry eyes, on Chyavana. The sage, however, sprinkling him with water, arrested him with his mountain and thunderbolt. Chyavana then created a fearful open-mouthed monster, called Mada, formed of the substance of the oblation," who is further described as having teeth and grinders of portentous length, and jaws, one of which enclosed the earth and the other the sky: and the gods, including Indra, are said (7319), "to have been at the root of his tongue [ready to be devoured] like fishes in the mouth of a sea monster. Finding themselves in his predicament, the gods took counsel and said to Indra, 'Make salutation to Chyavana, and let us drink soma along with the Āśvins, and so escape from our sufferings.' Indra then, making obeisance, granted the demand of Chyavana, who was thus the cause of the Āśvins becoming drinkers of the soma. He then performed the ceremony, and clove Mada to pieces."

Does this legend mean that this rishi of the Bṛigu family was the first to introduce the Āśvins within the circle of the Aryan worship?

Compare the passages from the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa iv. 1, 5, 1 ff., and from the Vanaparvan of the M. Bh. verses 10316 ff. quoted in my "Contributions to a knowledge of the Vedic theogony and mythology," No. II., in the Journ. R. A. S., for 1866, pp 11 ff.; Ind. St. i. 188, and the Āśvamedhika-parvan of the M. Bh., verses 249 ff., there referred to. The Āśvins are, in different passages of the Rig-veda, as iii. 58, 7, 9; viii. 8, 5; viii. 35, 7–10, invited to drink the soma-juice.

Vāyu relates to Arjuna yet one more instance of the irresistible power of the Brāhmāns:

7327. Madasyāsya anuprāptāḥ yadā sendrāḥ divaukasaḥ | tādai vyākrama
Chyavanendraḥ hṛitā teśhāṁ vasundharaḥ | ubhau lokau hritau matvā to
devaḥ duḥkhitāḥ bhṛṣam | sōkārttāṁ cha mahātmāno Brahmānaṁ saranāṁ
yayuh | devāḥ uchuh | Madasya-vyatisiktānam asmākāṁ loka-pujita
Chyavanena hṛitā bhūmiḥ Kapaiś chaiva divam prabhō | Brahmā uvācha
7330. Gachhadhaam saraamam vipraan aau sendraah divakasaah | prasaddya tan ubhaa lokaa avapyyatha yathaa puraa | te yaauch saraaam vipraan uchus te "kau javayamaah" | ity uktas te dvijam prahur "javayeta Kapam" iti | “bhagatan hi vijetaro vayam” ity abruvan “dvijah” | tatah karcha samrabdham brahmaanaih Kapaanasaamam | tat shrutvah preshito duto brahmaanabhyo Dhanii Kapaih | bhagatan brahmaanah aha Dhanii Kapa-vacho yathaa | “bhavadhih sadrasah sarve Kapah kim iha varattate | sarve vedavidah prajnah sarve cha krutau-yajinaah | 7335. Sarve satyavratas chaiva sarve tulyah maharshibhih | shri chaiva ramataiteshu dharyanti shriyam cha te | .... 7339. Eati chanyais cha bahubhish guair yuktan kathaam Kapaan | 7340. Vyjeshyatha nivarttadhaam nivrittthanam suhham hi vaah” | Brahmaanah aahuhu | Kapaan vayaam vyjeshyamo ye devaa te vayaam smritah | tasmad badhyah Kapaap smakam Dhanin yahi yathagatam | Dhanii gatvah Kapaan aha “na no vipraah priyankaarah | grihastva strany atho vipraan | Kapaan sarve samadraavan | samudagru-dhaaajam drihsrta Kapah sarve divajatayah | vyayaman jvalitan arenas Kapannam praanam sahasranam | brahma-srishtaah havyabhuyaah Kapah hatvah sanatanah | nabhasvam yathaa 'bhrantii vyarajanta naradhipa | Hatvaa vai danavan devaa sarve sambhaya sahyyug | tenabhayaanam hi tad brahmaanair nhatan Kapah | athagamyah mahatejah Naraado 'kathayad vibaah | yathaa hatah mahabhagaish tejasah brahmaanaih Kapah | Naraadasya vachaah shrutva pritaah sarve divakasaah | prasaamsuh dvijanah chaapi brahmaanam cha yaasavinaah |

“When the gods, including Indra, were enclosed within the mouth of Mada, the earth was taken from them by Chyavana. The gods then considering that they had lost both worlds, in their distress resorted to Brahmma, and said, ‘Since we have been swallowed up in the mouth of Mada, the earth has been taken from us by Chyavana, and the heaven by the Kapas.’ Brahmma answered, ‘Go speedily, ye gods, with Indra, to the Brahmans for help. After propitiating them ye shall regain both worlds.’ They did so, and the Brahmans after ascertaining that the gods would themselves deal with those of their enemies who were on earth, began a ceremony for the destruction of the Kapas. The Kapas upon this sent a messenger to the Brahmans, to say that they themselves were all, like them, skilled in the Vedas, learned, and offerers of sacrifice, all pure in their observances, and all resembling great rishis, etc., etc. How then should the Brahmans be able to conquer them? It would be more for their interest to desist from the attempt. The Brahmans,
however, would not be persuaded; and when, in consequence, the Kapas assailed them, they hurled forth fires by which the Kapas were destroyed. The gods themselves conquered the Dānavas, and learning from Nārada what the illustrious Brāhmans had effected, they sang their praises."

Hearing of all these testimonies to the terrible might of the Brāhmans, Arjuna at length gives in, saying:

7350. *Jīvāmy aham brāhmaṇārthaṁ sarvathā satatam prabho | brahmaṁyo brāhmaṇābhyaś ca praṇamāmi cha nityaśaḥ | Dattātreya-prasādādach cha mayā prāptam idam balam | loke cha paramā kīrttir dharmāṅ cha charito mahān | aho brāhmaṇa-karmāṇi mayā Māruta tattvataḥ | tvayā proktāṁ kārtṣnyena śrutāṁ prayatena cha | Vāyur uvācha | brāhmaṇān kṣattra-dharmena pālayasvendriyāṇi cha | Bhrigubhyas te bhayaṁ ghoraṁ tat tu kālād bhavishyati |

"I live altogether and always for the sake of the Brāhmans. I am devoted to the Brāhmans, and do obeisance to them continually. And it is through the favour of Dattātreya (a Brāhman) that I have obtained all this power and high renown, and that I have practised righteousness. Thou hast declared to me truly all the acts of the Brāhmans, and I have listened intently." Vāyu then says to him: "Protect the Brāhmans, fulfilling a Kshattriya's function; and restrain your senses. A dreadful cause of apprehension impends over you from the Bhrigus, but it will only take effect after some time." This last remark may have been introduced to bring this story into harmony with the other legend about the destruction of Arjuna and the Kshattriyas.

The narrative, which has just been quoted, is, as I have already stated, preceded by a panegyric of some length pronounced by Bhīshaṁa on the Brāhmans (verses 7163–7184), of which the following are specimens:


"The prowess of the Brāhmans can destroy even the gods. 7164.
Those wise beings uphold all these worlds. 7175. To them it is indifferent whether they are perfumed with sandal wood or deformed with mire, whether they eat or fast, whether they are clad in silk, or in sackcloth or skins. 7177. They can turn what is not divine into what is divine, and the converse; and can in their anger create other worlds with their guardians. 7179. They are the gods of the gods; and the cause of the cause. 7181. An ignorant Brâhman is a god, whilst a learned Brâhman is yet more a god, like the full ocean.” (Compare the similar eulogies in p. 130, above.)

In the Anuśasana-parvan, sections 52 ff., we have the story of Para-śurâma, in connection with that of Viśvāmitra, yet once more handled. Yudhisṭhira says he is very curious to know something more about these two personages:

2718. Katham esha samutpanno Râmaḥ satya-parâkramaḥ | katham brâhmârshi-vâmśa ’yaṁ kshattrâ-dharmâ-vyâjyata | tad asya samaḥvâmaṁ rajaṁ nikhyâneraṅgkirttaya | Kauśikâcha cha katham vaṁśat kshattrâd vai brâhmâyo ’bhavat | aho prabhâvaḥ sumahân aśid vai sumahâtaṁnaḥ | Râmasya cha nara-syaṅghra Viśvâmitrasya chaiva hi | katham putrâṁ atikramya teshāṁ naprâishu athâbhavat | esha doshaḥ sutāṁ hitaṁ tat tvāṁ vyâkhyaṁ arhaṁ |

“How was this valiant Ráma, descended from the family of a Brâhman-rishi, born with the qualities of a Kshattriya? Tell me the whole story: and how did a Brâhman spring from the Kshattriya race of Kuśika? Great was the might of Ráma, and of Viśvâmitra. How did it happen that, passing over the sons [of Rîchïka and Kuśika], this defect showed itself in their grandsons?”

Then there follows a long dialogue related by Bhîshima as having taken place between king Kuśika and the sage Chyavana. The latter, it seems, “foreseeing that this disgrace was about to befall his race [from connection with the Kuśikas], and entertaining, in consequence, after he had weighed all the good and evil, and the strength and weakness [on either side], the desire of burning up that whole family” (verse 2723. Etaṁ doshaṁ purâ dritaṁ Bhârgavo Chyavanaṁ tadä | âgaminam mahâbudhâh śva-vãṁse muni-sattamaḥ | nischtïya manasâ sarvaṁ guṇa-dosham balâbalam | dagdhu-kâmaḥ kuḷaṁ sarvaṁ Kuśikânam tapodhanaḥ |), came to Kuśika. Chyavana is welcomed and treated with great attention, and receives from Kuśika the offer of all his king-
dom, etc. The saint, however, does not requite this honour with corresponding kindness, but makes the king and his wife perform many menial offices, rub his feet, attend while he sleeps, bring him food, and draw him in a chariot, while he lacerates their backs with a goad. All this is submitted to so patiently, that the sage is propitiated, addresses them in kindly tones, and touches their wounded bodies with his godlike hands. After creating a magical golden palace, with all the accompaniments of pleasure (2826 ff.), in order to give them a conception of heaven, (2892 ff.) the sage offers to bestow any boon the king may choose; and to solve any of his doubts. Kuśika asks the reason of the sage's unaccountable procedure. Chyavana answers that he had heard from Brahmā that there would be "a confusion of families in consequence of the hostility of Brāhmans and Kshattriyas, and that a grandson of great glory and heroism would be born to Kuśika" (verse 2878. Bhraha-kshattrā-virodhenā bhavitā kula-sankaraḥ | pautras te bhavitā rājaṁs tejo-virṛya-samanvitaḥ |); that he had intended in consequence to burn up the race of the Kuśikas, but that the king had come so well out of the severe ordeal to which he had been subjected, that the sage had become thoroughly pacified, and would grant the boon which Kuśika desired:

2897. Bhavishtayāt esha te kāmas Kuśikāt Kuśiko dvijaḥ | trītyam puruśaṁ tuḥṣyaṁ brāhmaṇatvam gamishyati | vaṁśas te pārthivaśreshṭha Bhṛgūnāṁ eva tejasā | pautras te bhavitā vipras tapasvī pāvanadyutiḥ | yaḥ sa-deva-manushyaṁ bhayam utpaḍayishyati |

"This thy desire shall be fulfilled; from a Kuśika a Kuśika Brāhma shall arise: in the third generation thy race shall attain to Brāhmahood by the might of the Brāgus. Thy son's son shall become a Brāhma, a devotee, splendid as fire, who shall alarm both gods and men." Kuśika being anxious to know how all this was to be brought to pass, Chyavana informs him:

2995. Bhṛgūnāṁ kshattriyāḥ yājyaḥ nityam etaj janāḥhipa | te cha bhedaṁ gamishyanti daiva-yuktena hetuṇā | kshattriyāḥ cha Bhṛgūn sarvāṁ badhishyanti narāḥhipa | āgarbhaṁ anukrintanto daiva-danda nipi-ditāḥ | tataḥ utpatsyate 'smākaṁ kula-gotra-vivardhanaḥ | Ūrvo nāma mahātejā jvalamārka-saṁ-dyutiḥ | sa trailokya-vināśaya kopānīṁ jana-yishyati | mahāṁ sa-parvata-vanāṁ yaḥ karishyati bhasmasūt | kan-hit kālaṁ tu vahniṁ cha sa eva samayishyati | samudre vaḍava-vaktre prak-
shipya muni-sattamaḥ | 2910. Puttraṁ tasya mahārāja Richikam Bhṛg-

u-nanḍānam | saṁkhat kṛsna āhanur-vedaḥ samupasthaśya-ya naṅha | kṣattriyāṁ abhayāya daiva-yuktena hetuṇā | sa tu tam pratigrihyaiva puttraṁ sankrāmasyati | Jāmadagnau mahābhāge tapaṁ bhavitām-

ani | sa chāpi Bhṛgū-śārdūlaṁ tāṁ vedaṁ āhārayishyati | kulaṁ tu tava āhārātānaṁ kanyāṁ so 'dhigamishyati | udbhavānārtham bhavato vaṁ-
sasya Bharatārthaḥ | Gādher duktaram prāpya pautrīṁ tava mahā-
tapāḥ | brāhmaṇaṁ kṣattrā-dhārmaṇaṁ putrāṁ upādāyishyati | 2915. Kṣattriyaṁ vipra-karmaṇaṁ Vṛhaspatim evajāsa | Viśvāmitraṁ tava kule Gādher putraṁ sudhārmikam | tapaṁ mahatā yuktam pradāsyati mahādyute | striyaṁ tu kāraṇaṁ tattva parivartto bhavishyataḥ | Pītā-

maḥa-miyogād vai nānyathaitad bhavishyati | tṛṣṭye puruṣaḥ tubhyam brāhmaṇatvam upaśīhyati | bhavitā tvāṁ cha sambandhi Bhṛgūṇāṁ bhā-
vitātmanāṁ | . . . | 2923. Etat te kāḥitāṁ sarvam aśeṣena mayā nri-
pa | Bhṛgūṇāṁ Kūṣikānāṁ cha abhisambandha-kāraṇaṁ | yathoktam rishīṁ chāpi tadā tad abhavad nri-
pa | janma Rāmasya cha muner Viśvāmitrasya chaiva hi |

"The Bhṛghus have always been the priests of the Kṣattriyas; but these will become hostile to each other for a fated reason. The Kṣattriyas shall slay all the Bhṛghus, even to children in the womb, being oppressed by a divine nemesis. Then shall arise the glorious Īruva, like the sun in splendour, who shall augment the glory of our race. He shall create a fire of wrath for the destruction of the three worlds, which shall reduce the earth with its mountains and forests to ashes. After a time he will extinguish the fire, throwing it into the ocean into the mouth of Vaḍavā (the submarine fire). Into his son Richika shall

243 Īruva is here said (verse 2907) to belong to the race of Chayana, but whether as a near or remote descendant is not stated. In verse 2910 Richika is said to be the son of Īruva. In the Ādiśarvan, verses 2610 ff., the matter is somewhat differently stated: Arushiṁ tu Manoḥ kanyāṁ tasya yatnī yāśaśevaṁ | Īruvaṁ tasyāṁ samabhavat uroḥ bhittāṁ mahāyāśāḥ | mahātyāḥ mahāvavyaḥ bālaḥ eva gunair yutaḥ | Richikas tasya putraṁ tu Jāmadagnis tato bhavaḥ | "Arushi, the daughter of Manu, was the wife of the sage (Chayana); of her was the illustrious Īruva born, having split his mother's thigh. He was great in glory and might, and from his childhood endowed with eminent qualities. Richika was his son, and Richika's yas Jāmadagni." Here Āruva is said to derive his name from having divided his mother's thigh (ṛurā); and no allusion is made to Īruva, though the same person appears to be meant. In the passage of the Anuśāsana-parvan, however, we have an Īruva, the father of Richika, whose patronymic will thus be Āruva; as it is, in fact, in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, as quoted above in p. 352.
enter the entire embodied Dhanur-veda (science of archery), for the destined destruction of the Kshattriyas. This science he shall transmit to his great son Jamadagni, whose mind shall be spiritualized by devotion, and who shall possess that Veda. He (Richika) shall obtain [for his wife] a maiden of thy family, to prolong thy race. This great devotee, wedding thy grand-daughter, the daughter of Gādhi, shall beget a Brāhman (i.e. Parāṣurāma), fulfilling the functions of a Kshattriya; (2915) and shall bestow on thy family a Kshattriya who shall perform the functions of a Brāhman, Viśvāmitra, the son of Gādhi, an austere devotee, and glorious as Vṛihaspati. The two wives shall be the cause of this interchange of characters. According to the decree of Brahmā all this shall so happen. Brāhmanhood shall come to thee in the third generation, and thou shalt become connected with the spiritual-minded Bṛrigus.” 2923. “Thus (concludes Bhīṣma) have I told thee at length the cause of the connection between the Bṛrigus and the Kuśikas. All this was accordingly fulfilled in the births of Parāṣurāma and Viśvāmitra.”

Is this legend intended to account for a real fact? Was Parāṣurāma of a sacerdotal tribe, and yet by profession a warrior, just as Viśvāmitra was conversely of royal extraction, and yet a priest by profession?

According to the Vishnu Purāṇa, iv. 11, 3 (Wilson, 4to. ed. pp. 416, 417), Arjuna was of the race of Yadu, and the ninth in descent from Haihaya, the great-grandson of that prince. It is there said of him:

"From Kṛitavirya sprang Arjuna, who was lord of the seven dvīpas [circular and concentric continents of which the earth is composed], and had a thousand arms. Having worshipped a portion of the divine Being, called Dattātreya, sprung from the race of Atri, he sought and obtained these boons, viz. a thousand arms, the power of restraining wrong by justice, the conquest of the earth, and the disposition to rule it righteously, invincibility by enemies, and death at the hands of a man renowned over the whole world. By him this earth, with all its dvīpas, was perfectly governed. He offered ten thousand sacrifices. To this day this verse is repeated respecting him: 'No other king shall ever equal Kārtavirya in regard to sacrifices, liberality, austerities, courtesy, and self-restraint.' In his reign no property was ever lost.

4. Thus he ruled for eighty-five thousand years with unbroken health, prosperity, strength, and valour. When he was excited by sporting in the Narmada and by drinking wine, he had no difficulty in binding like a beast Rāvaṇa, who had arrived in Māhishmati in his career of conquest, and who was filled with arrogance, arising from the pride of victory over all the gods, daityas, and gandharva chiefs, and imprisoning him in a secret place in his capital. At the end of his reign of eighty-five thousand years Arjuna was destroyed by Paraśūrāma, who was a portion of the divine Nārāyana."

The Bhāgavata Purāṇa, ix. 23, 20–27, assigns to him the same descent, and relates of him nearly the same particulars. Verse 23 says: 

\[Arjunaḥ Kṛitaviryyasya sapta-dvīpesvaro 'bhavat | Dattātreyād Hārer aṁśat praśta-yoga-mahāgūṇaḥ | "Arjuna was the son of Kṛitavirya, and ruler of the seven dvīpas. He obtained the great attribute of Yoga (supernatural powers arising from devotion) from Dattātreya, who was a portion of Hari," etc.

The legend of Paraśūrāma, as related, is of course fabulous. Not to speak of the miraculous powers which are ascribed to this hero, and the incredible number of the exterminations which he is said to have executed, we cannot even suppose it probable that the Brāhmaṇas should in general have been sufficiently powerful and warlike to overcome the Kshattriyas by force of arms. But the legend may have had some small foundation in fact. Before the provinces of the sacerdotal and military classes were accurately defined, there may have been cases in which ambitious men of the former successfully
aspired to kingly dominion, just as scions of royal races became distinguished as priests and sages. But even without this assumption, the existence of such legends is sufficiently explained by the position which the Brāhmans eventually occupied. With the view of maintaining their own ascendancy over the minds of the chiefs on whose good will they were dependent, and of securing for themselves honour and profit, they would have an interest in working upon the superstitious feelings of their contemporaries by fabricating stories of supernatural punishments inflicted by their own forefathers on their royal oppressors, as well as by painting in lively colours the prosperity of those princes who were submissive to the spiritual order.
CHAPTER V.

RELATION OF THE BRAHMANICAL INDIANS TO THE NEIGHBOURING TRIBES, ACCORDING TO MANU AND THE PURANAS.

I now propose to enquire what account the Indian writers give of the origin of those tribes which were not comprehended in their own polity, but with which, as dwelling within, or adjacent to, the boundaries of Hindustan, their countrymen were, in ancient times, brought into continual and familiar contact.

It appears to have been the opinion of Manu, the great authority in all matters regarding the Hindu religion and institutions in their full development, that there was no original race of men except the four castes of Brāhmans, Kshatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras; and that all other nations were derived from these. His own words (x. 4) are these: Brāhmaṇaḥ kṣatvriyo vaiśyas trayo varṇāḥ dvijātayāḥ | chaturthaḥ ekajātis tu śudro nāsti tu panchamaḥ | "Three castes, the Brāhman, the Kshatriya, and the Vaiśya, are twice-born; the fourth, the Śūdra, is once-born; and there is no fifth." On the last clause of this verse Kullūka Bhaṭṭa annotates thus: Panchamaḥ punar varṇo nāsti sankīrṇa-jātīnām tv aśvala-vad mātā-pitri-jāti-vyātirikta-jāty-āntaratvād na varṇatvam | ayaṁ cha jāty-antaropadesaḥ śāstre saṁvyavaharāṇaṁ-thāḥ | "There is no fifth caste; for caste cannot be predicated of the mixed tribes, from the fact that, like mules, they belong to another species, distinct from that of their father and mother. And this reference, which is made in the Śāstras to castes other than the four, is merely for the sake of convenience and conformity to common usage."

Accordingly, in the following description which Manu gives in the same chapter of the rise of the inferior castes, they are all, even the
very lowest, such as Nishādas and Chaṇḍālas, derived from the mixture the four so-called original castes. Thus, in verse 8: Ḫraṁanād vaiṣya-kanyāyām ambasṭho nāmā jaẏate | nishādah śudra-kanyāyāṁ yah parā-sava uchyaṭe | “From a Brāhman father and a Vaiṣya mother springs an Ambasṭha: from a Brāhman father and a Śūdra mother is born a Nishāda, called also Parāsava.” Again, in verse 12. Śudrād oyo-gavaḥ kshattā chaṇḍālaḥ chaḍhama nṛṇām | vaiṣya-rājanya-viprāsu jaẏante varṇa-sankarāḥ | “From a Śūdra, by women of the Vaiṣya, Kshattriya, and Brāhman castes are born those mixed classes, the Āyogava, the Kshattṛi, and the Chaṇḍāla, lowest of men.” Again, in verse 20: Dvijātayāḥ savarṇāśu janayanty avratāṁ tu yān | tān sāvitrī-parīḥrashtān vrātyāḥ iti vinirdiṣet | “Persons whom the twice-born beget on women of their own classes, but who omit the prescribed rites, and have abandoned the gāyaṭrī, are to be designated as Vṛātyas.”

In the next three verses the inferior tribes, which spring from the Brāhman Vṛātya, the Kshattriya Vṛātya, and the Vaiṣya Vṛātya respectively, are enumerated.

In verses 43 and 44 it is stated: Sanakais tu kriyā-lopād imāḥ

---

1 It does not appear how the account of the origin of the Nishāda race from king Veṣa, given above in pp. 301 and 303, can be reconciled with this theory of Manu; unless recourse be had to the explanation that that story relates to the Svāyambhuva Manvantara. But Manu’s narrative seems to refer to the same period. See above, p. 39. If the Vedic expressions paucchājānāḥ and the other corresponding phrases signifying “the five tribes” be rightly interpreted of the “four castes, and the Nishādas,” we might understand this as intimating that the Nishādas had at one time been regarded as a distinct race. But the phrase is variously understood by the old Vedic commentators; as has been shown above, p. 177.

2 Manu says, ii. 38 f.: Ḫaḥoṣasūd brāhmanayasya sāvitrī nātvartattate | ā-devināṁ kṣhattrabhandhor ā-chaturvisjñāt vīṣāḥ | ataḥ urddhaṁ trayo’py ētc yathā-kālam asaṁskṛitāḥ | sāvitrī-patitāḥ vrātyāḥ bhavanty āryya-nigarkātāḥ | “The gāyatṛi should not, in the case of a Brāhman, be deferred beyond the sixteenth year; nor in the case of a Kshattriya beyond the twenty-second; nor in that of a Vaiṣya beyond the twenty-fourth. After these periods youths of the three classes, who have not been invested, become fallen from the gāyatṛi, Vṛātyas, esteemed by respectable men (Āryyas).” In the following verse of the Mahābhārata, Anuśāsanaparvan, line 2621, a different origin is ascribed to the Vṛātyas: Chaṇḍīlo vṛātya-vaidyau cha brāhna-satyūṁ kṣhatriyāśu cha | vaiṣya-yāṁ chaiva śudrasya lakṣhyante pasadās trayāḥ | “The three outcaste classes are the Chaṇḍāla, the Vṛātya, and the Vaidya, begotten by a Śūdra on females of the Brāhman, Kshattriya, and Vaiṣya castes respectively.” A Vṛātya, therefore, according to this account, is the son of a Śūdra man and a Kshattriya woman. On the Vṛātyas, see Weber’s Indische Studien, i. 33, 52, 138, 139, 445, 446, etc.
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*kshattriya-jātayaḥ | vrishalatvaṁ gataḥ loke brāhmaṇa-värdhaṁ cha | Paũḍrakaś choḍra-dravidaṁ Kämbojaṁ Yavanāḥ Sakaḥ | Pāradāḥ Pahlavaṁ Cīnaḥ Kīrātāḥ Daradaḥ Khasāḥ |

“The following tribes of Kshattriyas have gradually sunk into the state of Vṛishalas (outcasts), from the extinction of sacred rites, and from having no communication with Brāhmans; viz. Paũḍrakas, Oḍras, Dravidas, Kāmbojas, Yavanas, Sakaś, Pāradas, Pahlavas, Cīnas, Kīrātas, Daradas, and Khasas.”

The same thing is affirmed in the Mahābhārata, Anuśasana-parvan, verses 2103 f.: *Sakaḥ Yavana-kāmbojas tāḥ kshattriya-jātayaḥ | vrishalavam parigataḥ brāhmaṇaṁ adarśanaḥ | Dravidaḥ cha Ka-lindaḥ cha Pulindaḥ chāpy Uśīnaraḥ | Kolisarpāḥ Māhishaṁś tāḥ kshattriya-jātayaḥ ityādi |

“These tribes of Kshattriyas, viz. Sakaś, Yavanas, Kāmbojas, Dravidas, Kaliandas, Pulindaś, Uśīnaraś, Kolisarpas, and Māhishakas, have become Vṛishalas from seeing no Brāhmans.” This is repeated in verses 2158–9, where the following additional tribes are named: Mekalas, Lāṭas, Konvaśiras, Sauṇḍikas, Darvas, Chauras, Savaras, Barbaras, and Kīrātas, and the cause of degradation is, as in verse 2103, restricted to the absence of Brāhmans. (Then follow the lines (2160 ff.) in glorification of the Brāhmans, already quoted in p. 130.)

The Yavanas are said in the Mahābhārata, Ádiparvan, section 85, verse 3533, “to be descended from Turvasu, the Vaibhoyas from Druhyu, and the Mlechha tribes from Anu” (*Yadu tu Yudavaḥ jātās Turvaras Yavanāḥ smritaḥ | Druhyoh sutas tu Vaibhojaḥ Anos tu mlechha-jātayaḥ |). Is it meant by this that the Yavanas are not to be reckoned among the Mlechhas? Their descent from Turvasu is not however, necessarily in conflict with the assertion of the authorities above quoted, that they are degraded Kshattriyas.

I shall not attempt to determine who the Yavanas, and other tribes mentioned in the text, were.

The verse which succeeds that last quoted from Manu is the following: 45. *Mukha-bāhuru-paj-jānāṁ yāṁ loka jātayo vahih | mlechha-vāchaṁ chāryya-vāchaṁ sarve te dasyavaṁ smritaḥ |

“These tribes which are outside of the classes produced from the mouth, arms, thighs, and feet, [of Brahma, i.e. Brāhmans, Kshattriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras,] whether they speak the language of the Mlechhas or of the Āryas, are called Dasyus.” The interpretation to be given to this verse turns...
upon the sense which we assign to "outside" (vāhiḥ). Does it mean that the Dasyus were of a stock originally distinct from that of the four primeval castes, and therefore altogether separate from those tribes which sprang from the intermixture of those four castes, or which, by the neglect of sacred rites, apostatized from their communion? Or does it merely mean that the Dasyus became eventually excluded from the fellowship of the four castes? If the latter sense be adopted, then Dasyu will be little else than a general term embracing all the tribes enumerated in verses 43 and 44. The commentator Kullūka understands the word in the latter sense. His words are: Brāhmaṇa-kṣatriya-vaiśya-
sādṛṣṇāṁ kṛśya-lopaḍinā yāḥ jātayo vāhyāḥ jātāḥ mlechha-bhāṣa-
yuktāḥ āryya-bhāṣopetāḥ va to dasyavaḥ sarve smṛitāḥ | “All the tribes, which by loss of sacred rites, and so forth, have become out-
casts from the pale of the four castes, Brāhmaṇs, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śādras; whether they speak the language of the Mlechhas or of the Āryas, are called Dasyus.” His view is confirmed by a short passage in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, quoted above (p. 358), where Viś-
vāmitra, speaking to his sons, says: “Let your descendants possess the furthest ends (of the country),” and the author of the Brāhmaṇa adds: “These are the numerous border-tribes, the Andhras, Puṇḍras, Sabaras, Pulindas, Mūtibas. Most of the Dasyus are sprung from Viśvāmitra.” Here the writer of this ancient Brāhmaṇa connects together certain tribes named either in Manu, or in the Mahābhārata, as degraded Kṣatriyas, with the appellation Dasyu, thus intimating that the latter was a general name embracing all the former. This view is further confirmed by the following lines of the Mahābhārata, book ii. verses 1031–2: Daradān saha Kāmbojair ajayat Pākaśasaniḥ | prāgut-
tarāṁ diśaṁ ye cha vāsanty āsritoṇa Dasyavaḥ | “The son of Indra con-
quered the Daradas with the Kāmbojas, and the Dasyus who dwell in the north-east region;” and still more by the annexed verses from: the Dronaparvan, of the same epic poem, 4747: Kāmbojānāṁ va hubhraiścha
Sakānāṁ cha visāmpate | Savaṇānāṁ Kīrātānāṁ Varvantānāṁ tathaiva cha | agamya-rūpāṁ prithivim māṁsa-śonita-karrdamāṁ | kṛitavāṁs
tatra Saineyāḥ kṣapayaṁś tavakam balam | Dasyūnāṁ sa-bhādramāṁ
śrobhir lāna-mūrdhāhajaiḥ | dīrgha-kūrcair mahī kīrṇa vīvarhair anda-
jaiv iva | “Saineya, destroying thy host, converted the beautiful earth into a mass of mud with the flesh and blood of thousands of Kāmbojas,
Sakas, Sabaras, Kiritas, and Vararas. The ground was covered with the shorn and hairless but long-bearded heads of the Dasyus, and their helmets, as if with birds bereft of their plumes.” Here the word Dasyu is evidently a general term for the tribes named just before. Some of these same tribes had previously been called Mechhas in verses 4716, 4723, and 4745. See also Sahap. 1198 ff.

There is a passage in the Sāntiparvan, section 65, lines 2429 ff., which is worth quoting, as it shows that the Brāhmans of that age regarded the Dasyus as owing allegiance to Brahmanical institutions. King Māndhātṛi had performed a sacrifice in the hope of obtaining a vision of Viṣṇu; who accordingly appeared to him in the form of Indra (verse 2399). The following is a part of their conversation. Māndhātṛi asks:


"""The Yavanas, Kiratas, Gandharas, Chinas, Savaras, Varvaras, Sakas, Tusharas, Kankas, Pahlavas, Andhras, Madras, Paundras, Pu-
lindas, Ramaṭhas, Kāmbojas, men sprung from Brāhmans, and from Kshattriyas, persons of the Vaiṣya and Śūdra castes—how shall all these people of different countries practise duty, and what rules shall kings like me prescribe for those who are living as Dasyus? Instruct me on these points; for thou art the friend of our Kshattriya race.' Indra answers: 'All the Dasyus should obey their parents, their spiritual directors, persons practising the rules of the four orders, and kings. It is also their duty to perform the ceremonies ordained in the Vedas. They should sacrifice to the Pitrīḥ, construct wells, buildings for the distribution of water, and resting places for travellers, and should on proper occasions bestow gifts on the Brāhmans. They should practise innocence, veracity, meekness, purity, and inoffensiveness; should maintain their wives and families; and make a just division of their property. Gifts should be distributed at all sacrifices by those who desire to prosper. All the Dasyus should offer costly pākā oblations. Such duties as these, which have been ordained of old, ought to be observed by all people.' Māndhātrī observes: 'In this world of men, Dasyus are to be seen in all castes, living, under other garbs, even among men of the four orders (āśramas).’ Indra replies: 'When criminal justice has perished, and the duties of government are disregarded, mankind become bewildered through the wickedness of their kings. When this Krīta age has come to a close, innumerable mendicants and hypocrites shall arise, and the four orders become disorganized. Disregarding the excellent paths of ancient duty, and impelled by passion and by anger, men shall fall into wickedness,'” etc. In these last lines it is implied that the Brahmanical polity of castes and orders was fully developed in the Krīta [or golden] age. This idea, however, is opposed to the representations which we find in some though not in all other passages. See above, the various texts adduced in the first chapter.

In the Vishṇu Purāṇa, Bhāratavarsha (India) is said to “have its eastern border occupied by the Kirātas; and the western by the Yavanas; while the middle is inhabited by Kshattriyas, Vaiṣyas, and Śūdras, engaged in their several fixed occupations of sacrifice, war, trade, etc.” (Vishṇu Purāṇa, ii. 3, 7. Pūrve Kṛtāḥ yasyānte paśchime Yavanāḥ sthitāḥ | brāhmaṇāḥ khaṭṭariyāḥ vaiṣyāḥ maḍhyo śudrāḥ cha bhogāṣāḥ | iṣyā-yuddha-vanijyādyair varttayanto vyavasthitāḥ |).
Manu's account of the origin of the Yavanas, Sakas, Kâmbojas, etc., corresponds with the tenor of the following story, which we find in the fourth book of the Vishnû Purâna, sect. 3. Bâhu, the seventh king in descent from Harischandra (see above, p. 379) was overcome by the Hâihâyas and Tâlajanghas, and compelled to fly with his queens to the forests, where he died. After his death one of his wives gave birth to a son, who received the name of Sâgara. When he had grown up, the youth learnt from his mother all that had befallen his father.

Para. 18. Tâtaḥ pitri-râjya-haraṇâmarshhito Hâihâyayâ Tâlajanghâdibadhâyaprâjinâm akarot praâyasaścha Haîhâyayâ jaghâna | Saka Yavana-Kâmboja-Pârada-Pahlavâ hanyamânâs tat-kula-guruṇa Vasishtham saraṇam gayuh |


21. Sa “tatha” iti tad guru-vachanam abhinandaya teshām veshânyatvam akârayat | Yavanan apamundita-siraśa 'rückha-mundan Sâkân pralamba-keśan Pârâdán Pahlavaṁ cha smâru-dhâram nîj-svâdhâyaya-vâshaṭkârin etân anyásu cha kshattriyân chakâra | te cha nîjâ-dharma-parityagâd brâhmaṇâais parityaktâh mlechhatâm gayuh |

"Being vexed at the loss of his paternal kingdom, he vowed to exterminate the Hâihâyas and other enemies who had conquered it. Accordingly he destroyed nearly all the Hâihâyas. When the Sâkas, Yavanas, Kâmbojas, Pâradas, and Pahlavas were about to undergo a similar fate, they had recourse to Vasishthâ, the king's family-priest, who interposed in their behalf in these words addressed to Sâgara, representing them as virtually dead: 'You have done enough, my son, in the way of pursuing these men, who are as good as dead. In order that your vow might be fulfilled, I have compelled them to abandon the duties of their caste, and all association with the twice-born.' Agreeing to his spiritual guide's proposal, Sâgara compelled these tribes to alter their costume. He made the Yavanas shave their heads, the Sakas shave half their heads, the Pâradas wear long hair, and the Pahlavas beards. These and other Kshatriyas he deprived of the

3 See Wilson's Vishnû Purâna, 4to. edit., p. 416 and 418 note. In the note to p. 418 the Ávantyas are mentioned, on the authority of the Vâyu Purâna, as being a branch of the Hâihâyas. In Manu, x. 21, the Ávantyas are said to be descended from Brâhman Vrûtyas.
study of the Vedas, and the vashaṭkāra. In consequence of their abandonment of their proper duties, and of their rdesertion by the Brāhmans, they became Mlechhas."

This story is also related in the Harivaṃśa, from which I extract the concluding part of the narrative:

773. Āurvas tu jātakarmādi tasya kṛtva mahātmanah | adhyāpya ve-

dān akhilān tato 'stram prayāpya dayat | āgneyaṁ tu mahābūhur amaraṁ

api dussaham | sa tenāstra-balena balena cha samanvitaṁ | Haihayān

nijaghaṇāsu krudho Rudraṁ paśūn iva | ājahāra cha lokesu kṛtām

kṛttimātām varaṁ | tataḥ Sākūn sa-yavanān Kāmbojac Pāradāṁs tathā |

Pahlavāṁs chaiva niśēṣaṁ kartuṁ vyavasitaṁ kila | te badhyamanāṁ

dvēna Sagaraṇa mahātmanā | Vāśishṭhasu sarāṇāṁ gatvā pratipetur mani-

śiṇam | Vāśishṭhasu tv atha tān drīṣṭvā samayena mahādyutiḥ | Sagaraṁ

vāraṇyāmśa teshāṁ dattvā 'bhyaṁ tādā | Sagaraṁ svām prativānāṁ cha
guror vākyāṁ niśāmya cha | dharmāṁ jaghāna teshāṁ vai vaśānyatvāṁ

chakāra ha | ardhānaṁ Sākūnāṁ śrīro muṇḍayitvā vyasarjāvat | Yavan-

ānāṁ śiraṁ sarvāṁ Kāmbojeṇāṁ tathaiva cha | Pāradāṁ muṣṭa-keśāchā

Pahlavāṁ śmaśrū-dhāriṇaḥ | nissvaḍhyāya-vashaṭkāraḥ kṛtās tāna

mahātmanā | Sākūḥ Yavana-kāmbojaḥ Pāradāḥ Pahlavāḥ tathā | Kol-

sarpāḥ sa-Mahāśeṇ Dāvraśa Cholaḥ sa-Keralāḥ | sarve te kṣatthriyās tata

teshāṁ dharmo nirākriṇaḥ | Vāśishṭhasa-vachanaṁ rājan Sagaraṇa ma-

hātmanā |

"Āurva having performed Sagara's natal and other rites, and taught him all the Vedas, then provided him with a fiery missile, such as even the gods could not withstand. By the power of this weapon, and accompanied by an army, Sagara, incensed, speedily slew the Haihayas, as Rudra slaughters beasts; and acquired great renown throughout the world. He then set himself to exterminate the Sakas, Yavanas, Kāmbojas, Pāradas, and Pahlavas. But they, when on the point of being slaughtered by Sagara, had recourse to the sage Vāsiṣṭha, and fell down before him. Vasiṣṭha beholding them, by a sign restrained Sagara, giving them assurance of protection. Sagara, after considering his own vow, and listening to what his teacher had to say, destroyed their caste (dharma), and made them change their costumes. He released the Sakas, after causing the hulk of their heads to be shaven;—and the Yavanas and Kāmbojas, after having had their heads entirely shavcd. The Pāradas were made to wear
long hair, and the Pahlavas to wear beards. They were all excluded from the study of the Vedas, and from the vashatkara. The Sakas, Yavanas, Kâmbhojas, Pâradas, Pahlavas, Kolisarpas, Mahishas, Dárvas, Cholas, and Keralas had all been Kshattriyas; but were deprived of their social and religious position by the great Sågara, according to the advice of Vasishtha.” Other tribes are mentioned in the following line who seem to have undergone the same treatment.

It would appear from this legend, as well as from the quotations which preceded it, that the Epic and Puranic writers believed all the surrounding tribes to belong to the same original stock with themselves; though they, at the same time, erroneously imagined that these tribes had fallen away from the Brahmanical institutions; thus assigning to their own polity an antiquity to which it could in reality lay no claim. Any further explanations on these points, however, must be sought in the second volume of this work.

In the passages quoted above, pp. 391, 393, and 398 from the Mahâbhârata and Râmâyana, it is stated that Sakas, Yavanas, Pahlavas, etc., were created by Vasishtha’s wonder-working cow, in order to repel the aggression of Viśvâmitra. It does not, however, appear that it is the object of that legend to represent this miraculous creation as the origin of those tribes. The narrators, if they had any distinct meaning, may not have intended anything more than that the cow called into existence large armies, of the same stock with particular tribes previously existing.

It is not very easy to say whether it is only the inhabitants of Bhûratavarsha (viz. that portion of Jambudvîpa which answers to India) whom the Puranic writers intend to represent as deriving their origin from the four primeval Indian castes. Perhaps the writers themselves had no very clear ideas. At all events the conditions of life are different in the two cases. The accounts which these writers give us of the other divisions of Jambudvîpa, and of the other Dvîpas, or continents, of which they imagined the earth to be composed, and their respective inhabitants, will be considered in the next chapter.
CHAPTER VI.

PURANIC ACCOUNTS OF THE PARTS OF THE EARTH EXTERIOR TO BHĀRATAVARSHA, OR INDIA.

It will clearly appear from the contents of the present chapter that the authors or compilers of the Purāṇas in reality knew nothing of any part of the world except that immediately around them. Whenever they wander away beyond their own neighbourhood, they at once lose themselves in a misty region of fiction, and give the most unbridled scope to their fantastic imaginations.

The following is the account given in the Vishṇu Purāṇa regarding the divisions of the earth, and their inhabitants. Priyavrata, son of Svāyambhuva, or the "Manu (see above, pp. 65 and 72) who is separated from the present time by an enormous interval (see pp. 43 ff. and 298, above), "distributed the seven dvīpas, of which the earth is composed, among seven of his sons" (ii. 1, 7. Priyavrato dadau teshāṁ saptānāṁ muni-sattama | vibhajyaṃ sapta dvīpāṇi Maitreya sumahātmanāṁ).

The Bhāgavata Purāṇa gives us the following account, v. 1. 30. Tad anabhinandăn sama-javena rathena jyotirmayena rajanīm api dinaṁ kariśyāmi iti saptakritvas taraṇīm anuparyakrāmad dvitiyāḥ īva patan-gaḥ | [evaṁ kuruṇam Priyavrataṁ āgatya Chaturānanaṁ "tavādhikāro 'yaṁ na bhaṇati" iti nivārayāmāsa] (The words in brackets are not in the Bombay edition, but are taken from Burnouf's.) 31. Ye vai u ha tad-ratha-charaṇa-nemi-kṛita-parikhātās te saptā sindhavaḥ āsan yataḥ eva kritāḥ sapta bhūvo dvīpāḥ | "Priyavrata, being dissatisfied that only

1 The original division of the earth into seven continents is assigned to Nūrāyaṇa in the form of Brahūṇā; see above, pp. 51 and 76.

2 In this passage we find the particles vai, u, ha, occurring all together as they do in the Vedic hymns and Brāhmaṇas. This circumstance might seem to suggest the
half the earth was illuminated at one time by the solar rays, "followed the sun seven times round the earth in his own flaming car of equal velocity, like another celestial orb, resolved to turn night into day. [Brahmā, however, came and stopped him, saying this was not his province.] The ruts which were formed by the motion of his chariot wheels were the seven oceans. In this way the seven continents of the earth were made."

The same circumstance is alluded to at the commencement of the 16th section of the same book, where the king says to the rishi: verse 2. Tattvāpi Priyavrata-ratha-charana-parikhātaḥ saptabhiḥ sapta sindhavah upakāriptaḥ | yataḥ etasyah sapta-dvīpa-viśeṣha-vikalpa tvaya bhagavan khalu sūchitaḥ | "The seven oceans were formed by the seven ruts of the wheels of Priyavrata’s chariot; hence, as you have indicated, the earth has become divided into seven different continents."

It is clear that this account given by the Bhāgavata Purāṇa of the manner in which the seven oceans and continents were formed does not agree with the description in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, as quoted above in p. 51.

These seven continents are called "Jambu dvīpa, Plaksha dvīpa, Śāl-possibility of the passage, or its substance, being derived from some of the Brāhmaṇas (to which, as we have seen, p. 156 note, the compiler of this Purāṇa was in the habit of resorting for his materials); but the style has otherwise nothing of an archaic caste, and I am not aware that the dvīpas are mentioned in any of the Brāhmaṇas. It is also remarkable that the words sapta sindhavah are here used for "seven oceans." This phrase occurs several times in the Vedas. For instance, it is to be found in the Vājasanēyī Śaṅhitā (of the Yajur-veda), 38, 28, yānavi śvav-eparitātār viṇaḥ cha sapta sindhavo vītasthīr | "As wide as are the earth and sky, and as far as the seven oceans extend." The commentator Mahīdhara understands the latter in the Puranic sense, as the oceans of milk, etc. (sapta sindhavah sapta samudrāh kṣīrādvyāḥ). The hemistich I have quoted from the Vāj. Śaṅhitā occurs somewhat modified, and in a different connexion, in the Atharva-veda, iv. 6. 2. The same phrase, sapta sindhavah, is to be found also in several places in the first Book of the Rig-veda. (See Benfey’s Glossary to Śāma-veda, sub voce septan.) In Rig-veda i. 32, 12, it is said to Indra avatārīyāh sartīte sapta sindhān | "Thou hast let loose the seven rivers to flow." Śāyaṇa understands this of the Ganges and other rivers, seven in number, mentioned in the Rig Veda, x. 75, 5: imam me Gange Yamunā Sarasvatī S’utudri sowaḥ sachaḥ āravasya | "Receive this my hymn with favour, o Gāṅgā, Yamunā, Sarasvatī, S’utudrī, with the Parushṇī, etc.;" but in this distich ten rivers in all are mentioned. (See Wilson’s note to Rig-veda, i. 32, 12, vol. i. p. 88, of his translation). See also hymns 34, 8; 35, 8; 71, 7; and 102, 2, of the first, and 58, 12, and 85, 1, of the eighth Books of the Rig-veda. The "seven rivers" of the Veda are, according to Professor Müller (Chips from a German Workshop, vol. i. p. 63), "the Indus, the five rivers of the Penjāb and the Sarasvatī."
mali dvīpa, Kuśadvīpa, Kraunchadvīpa, Śāka dvīpa, and Pushkara dvīpa. They are surrounded severally by seven great seas, of salt water, sugar-cane juice, wine, clarified butter, curds, milk, and fresh water’’ (V.P. ii. 2, 4. Jambu-plakṣāhavayau dvīpaau Sālmaliś chāparo dvīja | Kuśah Kraunchchas tathā Śākapah Pushkaraś chaiva saptaṃah | 5. Ete dvipāḥ samudraś tu sapta saptabhir āvīritāḥ | lavanēkṣu-suruśa-sarpīr-dadhī-dugāha-jalaiḥ samam |). Jambu dvīpa is in the centre of all these continents (Wilson, vol. ii. p. 110). It fell to the lot of Agnīdhra, son of Priyavrata, who again divided it among his nine sons (Wilson, ii. 101). In the centre of Jambu dvīpa is the golden mountain Meru, 84,000 yojanas high, and crowned by the great city of Brahmā (ibid. p. 118). There are in this continent six cross-ranges of boundary-mountains, those of Himavat (= Himādri, or Himālaya), Hemakūṭa, and Nishadhā lying south of Meru; and those of Nīla, Sveta, and Śringin, situated to the northward. Of these, Nishadha and Nīla are the nearest to Meru, while Himavat and Śringin are at the south and north extremities. The nine Varshas or divisions of Jambu dvīpa, separated by these and other ranges, are Bhārata (India), south of the Himavat mountains, and the southernmost of all; then (2) Kimpurusha, (3) Harivarsha, (4) Iḷāvrita, (5) Ramyaka, (6) Hiraṇmaya, and (7) Uttara Kuru, each to the north of the last; while (8) Bhadrāśva and (9) Ketumala lie respectively to the east and west of Iḷāvrita, the central region. Bhārata Varsha, and Uttara Kuru, as well as Bhadrāśva and Ketumala, are situated on the exterior of the mountain ranges. (Wilson, ii. pp. 114-116, and 123.) The eight Varshas to the north of Bhārata Varsha (or India) are thus described:

V.P. ii. 1, 11. Yāni Kimpurushadīni varśāṇy ashtau mahāmunaḥ | teshāḥ svābhavikā saddhiḥ sukha-prāyaḥ hy ayatnataḥ | 12. Viparyyayo

3 The Mahābhārata tells us, Bhishmaparvan, verses 227-8, in regard to the Varsha of Ketumala: āyur daśa sahasrāniḥ varśhānām tattra Bhārataḥ | suvarṇa-vargyaiḥ cha narāḥ striyas chōprasamapamāḥ | anāmayāḥ vīta-sokāḥ nityam mudita-mūnasaḥ | jayante mūnasaḥ tattra nishṭaptā-kanaka-prabhāḥ | “The people there live ten thousand years. The men are of the colour of gold, and the women fair as celestial nymphs. Men are born there of the colour of burnished gold, live free from sickness and sorrow, and joy perpetual happiness.” The men by the side of the mountain Gandhamadana, west of Meru, are said (v. 231) “to be black, of great strength and vigour, while the women are of the colour of blue lotuses, and very beautiful” (tattra kriṣṇāḥ narāḥ vijāña tejo-yuktāḥ mahābalāḥ | striyas chotpala-vargyāḥ sarvāḥ supriya-darśanāḥ).
na tattraśti jārā-ṃrityu-bhayān na cha | āhartāṃdharmānav na teshv āstāṃ
nettamādhama-madhyamāḥ | na teshv astī yugāvastāḥ kṣettravesa ashtaśa
sarvādā |

"In the eight Varshas, called Kimpurusha and the rest (i.e. in all except Bhārata Varsha) the inhabitants enjoy a natural perfection attended with complete happiness obtained without exertion. There is there no vicissitude, nor decrepitude, nor death, nor fear; no distinction of virtue and vice, none of the inequalities denoted by the words best, worst, and intermediate, nor any change resulting from the succession of the four yugas." And again:

ii. 2, 35. Yāni Kimpurushādyāni varṣāṇya ashtaṃ mahāmune | na teshu soko nāyāso nodvega-kshud-bhayādikam | sūstāḥ praśāḥ nirātānāḥ
sarva-duḥkha-pivarjayitāḥ | 36. Dāsa-dvādasā-varṣāṇāṃ sahasrāni sthirā-
yuṣaḥ | na teshu varshate devo bhauveyaṃ ambhaṃṣe teshu vai | 37. 
Kṛita-tretādikā naiva teshu sṭhānesu kalpanā |

"In those eight Varshas there is neither grief, nor weariness, nor anxiety, nor hunger, nor fear. The people live in perfect health, free from every suffering, for ten or twelve thousand years. Indra does not rain on those Varshas, for they have abundance of springs. There is there no division of time into the Kṛita, Tretā, and other ages."

The Uttara Kurus, it should be remarked, may have been a real people, as they are mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, viii. 14:

Atha enam udichyām diśi viśve devaḥ saṣāhiḥ chaiva pancharāmaśair
ahobhir abhyashinoḥam etena cha trichena etena cha yajuṣā etābhīḥ cha
yāhritibhir vairājyaya | tasmād etasyām udichyām diśi ye ke cha pareṇa
Himaṇcanāṁ janapadaḥ "Uttara-Kurvaḥ Uttara-Madraḥ" iti vairā-
jyaya eva te 'bhishchīcyante |

"Then in the northern region during six days on which the Pancharāma stoma was recited, the Viśve-devas inaugurated him (Indra) for glorious dominion with these three rāk-verse, this yajush-verse, and these mystic monosyllables. Wherefore the several nations who dwell in this northern quarter, beyond the Himavat, the Uttara Kurus and the Uttara Madras, are consecrated to glorious dominion (vairājya), and people term them the glorious (vīrāj)." See Coleman's Misc. Essays, i. 38–43; Dr. Haug's translation of the Ait. Brāhmaṇa; and Prof. Weber's review of this translation in Ind. Studien, ix. pp. 341 f.

4 Quoted by Weber in Ind. St. i. 218.
In another passage of the same work; however, the Uttara Kurus are treated as belonging to the domain of mythology:

Ait. Br. viii. 23. Etaṁ ha vai aindram mahābhishhekam Vāsishṭhaḥ Sātahavyo tyarātaye Jānantapaye provācha | tasmād u Atyarātir Jānantapir arājā san vidvayā samantaṁ sarvataḥ prithivyāṁ jayan parīyaya | sa ha uvācha Vāsishṭhaḥ Sātyahavyaḥ “ajaśhir vai samantaṁ sarvataḥ prithivyāṁ mahād mā gamaya” iti | sa ha uvācha Atyarātir Jānantapir “yadā brāhmana uttara-kurān jayeyam tvam u h a eva prithivyai rājā syah senāpatir eva te ‘haṁ syām’ iti | sa ha uvācha Vāsishṭhaḥ Sātyahavyo “dēva-kshetraṁ vai tad na vai tad mṛtyo jetum arhatya adṛukho me ā ‘taḥ idāṁ daṁ” iti | tato ha Atyarātir Jānantapim ātta-viryyam niṣṣukram amitra-tapanaṁ Sushmināḥ Sāivyo rājā jaghāna | tasmād evāṁ-vidushe brāhmanaṁ evāṁ-chakruse kshatriyo na druhyate na iū rāṣṭrād avapadyayā (?) na iū vāma-prāṇo jahād iti |

“Sātyahavya of the family of Vāsishṭha declared this great inauguration similar to Indra’s to Atyarāti, son of Jānantapa; and in consequence Atyarāti, though not a king, by his knowledge, went round the earth on every side to its ends, reducing it to subjection. Sātyahavya then said to him, ‘Thou hast subdued the earth in all directions to its limits; exalt me now to greatness.’ Atyarāti replied, ‘When, o Brāhmaṇa, I conquer the Uttara Kurus, thou shalt be king of the earth, and I will be only thy general.’ Sātyahavya rejoined, ‘That is the realm of the gods; no mortal may make the conquest of it: Thou hast wronged me; therefore I take all this away from thee.’ In consequence Sushmina, king of the Śivis, vexer of his foes, slew Atyarāti son of Jānantapa who had been bereft of his valour and energy. Wherefore let no Kshatriya wrong a Brāhmaṇa who possesses such knowledge and has so acted, lest he should be expelled from his kingdom, be short-lived, and perish.’

The Uttara Kurus are also mentioned in the description of the northern region in the Kishkindhā Kāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa, 43, 38, Uttarakṛuravaḥ tatra kriṇa-punya-pratiśrayah | “There are the Uttara Kurus, the abodes of those who have performed works of merit.” In v. 57 it is said: na kathanchana gantavyān kurāṇām uttarena vaḥ | anyeṣaṁ api bhūtanāṁ nānukramaṁ vai gatiḥ | “You must not go to the north of the Kurus: other beings also may not proceed further.”

See Colebrooke’s Essays, i. 43; Dr. Haug’s translation; and Ind. Stud. ix. 346.
In the same way when Arjuna, in his career of conquest, arrives at the country of the Uttara Kurus in Harivarsha, he is thus addressed by the guards at the gate of the city, M. Bh. Sabhāparvan, 1045:

Pārtha nedaṁ tvayā śakyam puraṁ jetaṁ kathāchana | upāvarttasva kalyaṇa paryāplam idam Achyuta | idam puraṁ yaḥ praviṣed dhruvaṁ na sa bhaved narāḥ | . . . na chātraṁ kincijj jetavyam Arjunāttra pradṛṣyate | Uttaraḥ Kuravo hy ete nātra yuddham pravarttate | praviṣeṣto 'pi hi Kaunteya neha drakhyasi kinhana | na hi mānusya-dehena śakyam attrābhicēhitum |

"Thou canst not, son of Prithā, subdue this city. Refrain, fortunate man, for it is completely secure. He who shall enter this city must be certainly more than man. . . . Nor is there anything to be seen here which thou canst conquer. Here are the Uttara Kurus, whom no one attempts to assail. And even if thou shouldst enter, thou couldst behold nothing. For no one can perceive anything here with human senses."  

In the Anuśāsanaparvan, line 2841, Kuśika says, on seeing a magic palace formed by Chyavana (see above, p. 475):

Aho suka śāriṣeṇa prāpto 'smi paramāṁ gatim | Uttarān vā Kurān punyāṁ athavā 'py Amārāvatīm |

"I have attained, even in my embodied condition, to the heavenly state; or to the holy Northern Kurus, or to Amarāvatī [the city of Indra]!"

"The country to the north of the ocean, and to the south of the Himādri (or snowy range), is Bhārata Varsha, where the descendants of Bharata dwell" (V.P. ii, 3, 1. Uttaraṁ yad samudranya Himādres chaiva dakaṁ | varṣaṁ tad Bhārataṁ nāma Bhārati gattra santatiḥ). It is divided into nine parts (bhedāḥ), Indradvīpa, Kaśerumat, Tāmavrāṇa, Gābhāstimāt, Nāgadvīpa, Saumya, Gāndharva, Vāruṇa; and "this ninth dvīpa," which is not named, is said to be "surrounded by the ocean" ayaṁ tu navaṁas teshāṁ dīpaṁ ṣaṇāra-saṁvritah), and to be a thousand yojanas long from north to south. "On the east side of it are the Kīrtās, on the west the Yavanas, and in the centre are the Brāhmans, Kshattriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras, following their respective occupations of sacrifice, arms, trade, etc." (The text of this passage, V.P. ii, 3, 7, has been already quoted in p. 485).

* See the second vol. of this work, pp. 332-337, and vol. iv., p. 375.
The Vishnū Purāṇa contains a very short list of the tribes inhabiting Bhārata Varsha. (See Wilson, vol. ii. pp. 132 ff.) It specifies, as the principal, only the Kurus, Pāṇchālas, the people of Kāmarūpa, the Puṇḍras, Kalingas, Magadhās, Saurāśṭras, Śūras, Bhīras, Arbudas, Kūrūshas, Mālavas, Sauvīras, Saindhavas, Hūṇas, Sūlvas, Sākulas, Madras, Rāmas, Ambashtaḥs, and Pārasikas. These tribes seem to be all confined to India and its vicinity.

The praises of Bhārata Varsha are celebrated as follows:


"In Bhārata Varsha, and nowhere else, do the four Yugas, Kṛita, Tretā, Dvāpara, and Kali exist. 12. Here devotees perform austerities, and priests sacrifice; here gifts are bestowed, to testify honour, for the sake of the future world. In Jambudvīpa Vishnū, the sacrificial Man, whose essence is sacrifice, is continually worshipped by men with sacrifices; and in other ways in the other dvīpas. In this respect Bhārata is the most excellent division of Jambudvīpa; for this is the land of works, while the others are places of enjoyment. Perhaps in a thousand thousand births, a living being obtains here that most excellent condition, humanity, the receptacle of virtue. The gods sing, "Happy are those beings, who, when the rewards of their merits have

7 The list in the Mahābhārata (Bhishmaparvan, 346 ff.), is much longer. See Wilson’s Vishnū Purāṇa, vol. ii. pp. 132 ff., and 156 ff.
8 "In other ways," i.e. in the form of Soma, Vāyu, Śūryya, etc." (Anyathā Soma-vāyu-sūryyādi-rūpaḥ | ). Commentator.
been exhausted in heaven, are, after being gods, again born as men in Bhārata Varsha; (14) who, when born in that land of works, resign to the supreme and eternal Vishnu their works, without regard to their fruits, and attain by purity to absorption in him. 15. We know not where we shall next attain a corporeal condition, when the merit of our works shall have become exhausted; but happy are those men who exist in Bhārata Varsha with perfect senses.’”

To the same effect the Bhāgavata Purāṇa says, v. 17, 11:


“Of these, Bhāratavarsha alone is the land of works: the other eight Varshas are places where the celestials enjoy the remaining rewards of their works; they are called terrestrial paradises. 12. In them men pass an existence equal to that of the Tretā age, living for the space of ten thousand ordinary lives, on an equality with gods, having the vitality of ten thousand elephants, and possessed of wives who bear one child after a year’s conception following upon sexual intercourse attended by all the gratification arising from adamantine bodies and from vigorous youth.”

The commentator remarks on verse 11: Divya-bhauma-bila-bhedat trividhaḥ svargah | tattva bhauma-svargasya padāṁ sthānāṁ vyopaditi | “Heaven is of three kinds, in the sky, on earth, and in the abyss. Here the other Varshas are called terrestrial heavens.”

It is curious to remark that in the panegyric on Bhārata Varsha it is mentioned as one of the distinguishing advantages of that division of Jambudvīpa that sacrifice is performed there, though, a little further on, it is said to be practised in Sālmali dvīpa also.

It would at first sight appear from the preceding passage (ii. 3, 11) of the Vishnu Purāṇa (as well as from others which we shall encounter below), to be the intention of the writer to represent the inhabitants of Bhārata Varsha as a different race, or, at least as living under quite different conditions, from the inhabitants of the other dvīpas, and even of the other divisions (varshas) of Jambu dvīpa itself. From the use
of the word mānushya (humanity) here applied to the inhabitants of Bhārata Varsha, viewed in reference to the context, it would seem to be a natural inference that all the people exterior to it were beings of a different race. Yet in the descriptions of Kuśa dvīpa and Pushkara dvīpa (see below) the words manujāḥ and mānavāḥ “descendants of Manu,” or “men,” are applied to the dwellers in those continents. In the passage of the Jātimālā, moreover, translated by Mr. Colebrooke (Misc. Essays, ii. 179), we are told that “a chief of the twice-born tribe was brought by Vishnū’s eagle from Sāka dvīpa; thus have Sāka dvīpa Brāhmans become known in Jambu dvīpa.” According to this verse, too, there should be an affinity of race between the people of these two dvīpas. It is also to be noted that the descendants of Priyavrata became kings of all the dvīpas, as well as of all the varshas of Jambu dvīpa (see above, pp. 489, 491). And in the passage quoted above, p. 478, from the Vishnū Purāṇa, iv. 11, 3, it is said of Arjuna, son of Kṛitavīrya, that he was “lord of the seven dvīpas,” “that he ruled over the earth with all its dvīpas.” If, however, the kings were of the human race, it is natural to infer the same of the people.

But, in a subject of this sort, where the writers were following the suggestions of imagination only, it is to be expected that we should find inconsistencies.

Jambu dvīpa is surrounded by a sea of salt water (Wilson, V.P. ii 109); and that sea again is bounded on its outer side by the dvīpa or continent of Plaksha running all round it. (V.P. ii. 4, 1. Kṣaṇo-dena yathā dvīpo Jambu-sanjno bhiyavēṣṭitaḥ | saṁvesḥya kṣaṇam udadhim Plaksha-dvīpas tathā sthitah). According to this scheme the several continents and seas form concentric circles, Jambu dvīpa being a circular island occupying the centre of the system.

Plaksha dvīpa is of twice the extent of Jambu dvīpa. The character and condition of its inhabitants are described as follows:


9 Purāṇavas is said to have possessed thirteen islands (dvīpas) of the ocean (above p. 307).
varṇās tattvāpi chatvārās tān nibodha gadāmī te | Aryyakāḥ Kuravaḥ chaiva Vivāśah Bhāvinaḥ cha ye | vipra-kshattriya-vaiśyās te śudrās cha muni-sattama |

"In those seven provinces [which compose Plaksha dvīpa] the division of time into Yugas does not exist: but the character of existence is always that of the Tretā age. In the [five] dvīpas, beginning with Plaksha and ending with Śāka, the people live 5000 years, free from sickness. In those five dvīpas duties arise from the divisions of castes and orders. There are there also four castes, Āryyakas, Kurus, Vivāśas, and Bhāvins, who are the Brāhmans, Kshattriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śudras," and whose worship is thus described:

9. Iṣyaṇa tattra bhagavān tair varnaир Aryyakādirīhī | soma-rūpi jagat-srashṭā sarvah sarveśworo Hariḥ | "Hari who is All, and the lord of all, and the creator of the world, is adored in the form of Soma by these classes, the Āryyakas, etc."

The inhabitants of this dvīpa receive different names in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, being there called (v. 20, 4) "Hansas, Patangas, Ārdhvāyanas, and Satyāngas, four castes, who, purified from passion and darkness by the touch of the waters of these rivers, live a thousand years, resemble the gods in their appearance and in their manner of procreation, and worship with the triple Veda the divine Soul, the Sun, who is the gate of heaven, and who is co-essential with the Vedas" (Yāsāṁ jalopasarsana-vidhāta-rajas-tamaso Haṁsa-patangorādhvāyana-satyāṅga-sanjñās chatvāro varṇāḥ sahasrāyusho vibudhāpama-sandarśana-prajananāḥ svarga-dvāram trayyā vidyayā bhagavantaṁ trayimayaṁ sūryam ātmānaṁ yajante).

In regard to Plaksha and the other four following dvīpas, the Bhāgavata Purāṇa says, ibid. para. 6, that "their men are all alike in respect of natural perfection as shewn in length of life, senses, vigour, force, strength, intelligence, and courage" (Plakshaśadāhu panchuṣu purushā-nām āyur intriyam oṣah saho bālam buddhir vikramaḥ iti cha sarveśham autpattiki sidhīr avīśeshena vartate ).

Plaksha dvīpa is surrounded by a sea of sugar-cane juice of the same compass as itself. ii. 4, 9, Plaksha-dvīpa-pramāyena Plaksha-dvīpaḥ samākritaḥ | tathaivekshu-rasodena pariveśānukārīṇā | Round the outer margin of this sea, and twice as extensive, runs Śālmala dvīpa (verse 11. Sālmaleṇa samudro 'sau dvīpenekshu-rasodakaḥ | vistara-
dvigunanātha sarvataḥ saṁvṛstāṁ sthitāḥ). It is divided into seven Varshas, or divisions. Of their inhabitants it is said:

V. P. ii. 4, 12. Septātāni tu varshaṇi cha turyavṛṣya-yutāni cha | Sālmaḥ ya tu varṇaḥ ca vasanti te mahāmune | kapilaḥ cha rūpaḥ pitāḥ kṛishṇaḥ chaiva prithak prithak | brāhmanaḥ kṣattriyāḥ vaisyāḥ śūdrāḥ chaiva yañantī te | bhagavantaṁ samastasya Vishnuṁ ātmānam avyayam | Vāyubhūtaṁ makha-śreshṭhaṁ yajvino yajna-saṁsthītan | 13. Devānām attra śāṃkīdyam ativa suṇamanoharam |

"These seven Varshas have a system of four castes. The castes which dwell there are severally the Kapilas, Aruṇas, Pitas, and Kṛishṇas (or the Tawny, the Purple, the Yellow, and the Black). These, the Brāhmaṇas, Kṣattriyas, Vaisyās, and Śūdras, worship with excellent sacrifices Viṣṇu, the divine and imperishable Soul of all things, in the form of Vāyu, and abiding in sacrifice. Here the vicinity of the gods is very delightful to the soul."

The Bhāgavata Purāṇa says of this dvīpa, v. 20, 11: Tat-varsha-purushāḥ Srutadhara-vīruryadharavasundhareshhundhara-saṁjnāḥ bhagavantaṁ vedamayaṁ somam ātmānaṁ vedena yajante | "The men of the different divisions of this dvīpa, called Sṛutadrhas, Vīryadharas, Vasundharas, and Ishundharas, worship with the Veda the divine Soul Soma, who is co-essential with the Veda."

This dvīpa is surrounded by a sea of wine of the same compass as itself (v. 13. Eṣa dvipaḥ samudṛṣaṇa svuṛdṛṣa saṁvṛsitaḥ | vistārāḥ chhālmalasyaiva samena tu samantataḥ). The exterior shore of this sea is encompassed by Kuṣa dvīpa, which is twice as extensive as Sālma dvīpa (v. 13. Surodakaḥ parivṛsitaḥ Kuṣadvīpēṇa sarvataḥ | Sālmaśila tu vistārāḥ dviguṇena samantataḥ). The inhabitants of Kuṣa dvīpa are thus described, V. P. ii 4, 14:


"In this set of Varshas (of Kuṣa dvīpa) dwell men with Daityas, Dānavas, Devas, Gandharvas, Yakshas, Kimpurushas, and other beings.
there, too, there are four castes, pursuing their proper observances, Damins, Sushmins, Snehas, and Mandehas, who in the order specified are Brāhmans, Kshatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Sūdras. In order to destroy their right [to reward] derived from the performance of these works, they worship Janārdana in the form of Brahma, and so neutralize this direful merit which brings rewards.”

Of Kuśa dvīpa the Mahābhārata tells us, Bṛhadmaparvan, verses 455–7: Eteshu deva-gandharvāḥ prajāścha jagatīsvara | viharante ramante cha na teshu mriyato janaḥ | na teshu dasyavah santi mlecha-jātyo ’pi va nīpa | gauraprāyo janaḥ sarvāḥ sukumāras cha pārthivā | “In these (Varshas of Kuśa dvīpa), gods, Gandharvas, and living creatures, amuse and enjoy themselves. No one dies there. There are no Daśus or Mlechhas there. The people are fair, and of very delicate forms.”

The Bhāgavata Purāṇa, v. 20, 16, says, “The people of this dvīpa are called Kuśalas, Kovidas, Abhiyuktas, and Kulakas” (Kuśa-dvīpa ukasah Kuśala-kovidābhīyukta-kulaka-saṇjānaḥ |).

Kuśa dvīpa is surrounded by a sea of clarified butter, of the same circumference as itself.

Around this sea runs Krauncha dvīpa which is twice as large as Kuśa dvīpa. The V. P. says, ii. 4, 19: Sarveshu eteshu ranyeshu varsha-kaila-vareshu cha | nivasanti nirātankaḥ saha deva-ganaḥ prajāḥ | Pushkarāḥ Pushkalāḥ Dhanyās Tishmās chaṭṭra mahāmune | brāhmaṇaḥ kshatriyāḥ vaisyāḥ sūdrāḥ chānukramoditaḥ | “In all these pleasant division-mountains of this dvīpa the people dwell, free from fear, in the society of the gods. [These people are] the Pushkaras, Pushkalas, Dhanyas, and Tishmas, who, as enumerated in order, are the Brāhmans, Kshatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Sūdras.” The inhabitants of this dvīpa are called in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, v. 20, 22, “... Purushas, Rishabhhas, Draviṇas, and Devakas” (Purusharṣabha-draviṇa-devaka-saṇjānaḥ).

This dvīpa is encompassed by the sea of curds, which is of the same circumference as itself. The sea again, on its exterior edge, is surrounded by Sāka dvīpa,10 a continent twice the size of Krauncha dvīpa.

Of Sāka dvīpa it is said in the Vishnupurāṇa, ii. 4, 23 ff.:

Tattra punyāḥ janapadāḥ chātuvravya-samanvitāḥ, nadyāḥ chaṭṭra mahāpunyāḥ sarva-pāpa-bhayapāh | ... tāḥ pibanti mudā yuktāḥ Jaladādiśu ye sthitāḥ | varsheshu te janapadāḥ svargād abhyetya me-

10 In the M. Bh. (Bṛhadmap. v. 408 ff.) Sūkadvīpa comes next after Jambudvīpa.
There there are holy countries, peopled by persons belonging to the four castes; and holy rivers which remove all sin and fear. . . . The people who dwell in these divisions, Jalada, etc. [of Sāka dvīpa], drink these rivers with pleasure, even when they have come to earth from Svarga. There is among them no defect of virtue; nor any mutual rivalry; nor any transgression of rectitude in those seven countries. [There dwell] Magas, Māgadhās, Mānasas, and Mandagas, of whom the first are principally Brāhmans; the second are Kshattriyas; the third are Vaiśyas, and the fourth are Śūdras. By them Vishnu, in the form of the Sun, is worshipped with the prescribed ceremonies, and with intent minds.

Of this dvīpa the Mahābhārata tells us, Bhārmaparvan, verse 410, that the “people there are holy, and no one dies” (tattva punyāḥ jana-padaḥ na tattva mriyate naraḥ). One of the mountains there is called Syāma (black), “whence men have got this black colour” (verse 420. Tatāḥ syāmatvam āpannāḥ janāḥ janapadesvaro). Dhṛtarāśṭra then says to his informant Sanjaya that he has great doubts as to “how living creatures have become black.” Sanjaya promises in the following lines, the sense of which is not very clear, to explain the mystery: 422. Sarvesho eva mahārāja dvīpesu Kuru-nandana | gaurāḥ kṛṣṇāḥ cha pātango yato varṇāntare dvijāḥ | syāmo yasmat pravṛttto vai tat te vakṣhyāmi Bhārata | But as he proceeds no further, we lose the benefit of his solution of this interesting physiological problem. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa, v. 20, 28, gives the four classes of men in this dvīpa the names of Ritavratas, Satyavratas, Dānavratas, and Anuvratas (advarsha-purushāḥ Ritavrata-Satyavrata-Dānavrata-Anuvrata-nāmānāḥ).

This Sāka dvīpa is surrounded by the ocean of milk as by an armlet. This ocean again is encompassed on its outer side by Pushkara dvīpa, which is twice as extensive as Sāka dvīpa.

Of Pushkara dvīpa it is said, Vishnu Purāṇa, ii. 4, 28 ff.:

Daśa-varsha-sahasrāṇi tattā jīvanti mānavaḥ | nirāmayaḥ viśokūścha
rga-dvesha-vivarjitaḥ | adhamottamaṁ na teshv āstāṁ na bādhya-bādhakaṁ dvīpa | nershyā 'sūyā bhayāṁ rosha dosho lobhādiko na cha | . . . . 
29. Satyānīte na tattrāstāṁ dvīpa Pushkara-sanjrītaḥ | . . . . 30.
Tulya-veśāṁ tu manuṣyaṁ devais tattvaika-rūpinaḥ | 31. Vṛṇābrahmācāra-
hinam dharmācaraṇa-variṣṭaṁ | trayā - vārtta - dandaṇī - suśrūṣhā-
rahitaṁ cha yaṁ | 32. Vṛṇā-advayāṁ tu maṁtreyāḥ bhauma-svarga 'yam uttamaḥ | sarvasya sukha-dāh kālo jarā-rogūdī-variṣṭaṁ |

"In this dvīpa men live ten thousand years, free from sickness and sorrow, from affection and hatred. There is no distinction among them of highest and lowest, of killer and slain; there is no envy, nor ill-will, nor fear, nor anger, nor defect, nor covetousness, nor other fault; there is there neither truth nor falsehood. Men there are all of the same appearance, of one form with the gods. The two divisions of this dvīpa have no rules of caste or orders, nor any observances of duty; the three Vedas, the Purāṇas (or, trade), the rules of criminal law and service do not exist. This [dvīpa] is a most excellent terrestrial heaven; where time brings happiness to all, and is exempt from decay, sickness, and all other evils." 11

Of all the dvīpas together, the Mahābhārata says, Bhīshmaparvan, verses 468 ff.: 

Evāṁ dvīpeshu sarvāṁ āsraṁ Kuru-nandana | brahmācāraṇa-
satyena prajāṁ hi ādāmaṁ cha | ārogyāyuḥprayāmāṇābyāṁ dviguṇaṁ
dviguṇaṁ tataḥ | eko janapado vajanti dvīpeshu eteshu Bhūrata | uktāḥ

11 In the same way as Pushkara, the remotest dvīpa, is here described to be the scene of the greatest perfection, we find Homer placing the Elysian plains on the furthest verge of the earth:

αλλά σε Ἡλώσιον πέδιον καὶ πείρατα γαίης
διἀναι τοὺς πέμψωσιν, ἃν ξανάθω Παθόμενως,
τὰπερ βρέστημεν τὴν πέλει ἀνθρώπωσιν.
οὐ νεφελοῖ, οὔτε ἄρ χειμῶν πολὺς οὔτε ποτ' ὀμβρος,
ἄλλα αἰεὶ Ζεφύροι λεύκη πνεύονται ἄγνωστα

"Thee, favoured man, to earth's remotest end,
The Elysian plain, the immortal gods shall send,—
That realm which fair-haired Rhadamantys sways,
Where, free from toil, men pass their tranquil days.
No tempests vex that land, no rain, nor snow;
But ceaseless Zephyrs from the ocean blow,
Which sweetly breathe and gently stir the air,
And to the dwellers grateful coolness bear."
Thus in all these dvīpas each country doubly exceeds the former one in the abstinence, veracity, and self-restraint, in the health and the length of life of its inhabitants. In these dvīpas the people is one, and one sort of action is perceivable. Prajāpati, the lord, wielding his sceptre, himself governs these dvīpas. He, the king, the auspicious one (śiva), the father, along with the patriarchs, protects all creatures, ignorant as well as learned." (So there are differences of intellectual condition in these dvīpas after all!) “All these people eat prepared food, which comes to them of itself.”

Pushkara is surrounded by a sea of fresh water equal to itself in compass. What is beyond is afterwards described:

V.P. ii. 4, 37. Svādūdakasya parato drīṣyate loka-saṁsthitiḥ | dvīgūna kānchani bhūmiḥ sarva-jantu-vivarjitaḥ | 38. Lokālokas tataḥ saílo yojana-vistritaḥ | uchchhrāyapī tāvantā sahasrāny achalo hi saḥ | tatas tamaḥ samāvṛitya taṁ śaivaṁ sarvataḥ sthitam | tamaṁ chaṅga-kaṭāhenā samantā parisveshṭitam |

"On the other side of the sea is beheld a golden land of twice its extent, but without inhabitants. Beyond that is the Lokāloka mountain, which is ten thousand yojanas in breadth, and as many thousands in height. It is on all sides invested with darkness. This darkness is encompassed by the shell of the mundane egg.”

In a following chapter, however, (the seventh) of this same book, the

---

12 See Manu, i. verses 9 and 12, quoted above, p. 35. The thirteenth verse is as follows: Tūḥhyāṁ sa śakalabhyaṁ cha divam bhūmiṁ cha nirmane | madhye vyoma dīsai chāśṭīv apūṁ sthānam cha dūvatam | “From these two halves of the shell he fashioned the heaven and the earth, and in the middle (he formed) the sky, and the eight quarters, and the eternal abode of the waters.” In regard to the darkness (tama) with which the mountain Lokāloka is said to be enveloped, compare Manu iv. 242, where the spirits of the departed are said to pass by their righteousness through the darkness which is hard to be traversed (dharmena hi salāyena tamaṁ tarati āstaram); and Atharva-veda, ix. 5, 1, “Crossing the darkness, in many directions immense, let the unborn ascend to the third heaven” (tiretvā tamaṁśi bhudāṣa mahānti ojo nīkam ā kramatiṁ tītiyam). See Journal Royal Asiatic Society for 1865, pp. 298, note 2, and p. 304.
shell of the mundane egg is said to be outside of the seven spheres of which this system is composed:

V.P. ii. 7, 19. *Esa sapta mayā lokāḥ Maitreya kathitās tava | pātālāni cha saptaiva brahmāndasyaisha vistaraḥ | etad anā-kaṭāhena tiryak chordeśvam adhas tathā | kapitthasya yathā vijaṁ sarvato vai samāvritam |

“These seven spheres have been described by me; and there are also seven Pātālas: this is the extent of Brahmā’s egg. The whole is surrounded by the shell of the egg at the sides, above, and below, just as the seed of the wood-apple (is covered by the rind).”

This system, however, it appears, is but a very small part of the whole of the universe:

Ibid. verse 24. *Anḍānāṁ tu sahasrānāṁ sahasrāny ayutāni cha | idrīśānāṁ tathā tattva koṭi-koṭi-śatāni cha |

“There are thousands and ten thousands of thousands of such mundane eggs; nay hundreds of millions of millions.”

Indian mythology, when striving after sublimity, and seeking to excite astonishment, often displays an extravagant and puerile facility in the fabrication of large numbers. But, in the sentence last quoted, its conjectures are substantially in unison with the discoveries of modern astronomy; or rather, they are inadequate representations of the simple truth, as no figures can express the contents of infinite space.
APPENDIX.

Page 6, line 24.

Professor Wilson’s analyses of the Agni, Brahma-vaivartta, Vishnu and Vāyu Purāṇas, were originally published, not in the “Gleanings in Science,” but in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, vol. i.; and are reprinted in the 3rd vol. of Wilson’s Collected Works, edited by Dr. R. Rost.

Page 37, line 1.

“Abodes of gods.” Böhtlingk and Roth in their Sanskrit Lexicon, s.v. nikāya, shew that in other passages, if not here also, the compound word deva-nikāya should be rendered “classes, or assemblages, of gods.”

Page 50, line 25.

Compare the passage, quoted below, in the note on p. 115, from the Sāntiparvan of the M. Bh., verses 6130 ff.

Pages 90 ff.

The representations of the Kṛita yuga are not always consistent. In the Dronaparvan, verses 2023 ff. a story is told of King Akampana, who lived in that age, and who was yet so far from enjoying the tranquillity generally predicated of that happy time that he was overcome by his enemies in a battle, in which he lost his son, and suffered in consequence severe affliction.

Page 97, note 190.

It is similarly said in the Dronaparvan, verse 2395: Kṣhatrād nās tṛayate sarvān ity evam kṣattrīya bhavat | “He (Prithu) became a Kṣattriya by delivering us all from injuries.” See also Sāntiparvan, verse 1031.
APPENDIX.

Page 115, line 13.

The Sāntiparvan of the M.Bh., verses 6130 ff., gives a similar description of the original state of all things, and of the birth of Brahmática. Bhishma is the speaker: 

Sāliitaikārgevaṁ tāta purā sarvam abhād idam |

ushnprakampam anākāsam anirdēṣya-mahītalam |

tamase vīritam asparṣam api gambhira-dārsanam |

nīkṣabdam vā āprameyaṁ cha tattra jajne Pitāmaḥ | so 'sṛjat vātām agniṁ cha bhāskaram cāpi vīryavaṁ |

ākāsam aśṛjach chodbhem adho bhūmiṁ cha nairṛtima |

nabhaḥ sa-chandraśārān cha nakshattraṁ grāham śaḥ |

saṁvatsarān rītin māsān paśāna athā lavān kṣaṇan |

tataḥ sarirāṁ loka-stham etapayitvā Pitāmaḥ |

janayāmāsa bhagavān puttrān uttama-tejasāḥ | 6135. Marīchim rishiṁ Attriṁ cha Pulastyam Pulahāṁ Kratum |

Vāsiṣṭhāṅgirasau chobhau Rudraṁ cha prabhum īsvaram |

Prachetasas tathā Daksśaḥ kanyāḥ shashūṁ aśījanat |

tāḥ vai brahmaśravyah sarvāḥ praśāraṁ prati-

pedoś | tābhya vīśvāṁ bhūtani devāḥ piṭri-gaṁaḥ tatha |

dsarva-loka-pitamahāḥ |

śāsvataṁ veda-paṭhitam dharmam pratyuyujre
tataḥ |

tasmin dharme sthitāḥ devāḥ sahāchāryya-purohitāḥ |

ādityāḥ vassavo rudrāḥ sa-sādhyaṁ marud-aśvinaḥ |

"This entire universe was formerly one expanse of water, motionless, without aether, without any distinguishable earth, enveloped in darkness, imperceptible to touch, with an appearance of (vast) depth, silent, and measureless. There Pitāmaḥ (Brahmā) was born. That mighty god created wind, fire, and the sun, the aether1 above, and under it the earth belonging to Nirṛiti, the sky, with the moon, stars, constellations, and planets, the years, seasons, months, half-months, and the minute sub-divisions of time. Having established the frame of the universe, the divīr a Pitāmaḥ begot sons of eminent splendour, (6135) Marīchhi, the rishi Attri, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu, Vāsiṣṭha, Angiraś, and the mighty lord Rudra. Daksha, the son of Prachetas, also begot sixty daughters, all of whom were taken by the Brahmaśri2 for the purpose of propagating offspring. From these females, all beings, gods, piṭris, gandharvas, apsarasas, and various kinds of rākshases, . . . . (6149) this

1 And yet it is elsewhere said (Aanuśasanap. 2161, quoted above in p. 130) that the aether (aṅgūsa) cannot be created.

2 Here this word must mean "rishi, sons of Brahmática."
entire world, moving and stationary, was produced. 6150. Having formed this creation of living beings, the parent of all worlds established the eternal rule of duty as read in the Veda. To this rule of duty the gods, with their teachers and domestic priests, the Ādityas, Vasus, Rudras, Śādhyas, Maruts, and Aśvins conformed.”

Another account of the creation is given in the same book of the M. Bh., verses 7518 ff., where it is ascribed to Viśṇu in the form of Govinda, or Keśava (Krishṇa), who is identified with the supreme and universal Purusha. Resting on the waters (7527) he created by his thought Sankarshaṇa, the first-born of all beings. Then (7529) a lotus sprang from his (either Sankarshaṇa’s or Viśṇu’s) navel, from which again (7530) Brahmā was produced. Brahmā afterwards created his seven mind-born sons, Marīchī, Attri, Angiras, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu, and Dakṣa (7534).

Compare Bhīṣmaparvan, verses 3017 ff.

Page 122, note 223.

Compare the passage quoted in the last note from the Sāntiparvan, verse 6135.

Page 128, līn 20.

The Sāntiparvan, verses 7548 ff. ascribes the creation of the four castes to Krishṇa: Tataḥ Krishṇo mahābhāgāḥ punar eka Yudhisṭhirera | brāhmaṇānāṁ satāṁ śreṣṭham mukhād evāsrijat prabhuḥ | bāhubhyāṁ kṣattra-śataṁ vaisyānāṁ ūrūtaḥ satāṁ | pāddhyāṁ śūdra-śataṁ chaiva Keśavo Bharatarshabha | “Then again the great Krishṇa created a hundred Brāhmans, the most excellent (class), from his mouth, a hundred Kṣattriyas from his arms, a hundred Vaiśyas from his thighs, and a hundred Śūdras from his feet.”

Compare Bhīṣmaparvan, verse 3029.

Page 128, note 238.

In another place also, verses 6208 f., the Anuśāsanaparvan ranks purohitas with Śūdras: Śūdra-karma tu yaḥ kuryād avahāya eva-karma cha | sa vijneyo yathā śūdro na cha bhojiyāḥ kathanchana | chikitsakaḥ kāṇḍaprīṣṭhas purādhyaścāḥ purohitas | sāṁvatsaro vṛthādhyāyī sarve te śūdra-sammitāḥ | “He, who, abandoning his own work, does the work of a Śūdra, is to be regarded as a Śūdra, and not to be invited to a feast. A physician, a kāṇḍaprīṣṭha (see above, p. 442), a
city governor, a purohita, an astrologer, one who studies to no purpose:—all these are on a level with Sudras."

*Pages 144 ff.*

See above, note on pp. 90 ff.

*Page 150, line 4.*

Compare Dronaparvan, verse 2397.

*Page 220, line 14.*

I am indebted to Professor Max Müller for pointing out to me two passages in Indian commentators in which Manu is spoken of as a Kshattriya. The first is from Madhusūdana Sarasvatī’s Commentary on the Bhagavad-gītā, iv. 1. The words of the text are these: Sṛi-Bhagavān uvācha | imāṁ Vivasvate yogam proktavān āham avyayam | Vivasvān Manavā prāha Manur Iksvākave ‘bravīt | evam paramparā-prāptam imāṁ rājarshayo vidūḥ | sa kāleneha mahatā yogo nāśṭaḥ parantapa | sa evāya mayā te ’dya yogyo praktaḥ purātanaḥ | bhakto ’si me sakhlā cheti rahasyam etad uttamam | “The divine Being (Krishṇa) said: I declared to Vivasvat (the Sun) this imperishable Yoga-doctrine. Vivasvat told it to (his son) Manu; and Manu to (his son) Iksvāku. Thus do royal rishis know it as handed down by tradition. Through lapse of time however it was lost. I have to day therefore revealed to thee (anew) this ancient system, this most excellent mystery; for thou art devoted to me and my friend.”

On this Madhusūdana remarks: “Vivasvate” sarva-kṣattriya-vamśa-vijya-bhūtāya Ādityāya proktavān | “I declared it to Vivasvat’ i.e. to Āditya (the Sun) who was the source of the whole Kṣattriya race.”

The second passage is from Someśvara’s tīkā on Kumārila Bhaṭṭa’s Mīmāṃsa-vārttika. I must, however, first adduce a portion of the text of the latter work which forms the subject of Someśvara’s annotation. For a copy of this passage, which is otherwise of interest, I am indebted to Professor Goldstücker, who has been kind enough to copy it for me.2 The first extract refers to Jaimini’s Sūtra, i. 3, 5; where the question under discussion is, in what circumstances authority can be assigned to

---

2 See Professor Müller’s Anc. Sansk. Lit. pp. 79 ff. where this passage is partly extracted and translated. See also the same author’s Chips from a German Workshop, vol. ii. pp. 338 ff.
the Smṛiti when the Sruti, or Veda, is silent. After some other remarks Kumārila proceeds: S’ākyādi-vācanāni tu katipaya-dama-dānādi vachana-vārijām sarvāny eva samasta-chaturdāsa-vidyā-thāṇa-viruddhāni trayā-mārga-vyutthita-viuddhācharanānāi cha Buddhādidiḥ práti-tāni trayā-bāhyebhyām chaturtha-varna-niravasita-prāyebhyo vyāmudhebhyāḥ samārthtānāḥ iti na veda-mulatvāna sambhāvyante | svadharmātikramena cha yena kṣatitriyena satā pravakṣritva-pratigrahau pratipannau sa dharmam aviplutam upadekhyati iti kāḥ samāśvāsaḥ | uktaṁ cha "para-loka-viruddhāni kurvānam dūrata tyājat | ātmānāṃ yo visamāḥātto so 'nyasmai syat kathāṁ hitaḥ" iti | Buddhādeśaḥ punar ayam evātikramo'lan-kāra-buddhau sthito yena evam āha "kali-kalucha-kritāni yāni loke mayi nipatantu | vimuchyatām tu lokaḥ" iti | sa kila loka-hitārtha-kṣatitriyā-dharmam atikramya brāhmaṇa-vṛttim pravakṣritvam pratipadyo pratishedhātikramasamarthair brāhmaṇair anuṇuṣṭhām dharmam bāhyājanān anuśāsaṅ dharma-pidām api ātmano 'nukṛtya paraṇugrahāṅ kritavān ity evāmvidhārṇa eva ganaṅk stūyate | tad-anuṇuṣṭhānasārināṃ cha sarve eva śṛuti-smṛiti-vihiṇa-dharmātikramena vyavaharante viuddhācharāravena jñayante | tena pratyakṣayā śrutiḥ virodhe grantha-kāriṇām grahitrācharitrīrāṅ grantha-prāmāṇya-bādhanaṁ | na ṣvāḥ eṣhāṁ par-voktena nyāyena śruti-pratibaddhānāṁ svā-mūla-śrutya-anumāna-sāmarthyaṁ asti | "But the precepts of Śākya and others, with the exception of a few enjoining dispassion, liberality, etc., are all contrary to the fourteen classes of scientific treatises, and composed by Buddha and others whose practice was opposed to the law of the three Vedas, as well as calculated for men belonging mostly to the fourth caste who are excluded from the Vedas, debarred from pure observances, and deluded:—consequently they cannot be presumed to be founded on the Veda. And what confidence can we have that one (i.e. Buddha) who being a Kṣatritriya, transgressed the obligations of his own order, and assumed the function of teaching and the right to receive presents, would inculcate a pure system of duty? For it has been said: ‘Let everyone avoid a man who practises acts destructive to future happiness. How can he who ruins himself be of any benefit to others?’ And yet this very transgression of Buddha and his followers is conceived as being a feather in his cap; since he spoke thus, ‘Let all the evils resulting from the sin of the Kali age fall upon me; and let the world be redeemed.’ Thus, abandoning the

2 Compare Colebrooke’s Misc. Essays, i. 312.
duties of a Kshatriya, which are beneficial to the world, assuming the function of a teacher which belongs only to the Brāhmans, and instructing men who were out of the pale in duty which was not taught by the Brāhmans who could not transgress the prohibition (to give such instruction), he sought to do a kindness to others, while consenting to violate his own obligations; and for such merits as these he is praised! And all who follow his instructions, acting in contravention of the prescriptions of the Śruti and Smṛiti, are notorious for their erroneous practices. Hence from the opposition in which the authors of these books, as well as those who receive and act according to them, stand to manifest injunctions of the Veda, the authority of these works is destroyed. For since they are by the above reasoning opposed by the Veda, the inference that they rest upon independent Vedic authority of their own possesses no force."

The next passage is from Kumārila’s Vārttika on Jaimini’s Sūtra, i. 3, 7: Vedenaivābhyanujatā yeshāṃ eva pravaktātā | nityānām abhidheyānām manvantara-yugadishu | teshāṁ viparivartteshu kurodām dharma-saṁhitāḥ | vacananī pramāṇānī nāyeshām iti niśchayāḥ | tathā cha Manor richeh śāmīdhēno bhavanti ity asya vidhār vākyāḥ śrūyate “Manur vai yat kincid avadat tad bheshajam bheshajatāyai”\(^5\) iti prāyashchittādy-upadesa-vacananam pāpa-vyādher bheshajam | “It is certain that the precepts of those persons only whose right to expound the eternal meanings of scripture in the different manvantaras and yugas has been recognized by the Veda, are to be regarded as authoritative, when in the revolutions (of those great mundane periods) they compose codes of law. Accordingly by way of complement to the Vedic passage containing the precept (vīdiḥ) beginning ‘there are these śāmīdhēni verses of Manu’ it is declared, ‘whatever Manu said is a healing remedy;’ i.e. his prescriptions in regard to expiatory rites, etc., are remedies for the malady of sin.”

\(^4\) The Nyāya-mālā-vistara, i. 3, 4, quotes Kumārila as raising the question whether the practice of innocence, which Sākyamuni (Buddha) inculcated, was, or was not, a duty from its conformity to the Veda, and as solving it in the negative, since cow’s milk put into a dogskin cannot be pure (Sākyoktiḥāṁśānāṁ dharma na vā dharmaḥ śruta evaḥ | na dharma na hi pūtaṁ eva go-kṣhārāṁ śriva-dṛṣṭau dṛṣṭam).

\(^5\) These words are quoted by Böhltingk and Roth, s.v. bheshajatā, as taken from the Panchavīṣā Brāhmaṇa, 23, 16, 7. A similar passage occurs in the Taitt. Śanbh. ii. 2, 10, 2.
From Someśvara’s elaborate comment on the former of these two passages I need only extract the following sentences: एतद अभियुक्तावचनेन द्राघचयती “उक्तानं च” | मानसूं तु कश्त्रियास्यापी प्रवाक्रितवम् “यद्वैं किन्चिद मनुव आवदत तद् भेष्चहाम्” इति वेदानुजनाते तैद अविरूध्दम् इति असयाः | “This he confirms by the words of a learned man which he introduces by the phrase ‘for it has been said.’ But although Manu was a Kshattriya, his assumption of the office of teacher was not opposed to the Veda, because it is sanctioned by the Vedic text ‘whatever Manu said was a remedy’: Such is the purport.”

Page 254, line 12.

Yas tityāja sachi-vidam; etc. This verse is quoted in the Taîttrīya Āraṇyaka (pp. 159 f. of Cal. edit.), which, however, reads sakhi-vidam instead of sachi-vidam. An explanation of the passage is there given by the Commentator.

Page 264, line 14.

Professor Weber considers (Indische Studien, i. 52) that “the yau- dhāḥ and the arhantah were the forerunners of the Rājanyas and the Brāhmans.” See the whole passage below in the note on p. 366.

Page 268, note 51.

Compare Āśvalāyana’s Srauta-Sūtras, i. 3, 3 and 4, and commentary (p. 22 of Cal. edit.). Prithī Vainya is, as I find from Böhtlingk and Roth’s Lexicon, s.v., referred to also in the Atharva-veda, viii. 10, 24. The words are these: Sā udakrāmat sā manushyaṁ āgachhat | tām manushyaḥ upāhavayanta “irāvati ehi” iti | tasyāḥ Manur Vaivasvato vatsaḥ āsīt prithivī pātram | tām Prithī Vainyo ’dhok tāṁ krishiṁ cha sasyaṁ cha adhok | te krishiṁ cha sasyaṁ cha manushyaḥ upajīvanti ityādi | “She (i.e. Virāj) ascended: she came to men. Men called her to them, saying, ‘Come, Irāvati.’ Manu Vaivasvata was her calf, and the earth her vessel. Prithī Vainya milked her; he milked from her agriculture and grain. Men subsist on agriculture and grain.”

See Wilson’s Viṣṇu Purāṇa, vol. i. pp. 183 ff., where Prithu’s (this is the Puranic form of the word) reign is described. It is there stated that this king, “taking the lord Manu Svāyambhuva for his calf, milked from the earth into his own hand all kinds of grain from a desire to benefit his subjects” (V.P. i. 13, 54. Sa kalpayītvā vatsam tu
Manuṁ Svāyambhuvaṁ prabhum | sve pānau prīthivyāḥ dudhaḥ prī-
thjīvāḥ Prithuḥ | 55. Sasya-jātāni sarvāni prajānaṁ hita-kāmyaṁ). See also the passage quoted from the Bhāgavata Purāṇa by the editor Dr. Hall in pp. 189 ff. The original germ of these accounts is evidently to be found in the passage of the Atharva-veda, from which the short text I have cited is taken.

Prithu's reign is also described in the Dronāparvan, 2394 ff., and Sāntiparvan, 1030 ff.

Page 286, line 8 from the foot.

The Śpinjayas are mentioned in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, xii. 9, 3, 1 ff. and 13 (see Weber's Indische Studien, i. 207), as opposing without effect the celebration of a sacrifice which was proposed to be offered for the restoration of Dushṭaritu Paunṣāyana to his ancestral kingdom.

Page 345, line 24.

Professor Aufrecht has pointed out to me a short passage in the Taittirīya Sanhitā, iii. 1, 7, 2, in which Viśvāmitra and Jamadagni are mentioned together as contending with Vasishṭha: Viśvāmitra-Jamad-
agni Vasishṭhena aspaddhētam | sa etaj Jamadagnir vihavyam apaśyat | tena vai sa Vasishṭhasya indriyam vīryam avrīnta | yad vihavyam śasyate indriyam eva tad vīryam yajamāno bhṛitrīvyasya vṛinkte | yasya bhūyāmo yajna-kratavaḥ ity āhubḥ sa devataḥ vṛinkte | “Viśvāmitra and Jamadagni were contending with Vasishṭha. Jamadagni beheld this vihavya text, and with it he destroyed the vigour and energy of Vasishṭha. When the vihavya is recited, then the sacrificer destroys the vigour and energy of his enemy. He whose oblations and all attendant ceremonies are superior destroys the gods (of his opponent).”

Page 366, note 164.

In a notice of Lāṭyāyanas Śūtras, in Indische Studien, i. 50, Professor Weber observes: “At the same time I remark here that the presence of Śūdra at the ceremonies, although on the outside of the sacrificial ground, was permitted—a point which results from the fact that during the dīkṣā they were not to be addressed (iii. 3). Here and there a Śūdra appears as acting, although in a degraded position. Compare iv. 3, 5: āryo (i.e. vaishyaḥ, according to the commentator Agnisvāmin) anantarvedi . . . bahirvedi śudraḥ | āryabhāve yah kaś
CHA ĀRYYO VARṆAḥ (brāhmaṇo vā kṣaṭtriyo vā, Agnisvāmin). Thus their position, like that of the Nishādas, was not so wretched as it became afterwards. Toleration was still necessary; indeed the strict Brahmanical principle was not yet generally recognized among the nearest Arian races. This is shown by the following fact. Before entering on the Vṛātya-stomas, Lāṭyāyana treats, viii. 5, of an imprecatory rite called Syena (the falcon), which is not taught in the Panchavīṇā, but in the Shaṅgīṃśa (iv. 2). The tribes mentioned by Pāṇini, v. 3, 112 ff., are there described: Vṛāṭinānāṁ yaudhānāṁ putrān anuḥcānānānī ritejo vriṅciṣa syenasya | “Arhatāṁ eva” iti Sāṃdīlyāḥ ("Let the learned sons of warriors, who live by the profession of Vṛātas, be chosen as priests for the Syena. ‘The sons of arhats only’ [should be chosen] says Sāṃdīlya"). "Whilst," proceeds Prof. W., "in the beginning of the Sūtra nine things are required for a ritejo (priest), viz. that he should be (1) ārṣheyaḥ (ā dasamāt purushād avyavahhinnam ārsham yasya, ‘able to trace his unbroken descent for ten generations in the family of a rishi’); (2) anuḥcānāḥ (śishyebhyo vidyā-sampradānāṁ yah kṛitāvān, ‘one who has imparted knowledge to pupils’); (3) sādhu- charaṇāḥ (shaṭsu brāhmaṇa-karmasv avastituḥ graṣasta-karmā, ‘one who has practised the six duties of a Brāhma, a man of approved conduct’); (4) vāgmī (eloquent); (5) anyūnāgāḥ (without deficiency in his members); (6) anatiriktāṅgāḥ (without superfluous members); (7) dvesatāḥ (equal in length above and below the navel); (8) anati- kriṣṇāḥ; (9) anatiśvetaḥ (na atibālo na ativeṛddhāḥ, ‘neither too young nor too old’).—Lāṭyāyana here contents himself with putting forward one only of these requirements, the second (i.e. that the priest should be ‘learned’), as essential. The title Arhat for teacher, which was at a later period used exclusively by the Buddhists, is found in the Satapācha Brāhmaṇa, (iii. 4, 3, 6) and the Taittirīya Araṇyaka, and

6 Nānā-jātiyāḥ aniyata-vrittayaḥ utṣedha-jīvinaḥ sanghāḥ vrāṭāḥ | (Patanjali, quoted by Weber) “Vrātas are the various classes of people who have no fixed profession, and live by violence.” Vṛāṭena āsārīyāṣena jivati vrāṭinaḥ (Comm. on Pāṇini, v. 2, 21) “He who lives by bodily labour is a vrāṭina.” The word means “he who lives by the labour usual among Vrātas,” according to another comment cited by Weber.

7 Arhatāṁ eva varṇaṁ karttavyam iti Sāṃdīlyāḥ | “Arhats only are to be chosen, says Sāṃdīlya” (Agnisvāmin, quoted by Weber).

8 It also occurs in Ait. Br. i. 15 (see Bühlingk and Iloth, s.v.). To his translation of this passage Dr. Haug appends the following note: “The term is arhat, a word
is known in the Gaṇa Brāhmaṇa (Pāṇini, v. 1, 124). The Yaudhāḥ and Arhantaḥ are the forerunners of the Rājanyas and the Brāhmans.’ According to Professor Weber, Ind. St. i. 207, note, a Sthapati “means, according to Kātyāyana’s Srauta Sūtras, xxii. 11, 11, a Vaiśya, or any other person (according to Kātyāyana, i. 1, 12, he may even be a Nishāda) who has celebrated the Gosava sacrifice, after being chosen by his subjects to be their ruler.”

Page 378, lines 1–3.

Compare Dronaparvan, verse 2149: nanv esāṃ niśchitā niśṭhā niśṭhā saptapadi smṛitā |

Page 400, line 9 from bottom.

If further proof of this sense of brahmārshi be wanted, it may be found in the words viprārshi and dvijārshi, which must be regarded as its synonyms, and which can only mean “Brāhmaṇ-rishi.”

Page 423, line 12, and foot-note.

The same verse with some variations is repeated in the Anuśāsanaparvan, verse 6262: Rājā Mitrasahaḥ chaiva Vaśishṭhāya mahātmane | Madayantim priyām bhāryām datvā cha tridivaṃ gataḥ | “And king Mitrasaha, having bestowed his dear wife Madayanti on the great Vaśishṭha, went to heaven.” Here, it will be observed, the name Madayanti is correctly given.

Page 423, line 17.

This stanza is repeated in Anuśāsanaparvan, verse 6250, with the following variation in the second line: arghyam pradāya vidhivaḥ lobha lokaḥ anuttamān |

Page 436, line 5 from the foot.

I find that two other instances of Brāhmans receiving instruction from Rājanyas are alluded to by Professor Weber, Ind. Stud. x. 117.

well known, chiefly to the students of Buddhism. Śāyaṇa explains it by “a great Brāhman, or a Brāhman (in general).” In reference to another part of the sentence in which this word occurs, Dr. Haug adds: “That cows were killed at the time of receiving a most distinguished guest is stated in the Smṛitis. But as Śāyaṇa observes (which entirely agrees with opinions held now-a-days), this custom belongs to former yugas (periods of the world). Thence the word goghna, i.e., ‘cowkiller,’ means in the more ancient Sanskrit books ‘a guest’ (see the commentators on Pāṇini, 3, 4, 78) for the reception of a high guest was the death of the cow of the house.”
The first is recorded in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, x. 6, 1, 2 ff.; where it is stated that six Brāhmans, who were at issue with one another regarding Vaiśvānara (Agni), and were aware that king Aśvapati the Kaikeya was well informed on the subject, repaired to him for instruction and requested that he would treat them as his pupils. He first asked them 'if they were not themselves learned in the Veda as well as the sons of learned men, and how they could in that case come to consult him' ("Yan nu bhagavanto'nūchānaḥ anūchāna-putrāḥ | kim idam" iti). They, however, persisted in their request, when he asked them severally what they considered Vaiśvānara to be, expressed his concurrence in their replies, though all different, as partial solutions of the question, and ended by giving them some further insight into the subject of their enquiry. The second instance is taken from the Chhāndogya Upanishad, i. 8, 1, which commences thus: 

Tayo ha udgīthe kusalāḥ babhūvaḥ Sīlakaḥ Sālavatyaś Chaikitāyana Dālbhyaḥ Pravāhaṇa Jaivalir iti | te ha āchur "udgīthe kathāṁ vadāma" iti | 2. "Tathā" iti ha samupaviviśuḥ | sa ha Pravāhaṇa Jaivalir uvācha "bhagavantāv agre vadatām | brāhmaṇayor vadator vāchaḥ śrōthyāmś" iti | "Three men were skilled in the Udgītha, Sīlaka Sālavatya, Chaikitāyana Dālbhya, and Pravāhaṇa Jaivali. They said, 'We are skilled in the Udgītha; come let us discuss it.' (Saying) 'so be it,' they sat down. Pravāhaṇa Jaivali said, 'Let your reverences speak first; I will listen to the discourse of Brāhmans discussing the question.'" 

Sīlaka Sālavatya then asked Chaikitāyana Dālbhya a series of questions; but was dissatisfied with his final reply. Being interrogated in his turn by Chaikitāyana, Sīlaka answered; but his answer was disapproved by Pravāhaṇa Jaivali, who finally proceeded to supply the proper solution.

In two other passages the same Upanishad, as quoted above in p. 195, and explained by the commentator, recognizes the fact of sacred science being possessed, and handed down, by Kshattriyas. See also the note on p. 220, above, p. 508. The doctrines held by Rājanyas are not, however, always treated with such respect. In the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, viii. 1, 4, 10, an opinion in regard to breath (prāṇa) is attributed to Svarijit Nāgajīta, or Nāgajīt the Gāndhāra, of which the writer contemptuously remarks that 'he said this like a Rājanya' (Yat sa tād uvācha rājanyabandhur iva to eva tād uvācha); and he then proceeds to refute it (see Weber's Indische Studien, i. 218). It appears that the Smṛiti
recognizes the possibility of a Brāhmaṇa becoming in certain circumstances the pupil of a Rājanya or a Vaiśya. Thus Manu says, ii. 241: 
Abrasmanād adhyayanam āpat-kāle vidhiyate | anuvrājyā cha suśruchā yāvād adhyayanam guruh | 242. Nābrāhmaṇe gurau śishyo vāsam ātyani-
tikāṁ vaset | brāhmaṇe chānanauchāne kāṅkṣan gatim anuttamām | 241. “In a time of calamity it is permitted to receive instruction from one who is not a Brāhmaṇ; and to wait upon and obey such a teacher during the period of study. 242. But let not a pupil, who aims at the highest future destiny, reside for an excessive period with such a teacher who is not a Brāhmaṇ, or with a Brāhmaṇ who is not learned in the Veda.” Kullāka explains this to mean that when a Brāhmaṇ instructor cannot be had a Kshattriya may be resorted to, and in the absence of a Kshattriya, a Vaiśya.

Page 457, note 241.

When I wrote this note, I did not advert to the difficulty presented by the word didāsitā, which has at once the form of a desiderative verb, and of the second person of the perfect tense. Böhtlingk and Roth, s.v. dā, on a comparison of the two parallel passages, suppose that the present reading of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa is corrupt as regards this word, which, as they quote it, is didāsitā. May not the correct reading be didāsitā from the root dās?

Page 461, line 14.

The Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, ii. 2, 4, 4 f., says of Prajāpati: So ‘surān aṣrijata | tad asya apriyam āsit | 5. Tad durvāram hirānyam abhavat | tad durvārasya hirānasya janma | . . . sa devān aṣrijata tad asya priyam āsit | tat swarnasya hirānasya janma | “He created Asuras. That was displeasing to him. 5. That became the precious metal, with the bad colour (silver). This was the origin of silver. . . . He created gods. That was pleasing to him. That became the precious metal with the good colour (gold). That was the origin of gold.”
INDEX OF PRINCIPAL NAMES AND MATTERS

A

Abhimūna, 201
Abhishrūtas, 353
Abyyuktas, 500
Achala, 400
Achāhydroka, 165
Adhipurusha, 111
Añāhana, 124
Adhvaru, 41, 155, 251, 263, 294, 459
Aditī, 18, 26, 72, 116, 122, 221
Ādityas, 19 f., 26, 52, 117, 126, 157, 270
Ardītyantī, 417
Agastya, or Agastī, 309 ff., 321, 330, 442, 461
Aghanamāṇa, 279
Aghanamarhaṇa, 353
Agni, 10, 16, 20 f., 33, 52, 71, 75, 165, 177 f., 180, 270
— one of the triad of deities, 75
Agnidhī, 251
Agnidhra, 155
Agniōhra (king), 491
Agnihotra, 21, 428
Agni Purāṇa, 210
Agnivīma, 512
Agnavēṣya, 223
Agnavēṣṭāyana, 223
Añālyā, 235, 310, 466
— the first woman, 121
Añakūra, 201
Añavaniya fire, 428
Añhi, 250, 340
Ahura Mazda, 293
Aindra-vṛṣbhaṇa oblation, 22

Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, 5 quoted—
ii. 33, — 180
— 34, — 166
iii. 31, — 177
— 34, — 443
v. 14, — 191
vii. 15, — 48
— 17, — 355
— 19, — 367 f.
— 27, — 436
viii. 14, — 492
— 21, — 326, 456
— 23, — 369, 493
— 24, 27, — 367
— 33, — 107

Ajasvāna, 301
Aja, 349
Ajamīda, 234, 267, 279, 360, 413
Ajastātra, 431
Añgarta, 355 ff., 360
Añja, 279
Añkampana, 505
Añkīśa, 115, 130, 506
Añkī, 232
Añkhamalā, 336
Añkula, 189
Añkūti, 65, 73
Añkara, 232
Añmāvati, 494
Añmāvasu, 349
Añmarīṣa, 224, 266, 279, 362, 405
Añmbaṣṭha, 481, 495
Añmbhumā, 23, 58, 79, 80
Añiša, 27
Añgha, 335
Añalā, 116
Añanta, 207
Añantā, 114
Añavadyā, 116

Andhras, 358, 483 f.
Anenaa, 226
Anga, 232, 298, 464
Anagā, 459
Angiras, 36, 65, 116, 122 f.
16, 168, 172, 184, 224 f., 226, 272, 286, 330, 341, 445, 466
Angirases, 192, 194, 224
Anīla, 294
Anū, 232, 482
Anus, 179
Anugraha-sarga, 68
Anukramanī, 228, 266, 328, 348
Anūpā, 116
Anushtubh, 16
Anuvratas, 500
Apsaṇa, 279
Apsaṭā, 2
Apsaṭa, 463
Aṣaya, 345
Aṣavatūni, 447
Apratitattha, 234
Apsarasas, 33, 37, 177, 320, 419, etc.
Aranakas, 2, 5, 32
Araha, 511, 513
Arishtanemi, 116, 125
Araṇa, 449 ff., 497
Araṇa (the Pāṇḍu), 494
Araha, 241
Arrian, quoted, 370
Aṣṭiṣṭaṇgata, 272, 279
Aṣtavas, 18
Aruṇas, 32, 449
Arundhati, 336, 398
Aurumaghas, 438
Aruṣi, 124, 476
Avaikrtones, 57, 61, 157
INDEX.

Årya, 18
Åryaman, 27, 158
Åryas, 174 ff., 396, 481
— their language, 141, 482
Åryakas, 498
Åst, 46
Asitamrigas, 438
Aushedakas, 279, 352, 357
Asmasärin, 276
Åśramas, 98
Aśurā, 116
Aśuras, 23, 24, 29, 33, 37, 58, 79, 130, 139, 177, 187, 228, 469, etc., etc.
— their priests, 189 f.
Aśuri, 430
Aśvalayana's Sūtra
Sūtras, 137, 611
Aśvamedha (proper name), 267
Aśvatara, 236
Aśvins, 166, 470, etc.
Athatvaran (the sage), 162, 169
— his cow, 395
Athatvaras, 293
Athatvā-veda, 2
quoted—
iii. 19, 1—283
— 24, 2, 179
iv. 6, 1—21
— 6, 2—490
— 14, 4—179
— 29, 3, 5—330
v. 8, 8—289
— 11, 1—395
— 17, 1—18, 280
— 18, 1—15, 284
— 19, 1, 15, 286
vi. 120, 3—335
— 123, 3, 137
vii. 104, 395
viii. 2, 21, 46
— 10, 24—217, 511
— 108, 1, 2, 254
ix. 5, 1, 503
— 5, 27—282, 385
x. 6, 2, 7, 9
xi. 10, 2, 22
xii. 1, 15, 163
— 3, 17, 385
— 6, 4—15, 287
xiii. 3, 14, 171
— 4, 29, 9
xiv. 8, 1, 22
— 9, 1, 22

Athatvā-veda continued—
xvii. 3, 15—330
— 3, 23—385
— 3, 34—179
xix. 6, 1 f., 8, 9
— 6, 6—10
— 9, 1—288
— 22, 21—288
— 23, 30—288
— 43, 8, 288
— 62, 1—282
Athishā, 116
Aśmatvā, 279
Atri, 36, 61, 116, 122 f., 171 f., 178, 225, 242, 248, 267, 303, 330, 468
Atryarit, 493
Auddumbaras, 353
Aurell, Professor, his Catalogue of Bodleian Sanskrit MSS. referred to, 203
— information or suggestions from him, 14, 19, 20, 29, 93, 137, 163 f., 210, 247 f., 254 f., 319, 325 f., 340, 346, 389, 395, 512
Aukha, 217
Aupamanavaya, 177
Aurva, 279, 445, 447, 448 f., 478
Avantyas, 438
Avyakta, 41
Avyāya, 355
Ayośyā, 116
Ayu, 170, 171 f., 174, 180
Ayu, 170
Ayu (king), 226, 308, 353

B
Babhārvas, 356
Babhras, 353
Badrī, 199
Bāhū, 486
Bahuputra, 116
Bahvaśva, 235
Bala, 279
Balā, 116
Balāhaka, 207
Balākāśva, 353
Balākhyas, 32, 305, 400
Bāleya, 232
Bali, 232
Balis, 469

Banerjea, Rev. Prof., his Dialogues on Hindu Philosophy referred to, 120
— his edition of the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa referred to, 223
Bang, 232
Barbaras, 482
Baresma, 293
Baudhās, 305
Benzey, Prof., his translation of the Śāma-veda quoted, 164
— his glossary to ditto, 490
— his translation of the Rig-veda quoted or referred to, 167, 180, 247, 331, 348
Bhagavadgītā quoted, 508
Bhadrā, 389, 467
Bhadrāśva (a division of Jambudīpā), 491
Bhaga, 27
Bhagavata Purāṇa—
i. 3, 15—213
— 3, 20—350
ii. 1, 37—156
— 5, 34—155
iii. 6, 29—156
— 12, 20—108
— 20, 25—157
— 22, 2—156
iv. 1, 40—335
v. 1, 30—489
— 16, 2—490
— 17, 11—496
— 20, 4, 6—498
— 20, 11, 499
— 20, 16, 22—500
— 20, 28—601
vi. 6, 40—158
vii. 11, 24—366
viii. 5, 41—157
— 24, 7—208
ix. 2, 16, 222
— 2, 17—223
— 2, 21—223
— 2, 23 ff.—222
— 6, 2—224
— 7—358
— 7, 6—386
— 12, 3—316
— 14, 48—158
— 15, 5—457
— 16, 17—458
— 16, 30—358
INDEX.

Bhāgavata Purāṇa continued—
ix. 17, 2,—227
  17, 10,—232
  20, 1,—234
  21, 19,—237
  21, 21,—235
  21, 33,—235
  22, 14,—275
x. 33, 27,—113
Bhūtananda, and Bhulandara a Vaisāya mantra-krīt, 279
Bhūyamāna, 266
Bhāradvāja, 141, 279, 330
Bharata, 168, 234, 242, 354, 360, 413
Bhūrata, 187, 348
Bharatas, 320, 338, 340, 354
Bhūrata, 344
Bhūratavarsha, 491, 494ff.
Bhūratī, 112
Bhārga, or Bhārga, 231
Bhūrgabhūmi, 231
Bhūrgava, 228
Bharmyāsa, 235
Bhāsta, 116
Bhāvins, 498
Bhedas, 319, 323
Bhīma, 133, 142, 308, 349
Bhūmaṇāda, 207
Bhūmasena, 273
Bhūras, 495
Bhūshma, 127
Bhirgu Vāruni, 443
Bhirugubhūmi, 231
Bhirugas, 169ff., 228, 442ff.
Bhiraktīla, 279
Bhumanyu, 360
Bhūrtakāśa, 51, 209, 211
Bhātañkita, 16
Bhūtāmpāti, 16
Bhūtāpati, 108
Bhūtas, 59
Bhūtatārtras, 438
Boar incarnation, 51ff., 54, 76
Böhtlingk and Roth’s Lexicon referred to, 47, 108, 144, 178, 180, 184, 253, 340, 348, 395, 400, 442, 505, 511
Brahma S’vovasyaya, 30
Brahmachārin, 289
Brāhma (masculine, a priest), 155, 242ff., 459
Brāhma (masculine, the god), 35, 36, 76, etc.
  — his passion for his daughter, 107
Brāhma (neuter, prayer), 241
Brahman (neuter, the universal soul), 20
Brāhmaṇa, son of a Brāhmaṇa, 252, 264
Brāhmaṇāchāraṇī, 155
Brāhmaṇā (the theological works), 2, 4ff.
Brāhmaṇapati, 16
Brāhmaṇī, 110
Brāhmaṇa, 7, and passim
  — origin of the word, 252, 259, 264
  — their intermarriage with women of other castes, 282, 481
  — their prerogatives and powers, 128, 130, etc.
Brahmāṇya, 155
Brahmaputra, 252, 259, 264
Brahmarshi, or Brāhmaṇi rishi, 400, 407, 410
Brahmiś, the nine, 65, 445
Brahmaśāva, 279
Brahmaudana, 26, 27
Brahma-yuga, 162
Bréal, M. Michel, his Hercule et Cacus, 246
Bridge’s seven steps, 378, 514
Bṛhaddevatā, 321, 326, 344
Bṛhadishu, 234
Bṛhaduduktha, 279
Bṛhaspati, 16, 22, 163, 167, 226, 270, 438
Bṛhat, 16
Bṛhat-śāman, 286
Buddha, 509
Buddhist, 513
Buddha, 221, 226, 307, 336
Bunsen, Baron, his Philosophy of Universal History referred to, 8
Burnouf, M. Eugène, his Bhāgavata Purāṇa referred to, 8, 155, 211, 489, etc.
  — his views about the Deluge, 215

C
Chākṣusha, 298
Chākṣusha Manyvantara, 207, 213
Chāṇḍa, 207
Chāṇḍāla, 402, 481
Caste, mythical accounts of its origin, 7ff.
  — Variety and inconsistency of these accounts, 34, 66, 102, 159
Castes, their future abodes, 63, 98
  — their respective colours, 140, 151, 153
  — no natural distinction between, 140
  — manner of their rise according to Prof. Roth, 289
  — time of their rise according to Dr. Haug, 292
Chāṭūrvārya, 135
Charhaṇī, 158
Chauras, 482
Chārvākas, 305
Chhandas, 4
Chhandogas, 334
Chāndogya Brāhmaṇa, 5
  — Upahanad, iii. 11, 4, 195, 514
  — vi. 1, 4—49
  — v. 3, 1—435
  — viii. 15, 1—195
Chīnīs, 482, 484
Chīrina, a rīv, 199
Cholas, 488
Chunchulus, 363
Chyavana, 124, 273, 283, 446, 470, 474
Colebrooke’s Miscellaneous Essays quoted or referred to, 8, 13ff., 25, 52, 325, 378, 386, 492, 497
Cowell’s Professor E. B., translation of Kaushitaki Brāhmaṇa Upāniśad, 10, 432
  — Preface to, quoted, 32
Creation of man, mythical accounts of, 7ff.
  — their mutual inconsistency, 34, 65, 102
  — how explained by Indian commentators, 66
Creations, similarity of successive, 60, 89
INDEX.

D
Dbadhichā, 279
Dādhyančha, 162, 169, 172
Dvītyas, 41, 138, 499
Davavāta, 348
Davodāsa, 348
Daksha, 9, 65, 72, 116, 122, 124 ff., 163, 221, 335
Dāksheyaṇi, Aditi, 126
Dama, 222
Damayantī, 389
Damayantī, see Madayantī
Damins, 500
Dānavas, 139, 144, 209, 468 ff., 499
Dānavratas, 501
Dānāyū, 123
Danḍakas, 467
Danu, 116, 123
Daradas, 459, 482
Darvas, or Dārvas, 482, 488
Dāsa, 174, 323, 396
Dasahotrī, 29
Dasarātha, 362
Dasārṇa, 222
Dasyun, 174 ff., 358, 460, 469, 482, 500
Dattātreya, 450, 473, 478
Day of Brabmā, 43, 48, 213
— gods, 43
Deities, triad of, produced from the three Gumas, 75
Deluge, legend of, 183, 199, 203, 209, 211
— was the tradition of it indigenous or not, 215
— comparison of different Indian accounts of, 216
Devedevs, 351
Dovakas, 500
Devala, 352
Devalas, 353
Devāpi, 269
Devavēja, 279
Devarāta, 279, 351 ff., 356, 413
Devarātas, 353
Devarshi, 400
Devas, 79, 499
Devasarman, 466
Devasārvas, 344, 352 f.
Devasvat, 323
Devavāta, 344
Dhānajayas, 353
Dhananjaya, 279
Dhanur-veda, 477
Dhanvātari, 226
Dhanaya, 500
Dharma, 20, 122, 124, 385, 400, 412
Dhararbhakas, 223
Dhātri, 18, 27, 124
Dīh, 241
Dhirahṣyā, 126
Dhīrābha, 221, 223
Dhīrāṣṭā, 117
Dhruva, 234, 298
Dhṛghatasamas, 226, 232, 247, 268, 279
Dhṛghatapas, 233
Dhṛghatasatra, 300
Dīṣṭa, 222
Diti, 116, 123
Dīvōdāsa, 229 ff., 235, 268, 279, 322, 348
Dogs, whether they fast from religious motives, 365
Draupadi, 381, 389
Draividā, 209
Dravides, or Drāvides, 482
Dravīṇa, 500
Dṛgīdhanatra, 400
Driptabālāki Gārgya, 432
Drishadvatī, 344
Drōna, 207
Druhyu, 232, 482
Druhyus, 179
Dūṣēma, 305
Durgā, commentator on the Nirukta, quoted, 344, 417
Durgāha, 267
Durtakṣeyaya, 237
Durvāsas, 357, 389
Dusyantā, 234, 360
Dvāparam, 39, 43 ff., 119, 146, 149 ff., 447
Dvīpas, 51, 489 ff.
Dwarf incarnation, 52, 54, 233
Dyaus (the sky), feminine, 108
— masculine, 163, 396, 434

E
Earth, the goddess, 51, 163
Earth fashioned, 51 ff., 76
— milked, 96

INDEX.

Egg, the mundane, 35, 74, 156, 503
Ekādiśina, 69
Ekāvīśa, 16
Elysiann fields, 502
Emūsha, 53

F
Families, hope of their re-
union in a future life, 385
Fathers, see Pitru
Fish incarnation, 50, 54,
111, 183, 199, 205, 209,
211
Flood, see Deluge

G
Gabhastimata, 494
Gabhibhā, 232
Gadhi, 343, 349, and passim
Galava, 232, 352, 411
Galavas, 353
Gandhamādana, 491
Gandharas, 484
Gandharva, 494
Gandharvas, 33, 37, 59,
139, 144, 177, 250, 257,
499
— their heaven, 63, 98,
307
Gangā, 130, 199, 206, 461,
490
Garga, 227, 236, 279, 305
Gārgya Bālāki, 431
Gārgyas, 236
Gārhapsatyāk, 18
Gāthin, 348, 358
Gāthinas, 356, 363
Gātra, 335
Gautama, 121, 235, 316,
434, 466
Gavishthāra, 330
Gaya, 227
Gāyatrī, 16, 110, 114, 137
Gēnasī, i. 2,— 52
Gifts to priests, 259
Gir, 241
Gods, intercourse of men
with, in early ages, 147
— whether they can
practise Vedic rites, 305
Goldstücker, Professor, aid
received from, 508
INDEX.

Harivāmśa continued—
1781,—238
1813,—273
8511,—307
11855,—154
11802,—153
11808,—152
Harivarsha, 491, 494
Harsha, 124
Hāryaśva, 279
Haug’s, Dr. Martin, Aita-
reya Brāhmaṇa quoted or
referred to, 4, 6, 48,
107, 137, 177, 180, 192,
246, 250, 256, 263, 356,
369, 438 f., 492 f., 513
— Origin of Brāhma-
ism quoted, 11, 14, 292
Haughton, Sir G. C., his
note on Manu, vii. 41,—
296
Hayagriva, 207, 212
Havishyanda, 400
Hayasiras, 449
Hema, 232
Hemakīta, 491
Himavat, or Himalaya,
130, 183, 200, 229, 311,
491
Hiraṃmaya, 491
Hiranyagarbha, 195, 220
Hiranyakṣa, 352
Hiranyakṣas, 353
Homer’s Odyssey quoted,
502
Hostility to Vedic wor-
sip, 259
Hotṛ, 165, 251, 263, 271,
294, 459
Houses, origin of, 93
Hṛṣṭikṛṣa, 206
Hūhu, 336
Hymns of the Rig-veda, 4, 
318
— whether they allude
to castes as already
existing, 161 ff.

I
Iḍā, 268, 279, 306
Iḍā, daughter of Manu,
184 ff., see Iḍā
Ikṣvāku, 116, 126, 177,
195, 221, 224, 268, 337,
355, 362, 401, 405, 508
Ikṣvākus, 401, 418
Iī, 126, 221, 306, see Iḍā
Iīvṛtya, 491
Indra, 3, 10, 18, 20, 33,
44, 165, 168, 171, 191,
438
Indra’s heaven, 63, 98
— wife, 341
— his adulteries, 121,
310, 466
Indra-evāpa, 496
Indrāni, 310, 389
Indu (Soma), 124
Instrumental cause, 51
Israel vi. 9, 10,—255
Iśāna, 20
Iśārathā, 348
Iṣhund̄hara, 499
Iśvara, 75, 221
Ithiḥsas, 3, 5, 215

Ja
Jubali, 115
Jahu, 273, 349, 353, 369
413
Jahnu, 355
Jaimini’s Sūtras, 508
Jainas, 305
Jāmadagni, 279, 330, 345,
350, 355, 413, 422, 447,
450 ff.
Jāmadagnis, 342
Jambudvīpa, 488, 490 ff.
Jambunāda, 461
Janaka, 130, 334, 426 ff.
Janalokas, 44, 51, 88, 95,
99
Janamejaya, 152, 438
Jananāta, 493
Janga, 206
Japa, 442
Jātāyu, 116
Jātīmūla, 407
Jātukarnya, 223
Jaya, 352
Jayakṛṣṭa, 351
Jayāpīḍa, 424
Journal of the Royal Asiat-
ic Society quoted, 3, 6,
and passim
Jyotanā, 69

K
Kā, 125
Kachhapa, 351 f.
INDEX.

Kadu, 123
Kakshvat, 268, 279
Kala, 62
Kala, 123
Kalakā, 116
Kalāpa, 277
Kalī, 39, 43 ff., 120, 146, 150, 495
Kalindas, 482
Kalīnga, 232
Kalīngas, 459, 495
Kalūshapāda, 414, 423
Kalpas, 43 ff.
Kāma, 112, 124
Kāmarūpa, 495
Kambojas, 482 ff., 485 ff.
Kānchana, 349
Kānchis, 391
Kāndapriyātha, 442, 507
Kandarpa, 408
Kāndarshi, 400
Kānīna, 223
Kankas, 484
Kānyakubja, 390
Kapya, 166, 170, 172, 234, 279
Kānyāyana, 234
Kapās, 472
Kapi, 237
Kapila, 227, 414
Kapila, 123
Kapilas, 499
Kāpīleyas, 356
Kāpiśthala, 344
Kardama, 116, 123, 400
Kārttikeya, 353
Kārmadevas, 46
Kārttavya, 460, 478
Kārūsha, 221 f.
Kārūsha, 126
Kārūshas, 495
Kāśa, or Kūśaka, 226 f.
Kāśerumat, 494
Kāśirōja, 226
Kāsī, 431
Kāśminras, 459
Kāsya, 227, 279
Kāsyapa, 37, 54, 115 f., 123 f., 126, 195, 230, 400, 451, 455 f., 459
Kāsyapas, 433
Kāthaka Brāhmaṇa quoted, 140, 186, 189, 332 f., 358
Kati, 352
Kātyāyanas, 362
Kātyāyana Sūtra Sutras, 19, 136, 365 ff., 369, 514
Kauśīrakṣa, 58
Kauśikakā Brāhmaṇa quoted, 328
— Upaśisahad, 10, 431
Kauśika, 342, 349
Kauśikā (epithet of Indra), 347
Kauśikas, 353, etc.
Kauśikī, 360, 411
Kavi, 243, 279, 445
Keralas, 488
Kesaraprābandhā, 285
Ketumāla, 491
Ketu, 32
Khaliṅs, 468
Khayālāśa, 235
Khāṇḍāvāyanas, 461
Khavas, 482
Khayāti, 67
Kikatas, 342
Kīlāta, 189
Kimpurusha, 491 f.
Kimpurushas, 499
Kīnśa, 97
Kinnaras, 37
Kīnuska, 229
Kīrātas, 391, 482, 484 f.
Kolisarpas, 482, 488
Koṇavirās, 482
Kovidas, 500
Krata, 36, 65, 116, 122 f., 400
Krauncheśvarī, 491, 500
Krauncheś, 117
Kripa, 279
Kṛṣṇa, 118
Kṛṣṇas, 499
Kṛṣṇī, 178
Kṛta, 39, 43 ff., 88, 90 ff., 119, 144, 148 f., 158, 492, 495, 505
Kṛtāmatā, 209, 212
Kṛtāvarīya, 449 ff., 478
Krodha, 123
Krodhavasā, 116
Khaṭṭāvṛiddha, 226
Khaṭṭātri, 481
Khaṭṭātriyas, 7, and passim
— etymology of the word, 97, 504
— how their race was restored, 452
Kahemaka, 235
Kahudrakas, 459
Kuhna, Dr. A., quoted, 179
Kulakas, 500
Kullaka quoted, 36, 47, 129, 279, 480, 483
Kumārika-Bhaṭṭa referred to or quoted, 122, 509
Kuntis, 459
Kürma avatāra, see Tor-toise incarnation
Kurus, 5, 269, 431, 495
Kurus, 498
Kusā, 227, 349, 351, 397
Kusā-dvīpa, 491, 497, 499
Kusālas, 500
Kusāṃba, 349, 351
Kusānābha, 351, 397
Kusika, 338, 340, 346, 400, 474
Kusikas, 342 f., 346, 355, etc.
Kusumāñjula (a name of Kama), 112
Kutsa, 330 f.
Kuvera, 140, 279, 400

L

Lakṣmanī, 124
Lalita-vistara, 32
Langlois, M., translator of the Harivamsa, 151
— of the Rig-veda, 273, 321
Lassen's Indian Antiquities quoted, 394, 425
Lāṭās, 482
Lāṭyāyana's Sutras, 512
Lecky, Mr., his History of Rationalism, 407
Leśa, 226
Life of Brahmā, 49
Lūngo Purāṇa quoted, 225
Lohita, 279
Lohitas, 353
Loiselour Deslongchamps, M., his note on Mānu, vii. 41,—296
Lokāloka mountain, 503
Lunar race, 220, 225

M

Mada, 471 f.
Madyantī, 419, 514
Madhuchhandas, or Madhusyanda, 279, 347, 351 f., 357, 400, 406
Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, his Commentary on the Bhagavad Gītā quoted, 508
INDEX.

Madras, 484, 495
Magadha, 495
Magadha, 501
Magas, 501
Mahābhārata, 5 fl.
quoted—
Ādi-parvan—
272, 447
869, 445
2253, 116
2459, 451
2517, 122
2559, 2574, 123
2606, 445
2610, 476
2620–2635, 117
2914–410
3128, 124
3143, 306
3151, 308
3533, 482
3727, 360
3750, 273
4719, 418
6638, 388
6695, 342
6699, 415
6802, 448
7351, 389
8455, 389
Sābhā-parvan—
489, 379
1031, 483
1045, 494
Vana-parvan—
10137, 10201-450
11234, 143
11248, 40
12460, 308
12469, 133
12619, 147
12747, 196
12826, 48
12952, 35
12962, 10
12981, 145
13090, 40
13436, 129
14160, 178
Udyoga-parvan—
375, 310
3721, 412
3970, 336
5054, 276
Bhāsha-parvan—
227, 491
346, 495
389, 145
Mahābhārata continued—
Bhārata-parvan—
410, 501
456, 500
468, 502
Droṇa-parvan—
2149, 414
2395, 505
2443, 459
4747, 483
Sālya-parvan—
2295, 392
2281, 272
2360, 419
Sānti-parvan—
774, 32
1741, 1792, 423, 452
2221, 304
2247, 97
2280, 370
2304, 366
2429, 484
2674, 49, 149
2682 ff., 49
2749, 127
2819, 140
3404, 3406, 150
3408, 49
4499, 388
4507, 209
5330, 376
6130, 506
6640, 429
6930, 138
7523, 125
7548, 507
7569, 122
7573, 125
7882, 430
8550, 60
8591, 8604, 423
10058, 151
10699, 430
10118, 423
10861, 130
11221, 334
11545, 11854, 430
12658, 215
12685, 122
13088, 145
13090, 40
Anusāsa-parvan—
183, 412
186, 352
201, 354
1867, 440
1944, 229
2103, 482
Mahābhārata continued—
Anusāsa-parvan—
2158, 482
2160, 130
2262, 466
2718, 474
2841, 494
3732, 374
3960, 460
4104, 443
4527, 128
4759, 128
4745, 314
6208, 507
6262, 514
6250, 154
6570, 132
7187, 462
Aśvamedhikā-parvan—
1038, 57
Mahābhāsya, 124
Mahābhāsa, 75, 207
— taught by Angirās
226
Mahākalpa, 213
Mahāloka, 156
Mahāshi, 400
Mahāyāna, 114
Mahāvyūha, 237
Mahēndra, 451
Mahēsyāra, 74
Mahābhārata, 490
Mashishas, or Māshishakas,
482, 488
Māmāśmat, 462, 478
Mahodaya, 402
Mahoragas, 139
Maitṛavarana, 165, 244
Maitṛavarapūjī, 186
Maitrāyana, 230
Maitreya, 56, 68
Maitreyas, 230
Mālavas, 459, 495
Malaya, 205
Māllinātha quoted, 395
Māmatā, 247
Māna (Agastya?), 521
Mānava-dharma-sūtra
(or Institutes of Manu)—
Quotations from—
I. 8 ff., 35
— 22, 25, 38
— 30, 60
— 31 ff., 35, 446
— 58 ff., 38, 446
— 66 ff., 43
— 69 ff., 47
— 79 ff., 36, 39
INDEX.

Māṇava-dharma-sūtra continued

Manu Tāmasa, 38


— Visvasvat, 217

Manu (a female), 116

Manu (=mind), 23

Manu’s Descent, 183, 217

Manush (=Manu), 165 ff.

Manvantaras, 43 ff.

Mārgaṇapaśīya, 116

Marichi, 36 f., 65, 114 ff., 122 f., 126

Mārkaṇḍeya, 48, 199, 207

Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa quoted, 75 ff., 221 ff., 379

Mārtanda, 126

Mārtikāvatās, 459

Maru, 277

Maruta, 20, 71

— their heaven, 63, 98

Marutta, 222

Matanga, 411, 440

Mātārīṣvan, 128, 170, 256

Mati, 241

Mātrikā, 158

Matsya-avatāra, see Fish-incarnation

Matsyas, 431

Matsya Purāṇa, 1, 12—203

49, 39—277

132, 98—278

3, 36 ff.—108

Matthew, Gospel of St. xiii. 14 ff.—255

Maudgalyāya, 235

Medhāthin on Manu, 47

Medhāthī, 234

Medhāyāthī, 170

Mekalas, 482

Men, Five races of, 163, 176

— their original condition, 62, 117, 145, 147

Menakā, 407, 410

Meru, 417, 491

Metempsychosis, 385

Mimāṃsā-vārttika quoted, 508

Mithilā, 279, 430

Mitra, 27, 184, 186, 221, etc.

Mitraśāha, 337, 414, 423, 514

Mītrayu, 230, 322

Mlecchas, 41 ff., 141, 482, 484

Mṛkiṃśha, 271

Mṛtyu, 20, 124, 299, 303

Mucchukunda, 140

Mudgala, 235, 279, 352

Mukhya-sarga, 67

Muller’s, Professor Max, Ancient Sanskrit Literature quoted or referred to, 2, 4, 5, 8, 13, 48, 122, 181, 192, 253, 263, 326, 355, 358, 366, 426, 508

— Art. in Journ. Germ. Or. Soc., 365

— Art. in Journ. Roy. As. Soc., 115, 177

— Art. in Oxford Essays, now reprinted in "Chips from a German Workshop," 226, 231

— Chips from a German Workshop, 429, 431, 490

— Preface to Rig-veda, 348, 417

— Results of Turanian Researches, 327

Munḍaka Upanishad, i. 2, 1, quoted, 3, 39

Muni (a female), 123

Munie, 153

Mūtabas, 358, 483

N

Nābhāga, 224, 268

Nābha, 126, 224

Nābhaṅgriśha, 126, 223

Nābhaṅnediśtha, 221

Nābhaṅgediśtha, 192 ff., 221

Nāgas, 37, 140

Nāgajit Gāndhāra, 515

Nahush, 165, 179, 307

Nahusha, 133, 226, 232, 297, 307 ff., 393, 410

Naigeya sākhā of Sama-Sanhitā, 14

Naimitātika-laya, 45, 209, 219

Naibandhana, 40°

Nairitasa, 124

Namuchi, 175

Nara, 35, 76, 353, 400

Nārada, 36, 119, 126, 400

Nārāyaṇa, 35, 50, 54, 76, 154, 400

— assumes different colours in different yugas, 115

Manu, 2, 4 ff.

Manu, progenitor of the Aryan Indians, 161 ff., 183 ff.

— his bull, 188 ff.

Manu, 119, 122, 297

— Autami, 38, 111

— Chākusha, 38, 298

— Raivata, 38

— Saṅga, 217

— Śāvars, 217

— Śvārochsha, 38, 111

— Śvāyambha, 25, 38 ff., 44, 65, 72, 106, 111, 114, 298, 489, 511
Nārāyaṇi, 353
Narishyanta, 126, 221, 223
Narmadā, 207, 478
Neshtri, 155, 251
Nēve, M., Mythe des Rībhasas referred to, 161
Nīchasūkha, 342
Nīdānā-Sūtras, 156
Nīgards, 259
Night-of-Brahmā, 43, 209
Nīla, a mountain, 491
Nīla, 235
Nīlakantha on M.Bh., 201
Nīmi, 297, 316, 337
Nīramitra, 235
Nīrūti, 124
Nīrūkta, 5
—— quoted or referred to, 3
   i. 8,—256
   — 20,—147
   ii. 10,—269
   — 24,—338
   — 25,—340
   iii. 4,—26
   — 7,—165
   — 8,—177
   — 17,—445
   iv. 19,—154
   v. 11,—253
   — 13,—321
   vi. 30,—322
   — 32,—342
   ix. 6,—253
   — 26,—417
   x. 44,—154
   xi. 19,—442
   — 23,—9
   xii. 10 f.,
   — 34,—162
   xiii. 9,—252
Nīshādas, 177, 481,153 f.
Nīshāda, birth of, 301, 303, 403, 481
Nīshāda sthāpati, 366
Nīshadhā, 491
Nītha, 241
Nīvid, 241
Nōdhas, 330
Nīnga, 231
Nyīya-māla-vistara quoted, 510

P
Pādma-kalpa, 44, 50
Pādma Purāṇa, 379
Pahlavas, 351, 391, 398, 482, 484, 486
Pajavana, 366
Pāka-yajna, 187
Pakṣhyā, 342
Pancachāḍă, 413
Pančhatasa, 16
Pančajanaḥ and other parallel terms, 176
Pančhālas or Pānchālas, 431, 434, 495
Pančhāsika, 430
Pančhavīṣa Brahmāṇa, 5
—— quoted, 417
Pančhavīṣa-stoma, 492
Pāṇḍu, 5, 127, 381
Pāṇini, 3
—— referred to, 513
Pāṇins, 353
Pannagas, 144
Para, 44
Parādas, 482, 486
Paramarshi, 400
Parameshtin, 123
Parārdha, 44
Parāśvāra, 56, 58, 130, 322, 417, 430, 447
Parāśava, 481
Pārusikas, 495
Pārsurāma, 350, 422, 442, 447 f., 474
Parāvasu, 455
Parīkṣit, 433
Parīvettrī, 275
Parīvettī, 275
Parjanya, 20, 270
Parās, 293
Pārthivās, 353
Parvūhi, 172
Parvahā, 490
Parvata, 400
Pāsadyumna, 319
Passion, 51, see Rājās
Parṣupati, 108, 444
Parās, 504
Patangas, 498
Pāţñāvata (Agni), 191
Paṇḍras, or Paṇḍramkas, 391, 482, 484
Paṇurava, 353
Paṇuruktañ, 351
Phena, 233
Pījavana, 268, 297, 322, 338
Pīṣāchas, 33, 37, 140
Pītas, 499
Pītris, 23, 37, 46, 58, 79, 88, 434
Plaksha-dvīpa, 490, 497
Plants, origin of, 59, 90, 95
Plato quoted, 147
Potri, 165, 251, 263
Prachetas, 36, 116, 125, 279
Prāchetas, 125
Prāchetasas, 72
Pradhū, 123
Pradāhāṇa, 51, 74
Pradyumna, 279
Prājāpatī, 16 f., 23 f., 29 f., 52 f., 68 f., 180, 184, 444, and passim
—— born on a lotus-leaf, 32
—— his exhaustion, 68
—— his heaven, 63, 98
Prājāpati Parameshtin, 19
Prakūsa, 58
Prākṛita-sarga, 58
Prakṛiti, 74 f.
Pralaya, 214, 217
Prāmuṇḍara, 342
Prāṇī, 221
Prāṇava, 168
Prāṣṭāri, 251, 263
Prāskanyu, 330
Prāskanyas, 334
Prasotri, 41, 155
Prasūti, 65
Pratardana, 229, 268, 455
Pratihārī, 41, 165
Pratīpa, 273
Pratīprasthātī, 136
Pratisanchhara, 44
Pratisarga, 49
Pratiśthātī, 165
Pratyūsha, 400
Pravāha Jaivali, 433, 516
Prāyaschitti, 294
Pretas, 141
Prishadasāva, 224, 279
Prishadhara, 126, 221
Prithū, 494
Prithivānas, 305
Prithī, or Prithū, 263, 279, 301, 304, 511
Prithibī, 434
Prithudaka, 272
Priyamedha, 172, 235, 268
Priyavrata, 66, 72, 196, 114, 483, 491, 497
INDEX.

Pulaha, 36, 65, 116, 122 f., 400
Pulastya, 36, 65, 116, 122 f., 400
Pulinas, 383, 482 ff.
Pundrr, 232
Pundras, 358, 483, 495
Purânas, 3, 5 f.
Purânisva, 279
Purohitas, 41, 128, 507
Purû, 232, 277, 331, 380
Pûrus, 179
Purukutsa, 266, 279, 331
Purukutsâuf, 267
Purumâtha, 267
Purâravas, 126, 128, 168, 172, 221, 226, 279, 306, 349, 497
Purusha, 9 ff., 25, 32, 34 ff., 75 f., 108, 165
Purusha-sûkta, translated and discussed, 7 ff., 34, 165 f., 169, 161
Purushas, 500
Purushottama, 51
Pûshan, 19 f., 33, 71, 270
Pushkalas, 500
Pushkara, 405
Pushkara-dvîpa, 491, 501
Pushkaras, 500
Pushkarin, 237
Pushpaka (Râma’s car), 120

Râma, 495
Râmâ, 5 f.
Râmaâyana, 5 f.
Râmausaha quoted—
i, 37, 4,—405
— 51—55,—397
— 55, 5,—329
— 70,—337
— 70, 41,—362
ii, 110, 1—115
— 110, 2,—35
— 110, 3,—54
— 110, 6,—337, 400
— 111, 1,—337
iii, 14, 5—15, 29—31,
— 116
iv, 43, 38,—493
v, 82, 18,—59
vili (or Uttara-kângâ)
30, 19 ff.,—120
74, 8 ff.,—117
Rambhâ, 226, 232
Rambhâ, 336, 408, 413
Ramyaka, 491
Ranîbhûra and Rantinûra, 234
Rantideva, 423
Rasollasa, 62
Raspi, 292
Rathachitra, 336
Rathakûra, 336
Rathaesthas, 293
Rathantara, 16
Rathavriti, 283
Rathitaras, 224
Rathi, 292
Rati, 106, 114
Raunihâyana, 72
Râvana, 21, 478
Re-marriage of Indian women in early times, 282
Renu, 346, 350, 357
Renukâ, 350
Reçumat, 352
Ribhuksas, 165
Ribhus, 255
Richika, 349, 405, 413, 450, 453, 476
Rig-veda, 2
Texts of, translated—
First Mandala—
10, 1,—246
10, 11,—347
13, 4,—167

Rig-veda continued—
First Mandala—
14, 11,—167
15, 5,—253
31, 4,—172
32, 12,—490
33, 9,—246
30, 10,—167, 170
— 19,—166, 167
44, 11,—168
45, 3,—341
47, 6,—330
58, 6,—170
63, 7,—330
65, 1,—170
68, 4,—164
76, 5,—166
80, 1,—244
— 16,—162
83, 5,—169
84, 7,—259
93, 11,—46
94, 6,—263
98, 5,—243
101, 4,—260
— 5,—246
102, 2,—322
106, 5,—167
108, 7,—246
— 8,—179
112, 16,—171
— 19,—331
114, 2,—163
117, 3,—178
— 21,—171, 174
122, 9,—260
124, 2,—46
125, 7,—260
130, 5,—173
— 8,—174
139, 9,—172
144, 4,—45
158, 6,—46, 247
163, 5,—7, 11, 15, 16,
163, 3,—12
164, 15,—362
— 34, 35,—244
— 45,—262
— 50,—11
167, 7,—173
175, 3,—174
177, 5,—183
182, 3,—260
185, 9,—331

1 A large number of texts are referred to in pp. 45, 163, 170, 171, 241, 245, 245, 239, 329, etc., but as they have not been translated they are not included in this list.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rig-veda continued—</th>
<th>Rig-veda continued—</th>
<th>Rig-veda continued—</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second Mandala—</td>
<td>Fifth Mandala—</td>
<td>Seventh Mandala—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3,—251</td>
<td>12,—248</td>
<td>87, 4,—326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— 4 ff,—270</td>
<td>37, 4,—247</td>
<td>88, 3,—6,—325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 10,—178</td>
<td>40, 5 ff,—6,—242, 469</td>
<td>91, 1,—172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 2,—170</td>
<td>— 8,—248</td>
<td>97, 1,—176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 1,—5,—348</td>
<td>45, 6,—166</td>
<td>— 3,—242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 6,—244</td>
<td>53, 2,—331</td>
<td>100, 4,—172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19, 8,—243</td>
<td>54, 7,—14,—247</td>
<td>103, 1, 7,—8,—253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20, 4,—243</td>
<td>Sixth Mandala—</td>
<td>104, 13,—258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— 6,—174</td>
<td>11,—2,—177</td>
<td>— 12,—16,—326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23, 1, 2,—242</td>
<td>14,—2,—165</td>
<td>Eighth Mandala—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— 4,—260</td>
<td>— 3,—174</td>
<td>22,—4,—46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27, 1,—72</td>
<td>10,—1,—167</td>
<td>4,—20,—262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 1,—184</td>
<td>— 9,—167</td>
<td>7,—20,—249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— 13,—163</td>
<td>18, 14,—169</td>
<td>9,—10,—268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36, 5,—253</td>
<td>— 19,—349</td>
<td>10,—2,—166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39, 1,—247</td>
<td>21,—8,—243</td>
<td>15,—5,—171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43, 2,—252</td>
<td>— 11,—175</td>
<td>16,—7,—245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Mandala—</td>
<td>44,—11,—261</td>
<td>17,—2,—249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 21,—345</td>
<td>45,—7,—244</td>
<td>18,—22,—173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 6,—165</td>
<td>46,—7,—179</td>
<td>19,—21,—167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 10,—170</td>
<td>48,—8,—165</td>
<td>23,—13,—165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18, 4,—346</td>
<td>49,—13,—172</td>
<td>27,—7,—168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23, 2,—345, 348</td>
<td>61,—6,—163</td>
<td>30,—3,—164’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26, 1,—346</td>
<td>61, 12,—176, 178</td>
<td>31,—1,—249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29, 15,—347, 362</td>
<td>70,—2,—167</td>
<td>32,—16,—249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30, 20,—347</td>
<td>75,—10,—252, 253</td>
<td>33,—19,—249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 10,—244</td>
<td>— 19,—242</td>
<td>34,—8,—168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 1,—12,—339</td>
<td>Seventh Mandala—</td>
<td>36,—7,—263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34,—9,—176, 258</td>
<td>2,—3,—165</td>
<td>37,—7,—263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42,—9,—347</td>
<td>— 5,—247</td>
<td>43,—13,—27,—168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43,—4,—344</td>
<td>7,—5,—249</td>
<td>46,—39,—249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— 5,—247</td>
<td>8,—4,—349</td>
<td>50,—9,—264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49,—1,—176</td>
<td>15,—2,—178</td>
<td>52,—1,—163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53,—16,—21,—24,—340, 354, 375</td>
<td>— 7,—176, 178</td>
<td>— 7,—250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— 9,—362</td>
<td>53,—1,—261</td>
<td>64,—6,—341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— 12,—242</td>
<td>— 7,—250</td>
<td>66,—6,—250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55,—19,—181</td>
<td>— 8,—253</td>
<td>— 8,—253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Mandala—</td>
<td>81,—30,—260</td>
<td>85,—6,—250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,—11,—173</td>
<td>— 6,—181</td>
<td>— 8,—181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,—3,—252</td>
<td>87,—5,—175</td>
<td>— 9,—250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,—9,—242</td>
<td>91,—1,—172</td>
<td>92,—2,—348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,—4,—348</td>
<td>Ninth Mandala—</td>
<td>66,—22,—23,—177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— 6,—7,—260</td>
<td>66,—20,—178</td>
<td>86,—28,—181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,—7,—175</td>
<td>92,—5,—175</td>
<td>96,—6,—250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37,—1,—165</td>
<td>— 11,—172</td>
<td>— 11,—166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42,—8,—9,—266</td>
<td>112,—1, 3,—250</td>
<td>112,—1, 3,—250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44,—6,—268</td>
<td>113,—6,—251</td>
<td>113,—6,—251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,—7,—9,—247</td>
<td>112,—1, 3,—250</td>
<td>112,—1, 3,—250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58,—2,—248</td>
<td>113,—6,—251</td>
<td>113,—6,—251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX.

Rig-veda continued—

Tenth Mandala—

14, 1, 0—217
16, 6, 0, 253
17, 1, 2, 0—217
21, 0, 6—169
26, 0, 6—167
25, 0, 11—251
33, 0, 4, 0—251
46, 0, 4—176
46, 4, 9—170
46, 7, 0—175
62, 2, 0—256
56, 4, 0—177
64, 3, 0—181
60, 4, 0—177
61, 7, 0—242
62, 4, 0—341
77, 7—183
65, 7, 0—166
66, 5, 4, 5—72
71, and 72, 13—217
71, 11, 11—254
72, 2, 4—41
72, 4, 5—72
87, 7—175
75, 5, 0—490
77, 1, 0—245
80, 6, 0—165
81 and 82, 0—13
82, 3, 0—181
85, 3, 16—245
87, 9, 0—251
89, 41—257
89, 0, 19—256
89, 19—243
89, 17—346
90, 1—32
11—16, 0
9, 9—173
92, 10, 0—169
95, 7, 0—306
97, 1, 0—46
97, 17, 19, 22—256
98, 1, 12—270
99, 7, 0—173
100, 6, 0—164
105, 8, 0—241
107, 6, 0—245
109, 0, 1—256
117, 7, 0—240
121, 13

Rig-veda continued—

Tenth Mandala—

125, 0, 6—246
129, 13—25
141, 3, 2—251
148, 3, 6—258
161, 0, 13—257
167, 4, 0—256

Rijrāśva, 266
Rikṣa, 235, 274, 300
Rikṣavat, 456
Rīpu, 238
Rishabhā, 279, 357
Rishabhās, 350
Rishi, 249
Rishi, 35, 44, 88, etc.
Rishitāśe, 269
Ritabūdha, 279
Ritav, 234
Ritvakata, 501
Ritupāra, 222
Roer, Dr. E., his translations of the Upānishads referred to, 25
Rohidāśva, 268
Rohita, 389
Rohita, 355
Rohita, 358
Rohita, 382
Roth, Dr. R., his Literature and History of the Veda referred to, 25
articles in Journ. of Germ. Or. Society, 8, 192, 194, 217, 245, 289
articles in Indische Studien, 48, 355, 376
Dissertation on the Atharva-veda, 395
Illustrations of Ni-rukta, 177, 253, 256, 321, 339
Rosen, Dr. F., remarks on the story of Sūnasāśe, 339
Ruchi (māta), 65
Ruchi (fem.), 466
Rudra, 3, 20, 65, 163, 194, 225
Rudras, 10 f, 52, 117
Rūpin, 360

S

Sāharas, or Sāvitas, 391, 353, 463 f.

Sacrifices of no avail to the depraved, 98
Sādāyana, 459
Sādhyā, 10 f, 26 f, 38, 41
Sāgara, 337, 486
Sahadeva, 266
Sahajāyā, 336
Sāndhyāvānas, 495
Sāndhyāyana, 333
Sāiney, 483
Sānyas, 236
Sātyā, 495
Sātyā, 401
Sākas, 391, 393, 482, 484, 486
Sākti, or Sāktri, 315, 322, 328, 342
Sākuntalā, 410
Sākṣārus, 266, 320
Sākṣya (Buddha) 309
Sālākanḍās, 279
Sālākāpars, 305
Sālāvatī, 352
Sālāvatya, 353
Sālmali-dvāpa, 490, 498
Sālva, 438
Sālva, 495
Sāma, 124
Samaṇḍapanchaka, 451
Sāma-veda, 2
quoted—
i, 262, 150
— 355, 163
Samprakṣāla-, kāla, 217
Sānāraya, 116
Sānivarana, 360
Sāśvarta, 207
Sanaka, 51
Sanandana, 51, 60
Sanatkumāra, 114, 307
Sāṃpīlīya, 313
Sanhitā, 2, 4
Sanjaya, 148
Sānkalpa on the Brahmanas, 147
— Chhāndogya Upāni-
— 153
— 195
— 207, 507
Sānkalpeyana Brāhmaṇa, 5
Sāṅkhya, 126, 210, 334, 430
— Kūrikā, 158
— Pravachana, 158
Sankrāti, a Vaiṣṇava author of Vedic hymns, 279
"A book that is shut is but a block"
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