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PREFACE

TO THE FIRST EDITION

In the following pages are reproduced, with a few alterations, the Lectures on Rigvada, given by me, last year, at the University of Bombay, in connection with the post-graduate studies. My object has been just to place in the hands of a beginner of the study of the Rigveda a handbook which would serve as a popular and convenient introduction, so as to enable him to enter upon the study with confidence and cheerfulness. For several reasons, it was not possible to do full justice to the subject, and the treatment of the few topics which alone could be touched upon, was bound to be cursory and incomplete. I have tried only to present in an interesting and easily digestible form the modicum of information with which a student of the Rigveda should be equipped. It is hoped that the reading of these pages would induce a student to know something more of the Rigveda and would give him the general outlook necessary to begin the study in the right spirit. Before concluding I have to request that this handbook to the study of the Rigveda, with all its imperfections, may deserve sympathy and indulgence at the hands of the readers.

ELPHINSTONE COLLEGE,
BOMBAY.
April, 15, 1915.

V. S. G.

As the earliest documents throwing light upon the history of the early Aryan settlers of India, the hymns of the Rigveda should be, to Indians, a perennial source of interest and inspiration. It is, therefore, not a little strange to find that Rigvedic studies should evoke, even in the present restless century of research and investigation, of excavation and revaluation, so little genuine interest in India, the cradle of these songs, the country where these very hymns have in time by-gone been studied and taught with such meticulous care and deep-rooted attachment, and even reverence. The only Indian scholar who in recent years had seriously studied the Vedas and tried to arrive at an independent conclusion as to their meaning and value was my Guru, the late Professor Rajaram Ramakrishna Bhagvat. His researches have suffered underserved neglect at the hands of his countrymen, and, owing to their being written in Marathi, have after barely twenty years, passed into unmerited oblivion.

The text of the Rigveda, it is true, has come down to us in a form not wholly authentic. Handed down through untold vistas of centuries exclusively by oral tradition the Rigveda Samhita has in the mouths of the devout reciters not entirely escaped that fate which is uniformly shared, in all climes and all ages, by similar works which have originated in some early historical epoch and have continued to live on through succeeding epochs of linguistic and literary development. Nevertheless, it cannot be gainsaid that the tradition of the Rigveda is unique for its antiquity, purity and continuity in the history of world literature, and particularly in the history of the literatures of the Indo-germanic family. The oldest remnants of the Iranian group are the cuneiform inscriptions dating from about 500 B.C. and the Avesta, which has come down to us with numerous and multiform corruptions, written in a defective
alphabet, which renders its decipherment an arduous and a problematic task. The early history of Greek has to be pieced together laboriously from imperfectly preserved inscriptions; the language of the Homeric poems, which are considerably later than our Rigvedic hymns, is regarded by competent critics as an artificial dialect. Latin is known to us from about the third century B.C., that is nearly 1200 years later than the latest period to which Vedic hymns have been assigned by some Western scholars. Gothic, the most archaic language of the Germanic group, is known to us chiefly through the translations of the Bible made by Bishop Ulfilas in the fourth century of the Christian era. Of the Balto-Slavonic branch, Old Prussian died out in the seventeenth century; only some few imperfectly recorded specimens of Old Prussian have been preserved to us and they date from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The literary record of Gaelic, the most important branch of the Celtic group, begins in the eighth century A.D., and only from the commencement of the twelfth century do we find any manuscripts which contain sagas and theological literature. It is needless to multiply instances. The value and importance of the Rigveda Samhita for linguistic, mythological and historical research is commonly acknowledged, if not fully realised in India. It is not an exaggeration to say that the imposing structures of Indo-germanic Philology and Mythology have been reared on—and would have been impossible to rear without—the solid and broad foundation of Rigvedic tradition. And this Rigveda is our heritage. We have the prior right to its exploitation. It is our duty to exercise that right. Furthermore it is improper to impose on European scholars the burden of interpreting our literature, our past. We must fit ourselves to shoulder our own burdens. And for that we must equip ourselves with all the paraphernalia of the technique of modern philological and historical research. The twentieth century is a century of specialists.

It is a sign of the times that the Bombay University, recently reorganising its Department of Post-graduate Studies
has inaugurated a course of lectures on the Rigveda. It is anticipated that the arrangement will be a permanent one. Here is, an opportunity for young Indians to learn, under competent guidance, the correct method and the results of latest researches in the interpretation of the Rigveda. It may be confidently hoped that the new scheme launched by the University will meet with ready response from the student world, and, in the fullness of time, will fructify in reawakening in India the interest in Vedic studies.

Nothing could serve better as an elementary guide to Vedic studies than this little hand-book, which embodies the lectures delivered under the auspices of the University of Bombay by the late Dr. Ghate, whose dissertation on the Vedanta, accepted as a doctor thesis by the University of Paris, entitles him to a rank among the leading Sanskritists of the present generation. It has served—and served well—the needs of the graduate students for over a decade and a call for a second edition is a clear indication of its just merits and well-deserved popularity. The lectures have been re-printed here, with the exclusion of what appeared to the editor as superfluous matter; the correction of some minor errors and inaccuracies; and finally addition of an index (compiled by Mr. N. N. Kulkarni, B.A., of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute) and of some supplementary matter, chiefly in the shape of foot-notes. These latter are mainly intended to draw the attention of the student to important works in this field which have appeared since the book was written. For the convenience of Indian students, with a view to facilitate reading and study, Sanskrit words and names have throughout been printed in Devanagari characters.

The student may further consult with advantage the chapters by Professor A. Berriedale Keith on the age of the Rigveda and the period of the later Samhitas in the Cambridge History of India, volume I (1922). They contain views which, if not wholly convincing, are highly interesting and suggestive.
While the revised edition was passing through the press there appeared two important aids to Rigveda study which could not be noticed in the body of the book: one of them is a new translation of the Rigveda by the nestor of Vedic studies, Professor Karl Geldner of the University of Marburg, and the other is a contribution to Rigveda Lexicography by Walter Neisser more elaborate, much more copious than Grassman's dictionary of the Rigveda, which it supplements. It is not impossible that the next generation will require and produce another translation and another dictionary of the Rigveda. If so, may it come to pass that they are from the pen of one who is proud to regard this ancient Samhita of the hymns of Rishis as his own, proper heritage!

BHANDARKAR ORIENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE, POONA

March 1st, 1926.
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LECTURE I.

INTRODUCTION

General neglect of the study of the Veda in India—why the Rigveda should be studied—the study essential for a right understanding of Indian history—the influence of the Veda seen everywhere and at all times—the study essential for the history of the world—important from the point of view of Comparative Philology—the effect of the introduction of Sanskrit to Western scholars—contrast between classical Sanskrit and Vedic Sanskrit—fortuna and उपस्थि—some interesting facts in the history of words—the roots कृप, रम, and शम—neglect of the study of the Rigveda least excusable under the present circumstances—the plan of the course of lectures.

Complaints are often made by students that the study of the Rigveda, which is very dry, is absolutely wanting not only in interest but also in utility. The same spirit animates our शास्त्रीs and पणिनि, who spend their whole lives in the study of one or more branches of philosophy or sciences like grammar and rhetorics, but none of whom seems ever to have given even a passing thought to the study of the Vedas. And this spirit seems to have been handed down from generation to generation, from very old times, to judge by the fact that even पणिनि, the oldest known grammarian, whose अद्वायनी याच has the honour of being regarded by the orthodox people as one of the वेददार्शिs or works specially intended as helps to the study of the Veda, deals with the grammar of the Vedic language only in a perfunctory manner. And the same is the case with the modern, highly popular manual of grammar, with which every व्याकरणशास्त्री begins the study of the subject, and whose knowledge is quite essential to every Sanskrit scholar whether of the ancient or the
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LECTURE I.

INTRODUCTION

General neglect of the study of the Veda in India—why the Rigveda should be studied—the study essential for a right understanding of Indian history—the influence of the Veda seen everywhere and at all times—the study essential for the history of the world—important from the point of view of Comparative Philology—the effect of the introduction of Sanskrit to Western scholars—contrast between classical Sanskrit and Vedic Sanskrit—fortuna and उपसन्न—some interesting facts in the history of words—the roots कृत, रम्य and शन्म—neglect of the study of the Rigveda least excusable under the present circumstances—the plan of the course of lectures.

Complaints are often made by students that the study of the Rigveda, which is very dry, is absolutely wanting not only in interest but also in utility. The same spirit animates our शाक्तिस and परिप्रेक्ष्य, who spend their whole lives in the study of one or more branches of philosophy or sciences like grammar and rhetorics, but none of whom seems ever to have given even a passing thought to the study of the Vedas. And this spirit seems to have been handed down from generation to generation, from very old times, to judge by the fact that even पाणिनि, the oldest known grammarian, whose अद्वाच्चाय श्री has the honour of being regarded by the orthodox people as one of the वेद panās or works specially intended as helps to the study of the Veda, deals with the grammar of the Vedic language only in a perfunctory manner. And the same is the case with the modern, highly popular manual of grammar, with which every व्याकरणार्थी begins the study of the subject, and whose knowledge is quite essential to every Sanskrit scholar whether of the ancient or the
modern type—I mean, the सिद्धान्तकौशल of महाभारत wherein all the द्वारका of पाणिनि dealing with the Vedic idiom have been put together in a section by itself called the वैदिकी शास्त्र, which forms the last chapter of the book, studied by very few शास्त्रीयs. The class of शास्त्रीs known as वैदिकs who can recite the Vedic texts from beginning to end without a mistake, but who are absolutely ignorant of the meaning thereof, also testifies to the fact, that the systematic exegesis of the Veda has been woefully neglected. How and why this spirit came over the votaries of Sanskrit is an enigma, especially when we remember that in the निरुक्त, the oldest known work dealing with the exegesis of the Veda, the author concludes his introduction to the work with a high eulogium of him who understands the meaning of the Veda and a scathing censure of him who only repeats the words without knowing their meaning. The verses on account of their directness and simplicity deserve quotation:

स्पष्टायुयं मारायायुं किलामूदुर्भ अधीत्य वेद न विजालति योग्यम्।
प्रोद्धर्थं इस्तकलं भद्ररूप्तं नाकर्मपि ज्ञानविश्वूत्तपर्यम्।

यद्इत्तमदिविसयं निगमिदेनव धर्म्यं।
अधिनाथविव शृण्यथायं न तत्वाटति कहिन्चिचित।

उत्त त्वः पद्मनं न दद्वूर्य वाच्यं उत्त त्वं शुम्भव शुम्रोयत्याम।
उत्तो त्वमेव तन्नेन विस्मिते जीविते पत्य उर्ध्वपि सुवासा।

उत्त त्वं सर्व्ये स्थिरपार्यताम। नैं नित्यत्वयिन्याय वाजिनेतु।
अधिनाय चारति मायायं वाच्यं गुरूवाः अफल्दमुप्यताम।

What has been said so far is, of course, only generally true, as one cannot shut one’s eyes to the work done in the

1 निरुक्त 1, 18 and 19. The first two verses are looked upon as interpolations by some; but that does not affect our position.
field by पण्डित्य especially during the period of special activity about the 14th century A.D., to which I shall have occasion to refer in a subsequent lecture.

The disappointment experienced by the present student of the Veda is due more to the wrong standpoint which the student takes than to the nature of the study itself. The archaic character of the language and the distance by which we are removed from the Vedic times no doubt contribute to make the study difficult and tedious, but these drawbacks are nothing compared to the utility of the study and the interest which would follow from it, if it is only pursued in the right spirit.

Do you, young readers, come to the Rigveda with the hope of finding in it the most sublime poetry? Then I am not surprised at the disappointment which would be in store for you. You must not expect to find in the Rigveda the smooth and melodic verses of कालिकात, nor the deep and heart-rending emotions of भवस्ति, nor the polished and jingling music of त्रुणि, nor the elaborate and highly finished art of माष, nor the deep significance of भारति, nor the bewilderingly complex phrases एवं. All the same it cannot be denied that the hymns of the Rigveda, at least some of them, are such as the goddess of poetry would be proud of. The freshness and beautiful imagery which characterize the hymns addressed to the Aurora, the heroic simplicity of some of the hymns addressed to the Thundering Bull, the homeliness which pervades some of the hymns to अष्टि, cannot but appeal to a sympathetic and appreciating reader. Though the Rigveda as a work of poetry cannot at all stand comparison with best specimens of Sanskrit classical poetry,
still it has something indescribable in it which cannot be lightly passed over.

Do you again expect to find profound philosophy in the Rigveda? Do you wish to have cut and dry systems of thought providing answers to such questions as,—“Who am I?” “What is the relation between the individual soul and the highest soul?” “What becomes of me after death?” In the Rigveda you cannot meet with the solutions of such and other problems of life. System and arrangement of thoughts calculated to solve a particular problem of life are absent from the Rigveda. The philosophy of the Rigveda proper, if philosophy it can be called, is much more practical. The ṛgvis with their frankness and simplicity, promise to offer sacrifices to gods, provided they in return bestow on them cattle and long life, war-like sons and riches. “Did I not bring to thee an offering of my prayers and oblations? Then why dost thou, O god, abstain from conferring on me long life and continuity of sons?”—asks the ṛgvi of a god more than once. Those hymns of the Rigveda which attempt to solve the riddle of life, are an exception and strike one as unvedic; and from the point of view of language and syntax, such hymns have been now authoritatively declared to be late productions, forming, as it were, the connecting links between the earlier Vedic thought and its later phase culminating in the उपनिषद्वें; and it must be stated here, that even these latter are far from being expressions of one particular system of philosophy. Thus, it is no wonder, if those who are familiar with the close and technical reasoning of त्वात works, or with the abstruse argumentation of Vedántists like शकराचार्य would, on opening the pages of the Rigveda, turn away their faces through sheer disappointment.
Then, why should one study the Rigveda? Because it is the sole means of knowing the history of the early Aryans. The Rigveda is the oldest record of the Aryans whose immediate descendants we are. It belongs to a period thousands of years removed from us, of which no other records, no monuments are available. It is indeed very fortunate that the Rigveda, though so old and voluminous in extent, has been preserved to us, in a form correct to a syllable, by oral tradition in our country. In the Rigveda, we are face to face with our ancestors, we see how they lived, how they spoke, how they thought, what religion and faith they professed, how they worshipped their gods, what their ideals were. Importance

But it may be interposed, let the student of antiquity read the Rigveda; why should every Sanskrit student be compelled to study it? To these persons we reply that the study of the Rigveda is essential not only to a student of antiquity, but also to the student of Indian history of the present time. The Indian mind is the same in many respects, whether in the Vedic Age or in the 20th century A.D. If it be asked what that unifying principle is which runs through all the several aspects of Indian life and temperament, we reply, it is the influence of the Veda and Vedic Age, which has permeated all strata of Indians and which is seen in every little act of ours. Whether it be religion, whether it be philosophy, morals, literature or social habits, we detect everywhere its influence. Our religious ceremonies may have become more elaborate and artificial and sometimes even farcical in character, still we cannot lose sight of the basis of the Veda. We cannot open an Indian book without being thrown back on an earlier authority which is
the Veda, and which is regarded as the basis of all our knowledge, both sacred and profane. The refined poetry of कालिदास, the philosophical vigour of कपिल, the voluptuous mysticism of जयदेव and epic simplicity of व्यास and वाल्मीकि all admirable in themselves, would, however, float before our eyes like the mirage of a desert, unless they are provided with the historical background by the Vedas. Likewise all the systems of philosophy or दर्शन, and all codes of law profess to impart the teaching of the Veda.

The study of the Rigveda is essential not only for a complete understanding of the history of India, whether ancient or modern, it is essential also for the elucidation of the history of the world. To quote Max Müller: "In the history of the world the Veda fills a gap which no literary work in any other language could fill. It carries us back to times of which we have no records anywhere, and gives us the very words of a generation of men of whom otherwise we could form but the vaguest estimate by means of conjectures and inferences. As long as man continues to take an interest in the history of his race, and as long as we collect in libraries and museums the relics of former ages, the first place in that long row of books which contains the records of the Aryan branch of mankind, will belong for ever to the Rigveda."

Above all, the study of the Rigveda is most important from the point of view of Philology, or the Science of Language. The study of languages as distinguished from the mere acquisition of languages, is a growth of the last century though it must be admitted that researches into the genealogies and affinities of words have exercised the ingenuity of

1 Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 63.
numberless generations of acute and inquiring minds. Still nothing deserving the name of science was the result of these older investigations in the domain of language. Those were merely hasty generalizations, baseless hypotheses and inconclusive deductions. As is the case with every science in its early stage, the science of language too was attended with difficulties namely, paucity of observed facts and a faulty standpoint. As Whitney has said:¹

"National self-sufficiency and inherited pre-possession long helped to narrow the limits imposed by unfavourable circumstances upon the extent of linguistic knowledge restraining that liberality of inquiry which is indispensable to the growth of a science." Thus in ancient times every one thought his own dialect to be the oldest one with which to start and compare other dialects. Until very recently Latin and Greek were supposed to be the oldest and the most primitive known languages from which every European language was derived. But the restless and penetrating investigations which characterized the last century changed the whole aspect of the study and linguists busied themselves with the study of the special relationship of the principal languages of Europe with one another and with the languages of south-western Asia, which led to the postulation of the Indo-European family of languages.

"No single circumstance," to quote from Whitney again, "more powerfully aided the onward movement than the introduction to Western scholars of Sanskrit, the ancient and sacred dialect of India. Its exceeding age, its remarkable conservation of primitive material and

¹ *Language and its Study*, p. 2.
forms, its unequalled transparency of structure give it an indisputable right to the first place among the tongues of the Indo-European family. Upon their comparison, already fruitfully begun, it cast a new and welcome light, displaying clearly their hitherto obscure relations, rectifying their doubtful etymologies, illustrating the laws of research which must be followed in their study, and in that of all other languages."

I may be excused for making another quotation owing to the importance of the subject. "What has been termed the discovery of Sanskrit by Western scholars," says Sayce, "put an end to all this fanciful playing with words and created the science of language. The grammarians of India had at an early period analysed both the phonetic sounds and the vocabulary of Sanskrit with astonishing precision and drawn up a far more scientific system of grammar than the philologists of Alexandria or Rome had been able to attain. The Devanāgarī alphabet is a splendid monument of phonological accuracy and...the Hindu Vaiyākaraṇas or grammarians had not only discovered that roots are the ultimate elements of language, but had traced all the words of Sanskrit to a limited number of roots. Their grammatical system and nomenclature rest upon a firm foundation of inductive reasoning and though based on the phenomena of a single language, show a scientific insight into the nature of speech which has never been surpassed."

From all this you can easily see what an important part Sanskrit has played in the domain of the science of

language. Now the object and aim of philology is to learn what man is by what man has been. And Indic philology in particular has served to supply one of the earliest and most important links in the history of mankind. Sanskrit has been regarded as a language even older and more primitive than Greek and Latin. At least Sanskrit enables us to have glimpses into the activities of the south-eastern branch of the Aryans as opposed to the north-western branch. And if Sanskrit is so important owing to its primitiveness and transparency, wherewith can we begin its study if not with the Vedic idiom? The classical Sanskrit, which we now know and which is accessible and intelligible to comparatively large numbers, is itself a very old dialect, preserved to us in its pristine purity, as it early ceased to be a language of the people and continued to be a literary dialect used by the learned alone. The Sanskrit language is to-day exactly what it was in the days of पाणिनि. Thus even the the classical Sanskrit is the means of studying the life and manners of a very old generation.

But this is not the case with the Vedic idiom. Though the dialect of the Veda or more particularly the Rigveda is essentially Sanskrit, still it differs from the latter in many important respects, so much so that to a student of classical Sanskrit, the Vedic language would be almost unintelligible. The Vedic is a much simpler idiom and less artificial than the classical Sanskrit. The forms of declension and conjugation are more regular, though more varied at the same time. Sandhi rules are simpler and far more intelligible. The Infinitive Mood has not less than six forms in the Veda, whereas in later Sanskrit, we have only one form. All these peculiarities I shall deal with
later on in their proper place. What I want to say here is that the Vedic Sanskrit is much older than the later Sanskrit, whether the Vedic age be placed 2000 years before Christ or still further back; that it represents a state of civilization nowhere else represented; that it provides us with many links which are otherwise obscure, though without them no certain conclusion can be arrived at.

The truth of what has been said so far may be illustrated by an example. Take for instance, the modern English word *fortune*. The word was brought by the Normans who had it in the form *fortune* in Northern French. It is derived from Latin *fortuna*. Now *fortune* in English means riches, prosperity, good fortune as well as bad fortune, chance as opposed to divine will and so on. The word in all these significations can be derived from *ferre*, "to bring"; one who brings good or bad luck. *Fors* which comes from the same root and is allied to *fortune*, was the name of an old deity in Italy, who was supposed to bring with her good or evil, was the first-born of gods and was also sometimes spoken of as the daughter of Jupiter, Zeus, corresponding to बृजा. Now who was this deity? Was it a mere personification of some virtue or act, as Victor-Victoria, Fides-Faith and so on?

If we study the mythology of the ancient Aryans, we find that the Dawn or Aurora (आग्न्य) was one of the deities whom the early Aryans worshipped and praised. The Dawn, as I remarked above, is the subject of many a beautiful hymn in the Rigveda. Now the Dawn is often described as the first-born of the bright gods. She is called अभिमा, the first who comes at the head of all the other gods,
who brings, indeed, precious gifts namely, light and life, and who is, therefore, invoked first (प्रथम) at every morning-prayer (प्रातान). The same Dawn is also called the daughter of प्रोσ (Zeus), दुहिता दिन: and in other places, she is like Fors represented as the mother of the gods. There are, in fact, few praises bestowed in the Veda on उच्छु the Dawn, which cannot be transferred to Fortuna, thus showing her to have been originally, like उच्छु, the bright light of each day, worshipped from the earliest days. Thus in the concept of Fors-Fortuna we cannot but recognize a reflex of the goddess of the Dawn who brings everything, who in her lap has good and evil gifts. Attempting to trace Fors or Fortuna (derived from ferre) to some Sanskrit root, we have ह “to bring”, as the most analogous one. And Fors is quite analogous to हरति or हरि-ति (fert). Derivatives from ह (हरति, हर्यति) are often used of उच्छु; thus हर्यत (adj. “beautiful, longed for”) is one of the common epithets used of the Dawn.

Thus you see what a flood of light is thrown by the Vedic Sanskrit on the relation between the Western fortuna and the Eastern उच्छु and the modern English fortune. It is a long journey, indeed, from the golden rays of the dawn to the bright gold coins, by which now fortune is measured.

Many other interesting facts in the history of language or of words will come to view on comparison of the language of the Veda with the later Sanskrit. Thus we find that in the growth of language and thought, words often change their material into a spiritual meaning. As

1. Max Muller, Biographies of Words.
an instance of this I may mention two roots कूष्ठ and रथ. In
the Rigveda कूष्ठ is used in the sense of physical motion,
agitation, and रथ in the sense of stopping, fixing firm.
Thus in Rigveda II, 12.2, we have पवित्तान्त्रकूष्ठितां अर्ग्नात, “He
fixed firm the mountains that were in motion.” The
agitation is then transferred from the sphere of the body
to that of the spirit; and कूष्ठ meant mental agitation,
emotion; and as the emotion of anger agitates the mind
most and commits the greatest havoc, कूष्ठ came to mean
anger in later Sanskrit, where again we find the word
used metaphorically, to denote physical agitation; as for
instance कूष्ठीर ज्ञानजः; if कूष्ठ is used literally, then ज्ञानज
must mean कृष्ण or the god of love, who alone is capable
of the mental emotion of anger. But, if कूष्ठ is used by चक्षणा
(indication) to mean agitated, then ज्ञानज should mean the
ocean. Thus we see that what was once the literal meaning
of the word has now been made possible only through a
metaphor. Similarly in the case of रथ the idea of fixing firm
or causing to rest is transferred from the physical domain to
the mental one; and what can enable the mind to rest
better than sporting or playing which causes pleasure and
thus rests the mind? And even in later Sanskrit रथे preserves
the old meaning as when we say क्रीड़ा रथे चित्तम. Similarly,
the root श्रय originally meant in the Rigveda “to toil hard, to

1 Cf. the following verses from अष्टाध्यायरामायण (अष्टाध्यायकण्ड
4th बो verses 35, 36): —

तत्त्वारिष्ट कृष्ठ एवां तोषाक्षियारं सर्वदा ।
येनानि: पुमान्त्वति पितृभारतु: सहसुभीव: ॥
लोकस्मृतो मनस्ताप: कृष्ठ: संसारस्यनमः ।
यंभेक्षयकर: कृष्ठस्तस्माक्षोष्प परित्याज ॥
work zealously as at a sacrifice". In Rigveda II. 12-14 we have, of Indra:

\[ \text{यः सुन्त्वतः यः पचन्तः} \\
\text{यः शंसन्तः यः शशामावृती} \]

शशामान is used by the side of सुन्त्वतः, पचन्तः and शंसन्तः. But as toiling hard leads to exhaustion and consequent inactivity, शम् has come to mean "to be quiet or tranquil" (which has more to do with the mind), the result of physical toiling, its original meaning.

From all this it will be seen, how very important the study of the Rigveda is from various points of view. It has been my object in this lecture to bring home to the mind of the young student, who has evinced a dislike for the study of the Rigveda; the fact what a gross mistake he commits. Such dislike or even indifference might have been excusable in days of old when Sanskrit learning, especially Vedic learning, had remained stagnant; there was a time when even European scholars were dazzled by the ravishing beauties of शक्तिला and took it to represent the best in Sanskrit literature. The raptures of Goethe on reading शक्तिला though only in translation, are too well-known. Others went even further and positively condemned the Vedic books. Herder, otherwise an excellent judge of ancient national poetry, says in his criticism of शक्तिला "Do you not wish with me that instead of these endless religious books of the Vedas, Upavedas and Upānīgas they would give us the more useful and more agreeable works of the Indians, and especially their best poetry of every kind? It is here the mind and character of a nation is best brought to life before us, and I gladly admit that I have received
a truer and more real notion of the manner of thinking among the ancient Indians from this one Ṣakuntalā than from all their Upanekats and Bagadams."  

But those days are now gone. The editio princeps of the Rigveda has marked a new epoch. Now the Rigveda and other allied Vedic literature forms a special and important subject of study at most of the important Universities of Europe and America, an unparalleled activity in the domain of Vedic study is manifested everywhere, single words are critically studied and their history traced through all available works, historical and mythological references are attempted to be explained on a rational basis, indexes and glossaries are multiplied, and exhaustive commentaries are produced. At such a time would it not be very strange if in our University curriculum Vedic study did not find a place? When Germans and Englishmen are trying their best to understand and explain the Vedic traditions and thought, would it behove us to sit with folded hands? I really am surprised to see cultured men come forward and advocate the abolition of the Rigveda from our curriculum. Are we not best fitted to understand our ancient tradition, and the spirit proper that pervades our ancient literature? If we only free our mind from prejudice and then apply ourselves to the study of the Rigveda, and pursue the Western methods of criticism, especially those based on comparison, we are sure to arrive at the most correct and acceptable interpretation of the sacred texts. The task is, no doubt, very arduous and difficult, requiring patience and perseverance; but the magnitude of the task must not

1. Max Muller, Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 5.
discourage you. If you only work in the right direction, never mind how little you achieve.

नेहाभिविभक्तमनशोदित्य प्रत्यवादो न विरहते।
स्वत्पस्य धर्मस्य ग्रावते महते भयान्। २.४०

Before concluding, it would not be out of place if I say a few words regarding the plan of my lectures and the principles which I would like you to bear in mind. The object of these lectures is to initiate you into the study, to show you the way and to present to you a number of facts, an acquaintance with which is quite essential for an intelligent study of the Rigveda. It will be my aim to make the exposition as popular as possible, which is the only means to make the study both useful and interesting.

At first I shall explain to you what the Veda is, and what relation it bears to the remaining Sanskrit literature. I shall speak at length of the Vedic literature, of its subdivisions, and review briefly some of the important works which are representative of the period to which they belong, which are typical of the class of literature of which they form part. Then I shall speak of the Rigveda in particular, its contents, the principle of arrangement which holds together the different parts, the old and late portions and how to distinguish them, in the course of which it will be made clear to you that the Rigveda is not a homogeneous work, but an encyclopaedic compilation.

Next, I shall proceed to indicate the method of studying the Rigveda, comparing the merits of the orthodox and modern ways, before doing which, however, an attempt will be made to give you an idea of the amount and nature of the work done in the field by modern scholars as well as by
ancient पण्डितs. Then may conveniently be presented to you the different views held regarding the contents of the Rigveda. We shall then see what the religion of the Early Aryans was, through what stages it passed, what gods they believed in, what myths were woven round them, how they were developed later on. This will be followed by a brief outline of the philosophy of the Rigveda.

Then we shall try to acquaint ourselves with the social condition of the Aryans, as depicted in the hymns of the Rigveda. Then we shall see what food and drink they used, what ideals of education there existed, whether there was caste system or not, whether widows were allowed to remarry or not; and several other interesting topics of a miscellaneous character.

After having made ourselves familiar with the ideas and contents of the Rigveda, we shall devote ourselves to the consideration of its form. We shall examine the grammatical peculiarities of forms and inflection, showing how full and varied the inflection was in the Vedic idiom. Next the metre will engage our attention, the metre which has been a necessary and an almost constant vehicle of poetry, and in which is clothed a very large part of Sanskrit literature. Lastly your attention will be drawn to the several theories put forth by different scholars regarding the age of the Rigveda, as determined by evidence both internal and external. Before concluding, I may express the hope that at the end of this course of lectures I shall have succeeded in persuading you to recognize that1 "we have in the Rigveda a literature which, well deserves at least in

1 Kaegi, The Rigveda, p. 91.
extracts to be known to every student and lover of antiquity, to every one who would have the poet’s words; \textit{homo sum, humanum nihil a me alienum puto}, applied to himself. The chief importance of the Veda is not indeed for the history of literature, but it lies elsewhere; it lies in the very extraordinary fullness of disclosures which this unique book gives to the student of philology and the history of civilization. In this no other literature is to be compared with it, and though the aesthetic value of this relic of long-vanished times has sometimes been exaggerated, yet its historical importance, its value for the history of mankind, cannot easily be overrated.
LECTURE II

THE VEDIC LITERATURE

and its relation to other Sanskrit Literature

What is the Veda? The view of साहित्य regarding the meaning of Veda—Veda is the sum of मन्त्र and ब्राह्मण—Vedic and Post-Vedic Literatures—Three periods of Vedic Literature—श्रुति and स्मृति—The संहिता period—The fourfold संहिता corresponding to the four priests—Rigveda, the most ancient and important—छन्द and मन्त्र—सामवेद-यजुवेद Black and White यजुवेद—अथवेद—its historical importance—The ब्राह्मण period—The distinction between मन्त्र and ब्राह्मण—The ऐतरेय ब्राह्मण—
The शतपथ ब्राह्मण—The literary estimate of the ब्राह्मण—अर्पणक्षेत्र—

Before we proceed to discuss the relation which the Veda bears to other Sanskrit literature, let us ask ourselves the question, ‘What is the Veda?’ No logically correct definition free from the faults of अव्याप्ति, अतिव्याप्ति and असंभव can be given. To begin with, Veda means knowledge (from the root, विद्यू to know); Veda means ब्रह्म, then secondarily the term denotes works (संब्रह्म) containing the ब्रह्म, the most sacred and authoritative ब्रह्म, works whose authority is not to be questioned, and which are the last tribunal in matters of dispute whether in religion, or philosophy, or social customs.
It is of interest to know how the great Vedic exeg- etist सार्यण defines the Veda. In his introduction to the ब्रताम्बन्ध, सार्यण first states the prima facie case thus: "If you define the Veda as the last of the three kinds of evidence — perception, inference and scripture — that will not do. The definition would be too wide, as it would include the स्त्रृतिस of मुद्र and others. For, by universal consent, आगम or scripture is defined as that which is an instrument of the right apprehension of things not evident to the senses. And such a definition applies to these स्त्रृतिस as well. You next propose to add 'provided it be not of human origin' and think in that way to make your definition faultless; that also will not do. For the Veda, too, made as it was by प्रभु, is of human origin. You will perhaps next say that by अभिज्ञ you mean 'not made by a corporeal living being'. But this will not do. For, from such texts as गहस्तर्शीयत गुरु: it is clear that this Lord, too, has a body. But, you say, the kind of body you mean is one which is the result of the works of a previous life; the author of the Veda has no such body, and that is what you mean when you say that it is 'not of human origin.' But this also will not do. For the Vedas were produced by such living beings as अभिज्ञ, बाहु and आदित्य. For we have such texts as, 'the Rigveda was born from अभिज्ञ, the यजुवंद from बाहु, the सामवेद from आदित्य,' from which it must be recognised that ईश्वर is the maker of the Vedas, as being the director of अभिज्ञ and others. If you define the Veda, as a collection of sayings made up of मन् and बाह्यार्, that will not do; for it has

never been definitely decided, what a मन्त्र is and what a ब्राृण. Thus there is no adequate definition of the Veda."

To all this साध्यण replies as follows: "The definition of the Veda as the sum of मन्त्रs and ब्राृणs is a faultless one: and therefore it is that आप्सल्लव in his यज्ञपरिभाषा says: 'The Veda is the name given to the मन्त्रs and ब्राृणs.'"

Further on, साध्यण discusses the meaning of मन्त्र and ब्राृण as follows:

"But it may be said, the definition of the Veda, according to which it is the sum of मन्त्रs and ब्राृणs is not a good definition, because no one can say what constitutes a मन्त्र and what a ब्राृण. Not so. For the nature of both has been clearly determined in the seventh and eighth अष्टि of the first पाठ of the second अष्टि. At the आष्टि रित a text is used which runs as follows: अहे, दुधिष्य मन्त्र मे गोपाय. Now there is no definition of a मन्त्र, because it is impossible to frame a definition which shall not be either too wide or too narrow. If we say that a मन्त्र is that which refers to a thing enjoined, we shall exclude the मन्त्र: वत्तमात्र क्रियान्त आदित्तेते, which is itself in form an injunction or विधि. If we give an etymological definition, and say that मन्त्र comes from मनन ‘thinking’, that would include the ब्राृणs. If we say that a मन्त्र is that which ends in अर्थ (pre. 2nd per. sing, of अर्थ, ‘to be’), that would exclude all hymns ending in the first person forms and so on.

"Not so. It is a good definition to say that whatever the sacrificing priest calls a मन्त्र is a मन्त्र. This denomination indicates that the texts used for the reminding of the performance of a rite, and others are also मन्त्रs.

"उष्ण प्रपश्च and similar texts direct the sacrifice. अष्टि यूथितम and similar texts are in praise of the gods. इर्ष्या त्या and

the texts which follow end in the word वा. अः आयाति वीते and texts like it are invocations. Such texts as अः अः अः अः विहर are directory. Such texts as अः च्चार्सिपर च्चार्सिपर are philosophical in character (चित्तार्सिप); and so on. Thus, since the मन्त्रs are so very varied in kind, there is no common quality except denomination, which will serve for a definition. But the need of some definition has been shown by old teachers. Even the कविः could not come to the end of things taken one by one; it is only when things are comprehended under a definition that learned men can master them. So the denomination by experts or learned men (अभिधिक) in the words that this is a Mantra is the definition.

"In the चादमालस्य ritual, a text is used which runs as follows: चादमालस्यान्येव च्चार्सिपि. Now there is no definition of a राहण. Why? Because, there being no limit to the divisions of the Veda, any definition which should seek to discriminate between the राहण parts and the other parts would be either too narrow or too wide. The मन्त्र part, of which we have already spoken, is one. The remaining parts have been thus summed up by ancient teachers:

हेतुत्तर्वेच्चर्चितः चितः प्रवेक्षा संखयो विषि।
पराक्षं पुराक्षग्नो व्यवङ्ग्यार्थकप्ना।

"It will not do to say that to define a राहण we have only to say that it must be one or other of the things just enumerated. For all these classes are found in the मन्त्रs too". Then there follow illustrations from the मन्त्रs containing the classes enumerated.

"Then is there no definition of a राहण? There is, and we give it. We have seen reason to hold that the
Veda is divided into two parts मन्त्र and बाण्य and we have laid down how the मन्त्र part is to be known. Well, whatever is not मन्त्र is बाण्य; that is our definition of a बाण्य. This very definition is given by जैमिनि in the two छविः: तत् च मन्त्र श्रव्यम् और श्रव्य बाण्यम्.

After having shown that what is called विविधात्, पुराण, कथा, गाथा and नारायण are only different kinds of बाण्य mentioned under distinctive names, he concludes: "There are, therefore, besides the मन्त्र and बाण्य no other parts of the Veda. And we have shown how these two are to be distinguished from each other. That definition of the Veda, then, according to which it is the sum of मन्त्रs and बाण्यs, is established."

You see how very vague is the connotation of the terms बेद, मन्त्र and बाण्य; and their denotation is to be ascertained only from tradition. Thus according to the orthodox view both the मन्त्रs (or what we shall call संहितास) and the बाण्यs go by the common appellation of Veda, notwithstanding the wide gulf between the two in point of language, form, and ideas.

Generally speaking, Sanskrit literature may be classed under two broad divisions: Vedic literature, and non-Vedic (or rather post-Vedic) literature. The codes of law by Manu and others, the epics, classical literature, philosophical works, commentaries and manuals, all come under post-Vedic literature, of which a beginning is marked by the predominance of the continuous अनुप्लं metre. Vedic literature itself may be divided into three great divisions: the मन्त्रs (or संहितास), the बाण्यs and the छविः. Of these the first two, as has been shown, are the proper, while the छविः are not.
Here is the place to refer to the well-known distinction between श्रुति and स्मृति. मन्त्रs and ब्राह्मणs are called श्रुति, while the छन्दs are called स्मृति. The श्रुति is what is heard, as opposed to what is composed or remembered; it is revealed scripture, self-evident and self-authoritative, not composed by any human authors. The क्रिप्तs of the hymns (छन्दs) are thus called मन्त्रमूर्ति, 'the seers of the मन्त्रs.' They are not responsible for the contents of the मन्त्रs. They are only the mediums communicating between gods and men. शास्त्र, the oldest known expositor of the Veda, while explaining the genesis of the निविष्ट, on which he writes a commentary, says:

साधारणतयाश्च अध्यायो च चित्ताय उपदेशन मन्त्रमंदृतादानः।
उपदेशाय ग्लायन्तोंवरं बिभ्यद्यायेयं प्रथम समान्ता सिद्धेंद्र च नेवाधारिता हृ।

Here it is distinctly said that धर्म (duty) revealed itself to the क्रिप्तs, who handed it down by oral instruction to their descendants, to whom धर्म did not manifest itself. This is the orthodox view; hence the extreme sacredness and importance of the श्रुति. It can be easily seen how this view came into existence and continued to gain strength. As we know, oral tradition was the only means, in early days, of communicating learning. A teacher, who learnt his स्त्राःचार्य from his preceptor, taught the same orally to his pupil, and this practice, continued from times immemorial, naturally led to the belief that the Vedas were handed down in the same manner; it was difficult to believe how they could have been composed by some particular persons. 2

1. निविष्ट 1. 20.

2. Here we need not discuss the view that the Brahmins or priests deliberately spread the idea that the scriptures were अप्राच्छन्दक 'not of
As opposed to the शुरूः, there is the स्मरित, or traditional works of human origin, which are solely based on the शुरूः, and which are possessed of authority, only inasmuch as they have their foundation in the शुरूः. As हुमायूँ, the great मीमांसा writer, remarks:

पूर्वविवेयानविपर्यं विवेयां स्मरितिरुच्चयते।
पूर्ववेयानाद्रिन्ना तथा: प्रामाण्यं नावचीयते॥

Thus everything contained in the स्मरितः is supposed to be confirmed by something corresponding in the शुरूः and when there is an antagonism between the dicta of the शुरूः and स्मरित, the former prevails: विरोधेयं ज्ञानं श्वास्वर्तश्च भ्राजतानम्.

It should be noted that often the title स्मरितः is applied not only to the शुरूः works but also to the metrical codes of महः and याज्ञवल्क्य, which, however, we have not included in the Vedic literature.

To the first or संहिता period, belong the four संहिता of the four वेदस: कृत्रिम, सामन्त, यज्ञुद्भिद्रुत and अश्वमेत्र. Of these the कृत्रिमसंहिता is the oldest and most important; not only from the point of view of its contents, but also from the orthodox stand-point. This four-fold division of the संहिता evidently presupposed an elaborate development of the sacrificial ritual, since even the simplest sacrifice required the four principal priests होतु, उदात्र, अष्ठाढ़े and त्रिवेठ, the more elaborate sacrifices requiring not less than sixteen priests.

This following verse from याज्ञवल्क्य's विरृत्त states succinctly the functions of the four priests:

human origin, that वामदव, विनय and others were not the composers but merely the instruments of communication, with the object of attaching greater importance to the वेदas and maintaining their own superiority, since it rests merely on a conjecture.
The priest recites verses from the  

The offering of oblations; the chants psalms at the sacrificial ritual from the  

is a general superintendent, whose duty it is to watch everywhere and to make corrections whenever any mistakes are committed in the general routine or particular details of the sacrifice. The  is thus required to be versed in all the Vedas. The  creates the form or body of the sacrifice. Manual work such as preparing the altar, placing the logs of wood in a particular position, making the oblations, and so on is the 's duty. For the guidance of this  is meant the , which is a mixture of prose formulae containing practical directions for the sacrifice and metrical portions. It should be noted that originally there were only three Vedas, , and  known collectively as the ; the fourth, , which is evidently far removed in spirit from the old Vedas, was only afterwards added to the triad. Thus the three Vedas presupposed their character of being, subsidiary to the sacrifice. And from the point of view of the sacrificial ritual the  of the  on whom falls the main burden of the sacrifice, should deserve precedence, but even orthodox opinion is in favour of regarding the Rigveda as the first and of primary importance. Even  who had first

1. Ch. मानविकाप्रामित्र Act 1. verse 14;
commented on the यजुर्वेद and then proceeded to comment on the Rigveda has to admit that the Rigveda must be given precedence “in such exercises as the learning of all the four Vedas, the continual study of them and the spiritual sacrifice which consists in the recitation of them.” In the well-known पुराणूक, the Rigveda is mentioned first and then the other Vedas:

तत्साहूऽ यजाद सर्वन्तः तत्र च्यानि जन्तिेः।

Not only is the pre-eminence of the Rigveda thus established on account of its being mentioned first, it also follows from the fact that it is the cause of strengthening or confirming the different parts of a sacrifice. Thus the तौरिष्यस have the text:

यदै यजस्य सात्ता यजुषा क्रियते शिपिठुः तदूऽ यहृच्छा तदूऽदित।

The छन्दोः, too, cite a speech of नारद’s addresed to सर्वेभार, which implies the primacy of the Rigveda: क्यावेदं माधवद्वामम यजुर्वेदं सामवेदमाधव्यनं चेति।

Leaving aside the Rigveda we shall for the present proceed to the सामवेद संहिता. In the first place, it must be stated that the सामवेद does not really seem to be an independent production, since it has taken many verses, a very large number indeed, from the Rigveda. As we have said above the साम prayer book was specially intended for the उदयान्त priest, who was to chant the psalms at the sacrifices. The संहिता text proper of the सामवेद consists of two parts, the शास्त्रिक and the उत्तरासिक. The first is divided into six lessons (पाठक), each of which contains ten decades of stanzas, except the last which has only nine. This शास्त्रिक is also called छन्द, छन्दसी or छन्दसिका. The verses of the शास्त्रिक are
also classified under the following five heads: 1 आर्थिक (treating of the god of Fire); 2 ऐन्त्रिक (treating of Indra); 3 पवनान (treating of the god of Wind); 4 अरुप, and 5 शुक्त्र (both treating of the supreme god, so named because these verses were proclaimed to the world by अरुप, the god of Dawn, and by शुक्त्र, the preceptor of the Asuras respectively). The क्रक्कव, when chanted, are called सामस. The book of सामस belonging to the शैवालिक is called प्रकृति; while those belonging to the उत्तरालिििक constitute उह and रहस्य. The peculiarity of the उत्तरालिििक is that generally three verses are grouped together and form one क्रक्क, the first verse being taken from the शैवालिक; and this group of verses is chanted in various ways, with the सामस, so occurring in the प्रकृति. Hence the सामस of the शैवालिक are called प्रकृति. At the end of the शैवालिक comes the मेहानासी, which is regarded by some as a part of the शैवालिक, by others as a separate work. The उत्तरालिििक consists of several sections referring to the following topics in order: 1 द्वारान, 2 संतस, 3 ऐकाह, 4 अधीन, 5 सत्त्र, 6 माण्डलित, and 7 शुक्त्र.

Collections of hymns arranged in a particular way, and set to music are called गान्स. One mode of recitation is simple and applies only to the क्रक्कs or hymns taken from the Rigveda, and adopts three त्तत्त, the उद्धात, अवद्धात and स्वरित. The उद्धात is high and emphasized, the अवद्धात is low, and the स्वरित occupies a somewhat middling position. The other mode, the musical chanting of the समावंद, is far more elaborate and has to do with seven notes called respectively कुष, प्रथम, द्वितीय, तृतीय, चतुर्थ, पञ्जम, and षड्ष, corresponding to the पञ्जम, माण्डल, गाण्डार, क्रक्क, षड्ष, भैवत, and निषव, respectively.1

1 See the verses from the नारस्विशिष्का quoted in Madras Catalogue of MSS, pt. I.
From the सामवेद we now pass on to the यजुवेद, which is specially and solely meant for purposes of the sacrificial ritual and which is, therefore, quite different in character from the two संहितास mentioned above. The word यजुस is explained in various ways: अनियतात्सारावस्थानो यजुः: “a यजुस is that, the number of letters in which is not fixed”; गधात्मको यजुः; त्रिगुण पञ्चमानो मर्गावशष्टात्मको यजुवेदः:। This यजुवेद is twofold, डुः (white or pure) and क्रृष्ण (dark). A very curious story is told by महिप्सर, about this twofold division of the यजुवेद, in the beginning of his भाष्य on the यजुवेदसंहिता. व्यास in view of the gradually degenerating intellectual powers of men, arranged the Veda into four groups, respectively called क्रृष्ण, यजुस, सामवेद and अथवेद and taught them orally to his four pupils वेद, वेशपायन, जैमिनि and समुद्र respectively, who, in their turn, handed them down to their pupils. वेशपायन taught the यजुवेद to याजवल्क्य and other pupils. Once, वेशपायन got angry with याजवल्क्य and asked him to give back what he had learnt. याजवल्क्य vomitted the Veda by the power of योग; while the other pupils, at the command of the यजुः, swallowed up the Yajus thus vomitted, assuming the form of निष्पित birds. Thus the Yajus became dark and was called क्रृष्ण and तैत्तिरिय. याजवल्क्य feeling aggrieved, prayed to the Sun, who came to him in the form of a horse.

1. The त्रिगुणल्भ refers to the triad either of संहिता, पद and क्रम, or of उदाच, अवदाच and स्वरित.—V.S.S.

2. The cause of anger is elsewhere (Calcutta MSS. Cat. I, p. 39) stated thus: वेशपायन asked his pupils to practise some austerities in order to make good for the श्रव्यावशोह. याजवल्क्य seeing the inferiority and weakness of his fellows proposed that he should alone be entrusted with the austerities. At this वेशपायन was enraged and thought him to be a despiser to the Brahmans.
and gave him back the यजुर्वेद. Hence this यजुर्वेद is called शुक्स owing to the bright form of the Sun and वाजसंनेति after the राजी form of the Sun.

Perhaps the epithet शुक्स refers really to the fact that the वाजसंनेति is free from a mixture with the ब्राह्मण (or sacrificial directions), as opposed to the कुण्ययजुर्वेद, which is really a mixture of both मन्त्र and ब्राह्मण.

मद्गामास्कर, a commentator on तैत्तिरियसंहिता observes in his introduction:

... भगवता व्यासेन जगदिशकाराभिज्ञेयस्य स्थिता: वेदा: व्यस्ता: शालास्य परिपूर्विक्षिप्ता:। तत्र वैसर्व्ययोऽन्तं नाम शिष्यं यजुर्वेदालासाधारामविस्तरमिव नियमं। स कै त्व पार्थ याज्ञवल्क्यम् प्राप्तवाच। स च तितिर्यो तोषिको च उस्ताय। उस्ताय अत्रियाय द्वैते वेद परविभागे चके। अवशेषं शासा अत्रिये इत्यचिह्यते।
The संहिता might have been named तैत्तिरिय after this विषयर.

The शुक्स or वाजसंनेय संहिता of the यजुर्वेद, which has fifteen शास्त्र (काण्य, माथ्यन्त्र, etc. from the fifteen followers of याज्ञवल्क्य, who first read them), is divided into forty अभ्यास each of which is again divided into short sections (कण्डिकास) the total number of these sections being 1975. The first twenty-five अभ्यास contain the formulae for the general sacrificial ceremonial: अभ्यास 1 and 2, those for the new and full-moon sacrifices (दर्शी and पूर्णमास); 3, for the morning and evening fire sacrifice, as well as for the sacrifices to be offered every four months, at the commencement of the three seasons; 4 to 8, for the सोम sacrifice in general; 9 and 10, for two modifications of it (वाजपेयराजपथाक्षरस्त्र); 11 to 18, for the construction of altars for the sacred fires; 19 to 21, for the लैलैलमणि, a ceremony originally appointed to expiate the evil effects of too free indulgence in the Soma drink; and 22 to
25, for the horse-sacrifice (अष्टमेष). The next fifteen अष्टमेष, which are evidently of more recent origin, are called तिल (supplements) in the commentaries of जूद्र and महाभाष्य अष्टमेष. 26 to 29 contain sacrificial formulæ which belong to the ceremonies treated of in the earlier अष्टमेष; while अष्टमेष 30 to 39 contain formulæ for entirely new sacrificial ceremonies, viz., the पुरुषमेष, सर्वमेष, पितृमेष and प्रज्ञमेष. The last अष्टमेष stands in no direct relation to the sacrificial ceremonial; it is what is known as the इशावास्यालीपिक्र.

The संहिता of the कृष्णदुर्गेन्द्र is arranged in seven books (अष्टक or काण्डs) containing from five to eight lectures (अष्टमेष, प्रश्न or प्रानंदक). Each lecture is subdivided into अष्टवाक्स. The first अष्टवाक corresponds with the first कण्डिका of the इशान संहिता, but all the rest differ, and so does the arrangement of the subjects. Many of the topics are indeed alike in both the संहिताः, but differently placed and differently treated. Thus the ceremony called राजय औष्ट्व occupies the eighth प्रश्न of the first अष्टक and is preceded by the वाजपेय and the mode of its celebration, which occupy fourteen sections in the preceding प्रश्न. Consecrated fire is the subject of the fourth and fifth books. The seventh book treats largely of the ज्वोतिषम, including the forms of preparing and drinking the Soma juice.

1. A general idea of the contents of the Yajurveda may be had from the following quotation from Macdonell's *History of Sanskrit Literature* (p. 183): "The religion of the Yajurveda may be described as a kind of mechanical sacerdotalism. A crowd of priests conducts a vast and complicated system of external ceremonies, to which symbolical significance is attributed and to the smallest minutiae of which the greatest weight is attached. In this stifling atmosphere of perpetual sacrifice and ritual, the truly religious spirit of the Rigveda could not possibly survive. Adoration of the power and beneficence of the gods, as well as the consciousness of guilt, is entire-
We pass on to the last of the संहिता, that of the अथर्वेद, which is much later in origin and which thus forms the transition from the संहिता to the बाज्रगा. The text of the अथर्वेद consists of twenty काण्डs, each काण्ड is divided into several अंशयाक्षs, and each अंशयाक्ष contains a number of चक्स. The contents of काण्ड 1 to 7 are distributed according to the number of stanzas contained in the hymns. In काण्ड 1 the hymns have on the average four stanzas; in 2, five; in 3, six; in 4, seven; in 5, eight to eighteen; in 6, three; and in 7, about half the hymns have only one stanza each. काण्डs 8—13 contain longer pieces. The contents of all these thirteen काण्डs are indiscriminately intermingled.

The following five काण्डs on the contrary, are arranged according to uniformity of subject-matter. काण्ड 14 contains the stanzas relating to the wedding rite, which consist largely of मन्त्रs from the tenth मण्डल of the Rigveda. काण्ड 15 is a glorification of the Supreme Being under the name of Vṛtya, while 16 and 17 contain certain conjurations. The whole of 15 and nearly the whole of 16, moreover, are composed in prose of the type found in the बाज्रगा. काण्ड 18 deals with burial and the manes; like 14, it derives most of its stanzas from the tenth मण्डल of the Rigveda. काण्ड 19 consists of a

ly lacking, every prayer being coupled with some particular rite and aiming solely at securing material advantages. As a natural result, the formulae of the काजुरवेदa are full of dreary repetitions or variations of the same idea, and abound with half or wholly unintelligible interjections, particularly the syllable om."

1. The codex is no doubt a late product; but, as Macdonell (History of Sanskrit Literature, p. 185) rightly observes: "The spirit which breathes in it is that of a prehistoric age. A few of its actual charms probably date with little modification from the Indo-European period."—V. S. S.
mixture of supplementary pieces. काण्ड 20, with a slight exception, contains only complete hymns addressed to Indra, which are borrowed, directly and without any variation from the Rigveda. The matter of this last काण्ड relates to the ऋषिष्ठ ritual, and is entirely foreign to the spirit of the अथर्वेद. It was undoubtedly added to establish the claim of the Atharva to the position of a fourth Veda; by bringing it into connection with the recognized sacrificial ceremonial of the three old Vedas.

From an historical point of view, the अथर्वेद is far more important than the बुद्धेद, inasmuch as the former is not at all liturgical in character. The अथर्वेद gives us an insight into the habits and customs of the masses in general. To quote Whitney: "The most prominent characteristic feature of the Atharvan is the multitude of incantations which it contains; these are pronounced either by the person who is himself to be benefited, or, more often by the sorcerer for him, and are directed to the procuring of the greatest variety of desirable ends: most frequently, perhaps, long life, or recovery from grievous sickness, is the object sought; then a talisman, such as a necklace, is sometimes given, or in very numerous cases, some plant endowed with marvellous virtues is to be the immediate external means of the cure; further, the attainment of wealth or power is aimed at, the downfall of enemies, success in love or in play, the removal of petty pests, and so on, even down to the growth of hair on a bald pate."

The अथर्वेद is also named एवरेद, or the Veda of the बहुन priest, the general director of the sacrificial ceremonial. That this was a mere pretence intended to attract greater sacredness to it, because the बहुन was supposed to know all the
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The goddess Prithvi, who appeared at once and offered a divine throne to Mahārāja and seated him on it. The goddess then made him a great scholar. To Mahārāja, enlightened by the boon of the goddess of Earth, there appeared or was revealed, the Brāhmaṇa and Āraṇyaka called the Āretaṇa Brāhmaṇa and Āretaṇa Āraṇyaka.

The Brāhmaṇa is divided into eight parīkṣas or pentads, each of which contains five ṛṣyaḥs. Thus the whole work consists of forty chapters. ṛṣyaḥs 1 to 13 treat of the duties of the hīrāṇa priest in the āśvinaḥ sacrifice; 14 explains the meaning of the term āśvinaḥ and several other matters; 15 to 17 describe the uṣṭha, pātṛaḥ, āddhāta and other sacrifices; 18 contains the rules to be observed by the hīrāṇa priest; ṛṣyaḥs 19 to 24 treat of the duties of the hīrāṇa priest at the twelve minor sacrifices; 25, the expiatory ceremonies to be performed by the āstamaṇa, the time of performing the āśvinaḥ sacrifice and the duties of the hīrāṇa priest; 26 to 30, of the duties of the āṣaktā, dūṣṇaḥ and the six minor priests at the Soma sacrifice; 31 to 40, of the sacrifices to be performed by a śāṭriya, and the mutual relation of the Brāhmaṇas and the Āraṇyakas.

The other Brāhmaṇa of the Rigveda is called कौमित्रिकः Brāhmaṇa and represents the वैष्णवविहिता.

To the सात्रिवेद belong several Brāhmaṇas of which the लावण (or प्रजालिंग) and the पदविं (a supplement of the previous one) are well-known.

To the सर्वसत्रेय is attached the शैविक ब्राह्मण, and to the शैवसर्वसत्रेय, the शातपथ ब्राह्मण, so called because it consists of 100 chapters. This work is, next to the Rigveda, the most important production in the whole range of Vedic literature.
The ब्राह्मणस have not only provided the priests with the details of sacrificial ritual; but they also contain the basis of grammar and etymology, subjects which were afterwards developed to such a great extent as to attain the dignity of science. If we bring together all the scattered etymological passages in the several ब्राह्मणस they by themselves would make a good निरुक्त, and one may notice in यास्क’s निरुक्त the frequent quotations from ब्राह्मणस (ending with शति ई विष्णुपते or शति ब्राह्मणस) which he brings forward in support of the particular etymology he proposes. More important than this is the fact that the ब्राह्मणस contain the germs of the later epic tales. कालेज the celebrated King of the कुस्तिन in the महाभारत is mentioned here for the first time, in this शतपथ ब्राह्मण. The पाण्डुस however, who proved victorious in the epic war, are unknown to the early literature, either ब्राह्मणस or कुस्तिन and अर्जुन is still a name of इन्द्र. But as the epic अर्जुन is a son of इन्द्र, his origin is doubtless to be traced to this epithet of Indra. Of two legends which furnished the classical poet काठिवास with the plots of two of his most famous dramas, one is told here in detail, and the other is at least alluded to. The story of the love and separation of दुर्गसुदुर्ग and दुर्गदी अस ond अनुसािन, already dimly shadowed forth in a hymn of the Rigveda, is here related in greater detail. भगवा, son of दुर्गसुन and of the nymph शुकुनि, also appears on the scene in this ब्राह्मण.

To the अर्जुन belongs the गाय्यन ब्राह्मण which consists of two books, (the first containing five chapters, the second six), both evidently very late in origin. 

Though the ब्राह्मणs represent, no doubt, a most interesting phase in the history of Indian thought, still, judged as literary productions, they are most disappointing. The
general impression they produce is one of pedantry and, if I may say so, sometimes of downright absurdity. There is no lack of striking thoughts, of bold expression, of sound reasoning and curious traditions in these collections, but these are only like precious gems set in a base metal. The general character of these works is marked by shallow and insipid grandiloquence, by priestly conceit, and antiquarian pedantry. The decline and degeneration of the simple and pure spirit of the Rigveda is seen everywhere, accompanied by a complete misunderstanding, of the old Vedic literature, resulting from the idea that everything else is subsidiary to sacrifice. How this spirit affected the traditional course of Vedic exegesis will be more fully explained on another occasion.¹

To this period of the Vedic literature also belong works going by the name of आरण्यकs and उपनिषद्वेंs which often form only the concluding portions of the several बाल्लाणs, but which on account of the absolutely distinct character of their contents and language deserve to be reckoned as a distinct category of literature. The आरण्यकs are so-called perhaps because they were works to be read in the forest (आरण्य) in contradistinction to the regular बाल्लाणs, which were to be read in the village (ग्राम). सायण on the तैतिरियारण्यक says:

अरण्याध्ययनादेतदारण्यकमितिैत ।
अरण्ये तदवादेतितेर्व वात्स्य प्रचक्षयते।

Or the reason might be that these आरण्यकs were the बाल्लाणs for the vow of the anchorite, as they contain explanations of the ritual and allegorical speculations thereon.

¹ See below Chapter V.
This alone was possible for the ब्राह्मण, as a substitute for the actual sacrificial observances which were no longer practicable. The आरण्यकas form a natural transition to the speculation of the उपनिषद्व's altogether emancipated as these are from the limitations of a formal cult. Thus it may be seen that these three classes of works, the ब्राह्मण's proper, the आरण्यकas and the उपनिषद्व's mark three consecutive stages, not only in the Indian thought in general but in the life of every individual. The ब्राह्मण's advocating the actual observances of the sacrifice are meant for the गृहस्थ; the आरण्यकa whose subject is the allegorical sacrifice, for the वानप्रस्थ; and the उपनिषद्व's purely philosophic, for the सन्न्यासिन्य. They mark the three distinct paths to निःश्रव्यस्य, viz. कृष्ण, उपासना and हान.

The उपनिषद्व's mark an absolutely different path from that of the works that preceded them in the Vedic canon. The उपनिषद्व's comprehended in the Vedas, are, however, included in the वैदिक and are at present the most popular works. They are popularly called the वेदांत, perhaps because they form the closing part of the Vedic canon, or because they contain the highest and ultimate goal of the Veda as they deal with मोक्ष or Supreme Bliss. They are, as it were, the kernel of the whole revelation. It is to be noted that though they are looked upon as the basis of all the six systems of theistic philosophy, still it is only one of these, the उत्तरामीमांसा or वेदांत, that has received the title as such. Knowledge, and not mere ceremonial, is the way to happiness, that is the keynote of the works we are now considering. The overdoing of the sacrificial cult brought on its own downfall, which culminated in the उपनिषद्व.
The word उपनिषदा originally meant a ‘sitting, confidential secret sitting’ (in contrast to परिषद or संसद, an ‘assembly’) and then, a ‘secret teaching, secret doctrine,’ a रहस्य. उपनिषद्व are frequently spoken of as: इति रहस्यम् (नृसिद्धि, <), गुहा आदेशः (छान्दियम् २. ५. २.) परमं गुहा (केत्त २. १५). An attempt to maintain secrecy with regard to abstruse, and therefore easily misunderstood, doctrines seem to be implied in such warnings as: रहस्य वाचन तत्त्वेष्ठाय पुत्राय पिता वाह प्राणायं प्राणायाय वासुदेवासिनेन (छान्दियम् ३.१ १.५.)

One who has read the उपनिषद्व may have been struck by the feature that a teacher refuses to impart instruction to a pupil who has approached him, until by persistence in his endeavour, he has proved his worthiness to receive the instruction, as is illustrated, for instance, by the story of निमंत्रकुष्यं and the god of death (in कठ) or by that of हन्द और प्रत्यदेन (कौशिकी).

Originally there must have been one उपनिषद for every शाख of the four Vedas, just like the बाह्यां. At present we know of the following उपनिषद्व, the ऐतरेियांगिषद, the कौशिक, (both belonging to the कृष्णवंड); कृष्णीय (belonging to the वामवंड); तैतिरिय, कठ and शेताश्चेत (belonging to the कृष्णार्नवंड); बहुदारण्यक and इश्व (to the शुक्र वात्सिंहवंड). The number of उपनिषद्व belonging to the अथवंड is large, amongst which the सूक्तक, माण्हक and प्रश्न, may be mentioned. The ten principal उपनिषद्व known as दशोपनिषद्व are: बहुदारण्यक, ऐतरेिय, कृष्णीय, तैतिरिय, इश्व, केत्त कठ, प्रश्न, सूक्तक, माण्हक. 'What is this world?,' 'Who am I?,' 'What becomes of me after death?': such questions are asked and boldly answered in these उपनिषद्व. There is an utter absence of systematic uniformity about them. The freedom and the breadth of thought which one meets with in the उपनिषद्व are remarkable, and may be appreciated if
one recalls that not only the वेदांतिवास but also the सास्यs and वेदोंs, the वेदोंवासिकs and वेदशास्त्रिकs profess to base their systems on the teachings of the उपनिषद्स. It is unnecessary to give a synopsis of the उपनिषद्स, as these are easily accessible and much indeed has been written on them both in English and in the Vernaculars. But it would not be out of place to refer here to the question as to what the उपनिषद्स teach, which has been answered in various ways. Many eminent scholars, along with the orthodox Hindus, especially of महाराष्ट्र, hold that the शंकरेन्द्रांन्त represents the true teaching of the उपनिषद्स. In spite of many inconsistent and mutually incoherent texts met with therein, the शंकरेन्द्रांन्त has best succeeded in accommodating all and evolving one definite system therefrom. The gist of the उपनिषद्स according to this view may be summed up as follows:

(1) The आत्मा is the knowing subject within us.¹
(2) The आत्मा, as the knowing subject, is itself unknowable.²
(3) The आत्मा is the sole reality. It is the metaphysical unity which is manifested in all empirical plurality; an indication that all plurality is mere माया.³

Thus, these people say that though the expression माया, in the strict sense of ignorance or अविष्कार or illusion,

¹ Cf. बुद्ध 3. 8. 11: नान्यद्वारस्तिः द्वीत नान्यद्वारस्ति श्रीमान् नान्यद्वारस्तिः मन्त्र नान्यद्वारस्तिः निहाराः.
² बुद्ध 3. 4. 2: न बुद्धेद्वारस्तिः पर्ययः न बुद्धि: श्रीमान्तं श्रीमान्तं न मतेन्द्रां मन्त्राः न निहारेन्द्रां निहारा: न निहारां.
³ बुद्ध 2. 4. 5: आत्मानो वा अर्थ द्वारस्ति अविष्कार मन्त्र निहारान्ति इत्यादि विनिति भवति.
may be of a later date, still the doctrine that the universe is illusory was taught already in the उपनिषद्स; and that the older the texts of the उपनिषद्स the more emphatically do they maintain this illusory character of the world of experience.

On the other hand, others hold the view that the उपनिषद्स contain no one doctrine, as evidenced from the fact that all the six systems of philosophy try to deduce their doctrines from the उपनिषद्स; that even the germs of the so-called नास्तिक schools like the बौद्ध धर्म and जैन धर्म were present in them. This view is well stated in the very first paragraph of his 'Vaishnavism Saivism and minor religious systems' by Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar, which may be quoted here, as it points out very lucidly the standpoint from which we should regard the उपनिषद्स. "The old Vedic gods became indissolubly involved in the elaborate and mechanical system of worship that had grown up. Speculations as regards the appropriateness of the rules and modes of worship and their efficacy as regards man's good in this world and the next became prevalent. But all this did not satisfy the religious spirit of the people. Religious speculation of a more natural order came to be established about the close of the Hymn-period and was continued into that of the उपनिषद्स. The various problems about God, man and the world engaged the attention of many thinkers and a variety of solutions was arrived at. It is generally believed that the उपनिषद्स teach a system of Pantheism; but a close examination will show that they teach not one, but various systems of doctrines as regards the nature of God, man and the world and the relations between them. The religio-philosophy..."
phic systems of modern times, which are mutually inconsistent, quote texts from the उपनिषद्व as an authority for their special doctrines. These references to the old books are correct in the most prominent cases, but when the advocates of the systems force into other texts of an opposite nature a meaning consistent with their own special doctrines, they are manifestly wrong. That the उपनिषद्व teach not one but various systems must follow from the fact that they are compilations just as the Rigveda संहिता is. The speculations of the old seers were clothed by them in words, and these were handed down orally and came to form a large floting mass”.

We have now arrived at the third and last period of Vedic literature, viz. the चृत period; from श्रुति we now pass on to स्मृति. The चृत works form the connecting link between the Vedic and the post-Vedic literatures. The style of these works, the चृत style, is very peculiar and stands unrivalled in the history of all the literatures of the world. If the शास्त्र envisaged the side of verbooseness and repetition, these erred on the side of brevity. A चृत means an aphorism, a sentence highly artificial, enigmatic and as brief as possible. The चृतs were merely mnemonic catchwords, the rest of the doctrines being stored up in memory or developed in the form of a commentary. They have absolutely no literary or esthetic value and are quite unintelligible without commentaries. For the sake of brevity, certain technical words (or संज्ञाः) and some conventional rules of interpretation (परिभाषाः) were invented, which made the चृतs mere riddles to one who did not first master the former. The grammar aphorisms of पाणिनि are the most typical product of the चृत style. Brevity was valued more than everything else. The saving of but one syllable.
was regarded as a matter of greater joy than even the birth of a son. And this desire for brevity may be explained thus. The ब्राह्मणs and other works relating to the sacrificial ritual became so voluminous and bulky that it became almost impossible to remember them and utilize them. Hence arose the necessity of short and convenient treatises which could be easily committed to memory. Of course in the days when the ritualistic observances were actually in full vogue, these ब्राह्मण treatises could not have been as obscure and unintelligible to them for whom they were meant as they became afterwards; for, in early times many things must have been quite familiar and plain which are now perfectly unintelligible.

The most important works belonging to the ब्राह्मण literature are the six ब्राह्मणs. This name does not imply the existence of six distinct books or treatises intimately connected with the sacred writings, but merely the admission to the Vedic canon of six subjects the study of which was necessary for the reading, understanding or proper sacrificial employment of the Veda. The six treatises known as the ब्राह्मणs are शिष्या (pronunciation), चन्द्रसू (metre), व्याकरण (grammar), निस्व (etymology), ज्योतिष (astronomy), and कस्त्र (ceremonial), which we shall now briefly review in order.

तारण defines शिष्या thus: शिष्या वैद्यवाचधिकवाते स्वर्णविकोक्ष सवासी शिष्या. It was a name given to works containing rules regarding the proper pronunciation of Vedic texts. The prose work now known as शिष्या (generally printed at the end of the शाहिता along with other ब्राह्मणs) must be, no doubt, a very modern work and one of the least successful attempts presupposing many similar works in the past. These शिष्या works must have been originally embodied as chapters in the ब्राह्मणs.
but were later included in more scientific treatises known as आदिवास्य्यां. "These आदिवास्य्यां were written for practical purposes: their style is free from cumbrous ornaments and unnecessary subtleties. It is their object to teach and not to edify; to explain, not to discuss." The word आदिवास्य्य �literally means 'that which belongs to every शाखा.' In the course of time, as the spoken language underwent changes, the language of the scriptures must have begun to appear archaic. Besides, different persons or groups of persons must have differed from each other in the matter of the pronunciation of the texts, which gave rise to different शाखां or recensions of one and the same Vedic text. So that ultimately the necessity of laying down certain rules regarding the phonetics and metre was felt, in order to stop any further changes. Thus came into existence the आदिवास्य्यां, each intended for a particular शाखा.

Here I may explain the proper signification of the term शाखा and other allied words. The word शाखा literally means a 'branch', which is very vaguely used by the orthodox people. The four Vedas are often spoken of as the four branches or शाखां of the Veda. But more properly the word applies to a text of the Veda as read and handed down in a particular school, corresponding to our modern readings or recensions. In general, the शाखां of the same Veda differed very little from each other, except in the matter of pronunciation, or the addition or omission of a few verses. Thus शाखा means a particular text and not a particular school. अनुभवति during the performance of his संस्कार, before uttering his name, says शाकलशाखाध्यायी, that is, one who reads or studies the text of the Rigveda as handed down by the शाकल (as opposed to the नाकल, now extinct).
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leads us to चरण, a word also very promiscuously used. It is explained by जगद्धर in his commentary on the माल्यमणविषय as:

चरणद: शाखाविविदथियनपरैक्तापरिजनसहानवाची.

A number of men formed into one body, pledged to the reading of a certain शाखा of the Veda. Thus चरण denotes the aggregate of the students of a particular recension of the Vedic text. परिषद is another word in this connection, meaning an assembly of वाह्यां's meeting together and containing men belonging to different चरणs. According to मठ and याज्ञवल्क्य, a परिषद ought to consist of twenty-one वाह्यā's well-versed in philosophy, logic and theology. पराशर says:

चतवारो वा भयो वापि वेदवन्तोज्ञाधिकोटित्रिण: ।

वाह्यांनां समर्थाः ये परिषत्सा विचीयते ॥

Thus a परिषद corresponds to University, which may consist of persons belonging to different चरणs or colleges. And the books or treatises belonging to a परिषद are called पार्षद्य, which may contain not only the प्रातिसार्यs concerning the several शाखास of the चरणs but other kinds of treatises also.

There is one प्रातिसार्य, written by शौनिक, for the शाक्त-शाखा of the Rigveda. Another there is for the यजुर्वेद, attributed to काल्याण, and the चुंदरायायिका (also by शौनिक) forms the प्रातिसार्य for the अथवेद. Of these, I may briefly notice here the contents of the शाक्तप्रातिसार्य by शौनिक, in order to give you an idea of what kind of works these so-called प्रातिसार्यs are. This प्रातिसार्य seems to be a comparatively late work, since it is a mixture of खट and अनुद्द्ध शौनिकs which latter were the distinguishing feature of the post खट works. It is divided into three अध्याय each of which is again divided into 6.
of which there are thus 18 in all. The 1st वेच्छ called the परिमापाप्ल holds treats of letters, vowels and consonants, their varieties and peculiarities, and other technical matters. The 2nd वेच्छ called the संबिलाप्ल holds treats of the संहिता and especially the combinations and mutations of vowels. वेच्छ 3 treats of accents; 4, 5 and 6, of the combinations and mutations of consonants; 7 to 9, of the circumflex accent; 11, of the elision of nasals, etc.; 12, of compound letters; 13, of the origin of letters, of the different प्रयोग or internal efforts, which precede the utterance of letters; 14, of the powers of letters; 15, of the rules for reading the Veda within certain prescribed times; and 16 to 18, of metres, their feet and their presiding divinities.

The second वेच्छ is छत्र्य which is also designed for the purpose of securing the proper reading and reciting of Vedic texts. As we have seen, the closing sections of the शीनक्ष’s प्रातिकास्त्व treat of this very subject. The वेच्छ work known at present is a work by थिन्द, which, however, cannot be the oldest वेच्छ. For थिन्द’s treatise deals with the Vedic as well as classical metres, looking upon both as equally important. As in the case of the रित्स, we have whole chapters in जात्मक, and आर्थपक्ष, explaining and accounting for the names of the different metres. Of the Vedic metres I shall speak more fully in another lecture.

The third वेच्छ is व्याकरण or grammar, which is necessary for the understanding of the Veda, and the work which now passes for this वेच्छ is the बदीचायगी of पाणिनि. This could not have been originally the वेच्छ proper, since as remarked already the बदीचायगी deals mainly with the classical Sanskrit, and only by way of exception with the Vedic Sanskrit. It is
more reasonable to suppose that the work marks the last attempt in this province, which on account of its great merits acquired such a great celebrity as to supersede almost all that had been written on grammar before it.

Two other छः works on grammar deserve to be noticed here, both belonging to a period anterior to पाणिनि; the छः on the उणादि affixes and the फिट्रक्ष्य. The उणादि affixes are those by which nouns are formed from roots, the nouns being used in a conventional sense, and not in strict accordance with their radical meaning. They are called उणादि, because in the छः, as we have them, उण is the first-mentioned affix. In their present form, the छः seem to treat the Vedic words as exceptions. The फिट्रक्ष्यs treat only of the accent and as the accent is used in Vedic words only, this second collection of छः is only meant for the Vedic dialect.

The fourth वेदाङ्ग, to which we shall now turn, is the निष्क्र, concerning itself with the derivation or etymology of words, and as such necessary for the understanding of the Vedic text. This वेदाङ्ग is at present represented by the work of वास्क. It is necessary here, in order to avoid confusion, to distinguish the two works from each other, which are both attributed to वास्क. One is the निष्क्र consisting of mere lists of words, and the other is the commentary on the same; and it must be the former work which is regarded as the वेदाङ्ग. The peculiarity of this वेदाङ्ग is that it is solely devoted to

1. Dr. K. K. Pathak, Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute, 1922-23, pp. 111 ff., citing Katyayana, Patanjali, Jnendrabuddhi, Rāyata, and Haradatta comends that Panini is the author of the Undal Sutras also.—V.S.S.

2. On the Nirukta, see the excellent edition by Lakshman Sarup, The Nighantu and the Nirukta, Oxford University Press, 1920-21.—V.S.S.
Vedic words. The निष्णु or समास्वयम consists of three portions divided according to the subject-matter of the words. The first of these is called the नैष्णुक काण्ड, where, for the most part, lists of synonymous words are given. This portion occupies the first three अध्यायाः. In the first of these, words connected with things relating to space, time etc. in this and other worlds are given. In the second, words connected with men, their limbs, etc., and in the third, words expressing qualities of both the preceding objects, such as thinness, shortness, etc., are given. The fourth अध्याय, which forms the second portion of the समास्वयम or the vocabulary, is called नैगम काण्ड; since for the most part, it consists of obsolete Vedic words and homonyms; for this reason, it is also called एकपदिक काण्ड. The fifth and the last chapter of the समास्वयम, forming the third portion, is called वैवलकाण्ड; for the names of the देवताः or deities are given therein.

On this vocabulary is written a commentary which is also called निष्णु and which is very important for several reasons. Firstly, it represents the type of the earliest classical style and in this respect stands by itself. Secondly, it is the oldest known attempt in the field of Vedic exegesis, unparalleled in respect of ingenuity and boldness, and at the same time, firmly founded on the material provided by the भाष्याः and भाष्याकार्, which are full of incidental references to etymological explanations of words.

This निष्णु consists of twelve chapters followed by two more परिशिष्ट chapters; each chapter is further divided into several संध्यास (sections). Of these the first three अध्यायाः form the नैष्णुककाण्ड dealing with the words in the first three अध्यायाः of the original निष्णु. अध्यायाः 4 to 6 form the नैगम or एकपदिक
dealing with the obsolete Vedic words contained in अष्टाध्याय 4 of the निष्णु. And the remaining six अष्टाध्याय form the दैवत काण्ड, corresponding to the 5th अष्टाध्याय of the निष्णु. The most interesting portion is the discussion which covers the whole of the first अष्टाध्याय, and a part of the second, as well as the seventh अष्टाध्याय, which was as an admirable introduction to the study of the Veda.

यास्क begins with four parts of speech, नाम, भास्त्रात, उपसर्ग and निपात (nouns, verbs, prepositions and other indeclinables) which he defines and distinguishes from each other clearly. He then proceeds to establish the main standpoint of the school to which he belongs, viz. that all nouns are derived from verbs, after refuting in his own way all that can be said against that view. I abstain from citing the discussion in full, since a separate course of lectures bearing on Nirukta alone has been arranged for you. However, I cannot refrain from quoting the pertinent remarks of Max Müller in this connection: "I doubt, whether even at present, with all the new light which comparative philology has shed on the origin of words, questions like these could be discussed more satisfactorily than they were by Yāska. Like Yāska we maintain that all nouns have their derivation, but like Yāska we must confess that this is a matter of belief rather than of proof. We admit with Yāska that every noun was originally an appellative and in strict logic, we are bound to admit that language knows neither of homonyms nor synonyms. But granting that there are such words in the history of every language, granting that several objects sharing in the same predicate, may be called by the same name, and that the same

object possessing various predicates, may be called by the
different names, we shall find it as impossible as Yāska to lay
down any rule why one of the many appellatives became
fixed in every dialect as the proper name of the Sun, the
Moon, or any other object or why generic words were found-
ed on one predicate rather than another. All we can say is
what Yāska says, it was so Svabhāvatah by itself, from acci-
dent, through the influence of individuals, of poets or law-
givers. It is the very point in the history of language, where
languages are not amenable to organic laws, where the
science of language ceases to be a strict science, and enters
into the domain of history."

Bārīk next proceeds to explain the purpose served by
्निरुत्त, in which connection there is a very interesting discus-
sion whether the महत्त्र of the Veda (for whose understanding
the निरुत्त is mainly intended) are possessed of a meaning
or not. Even in Bārīk's time, it appears, the Vedic language
had become partly unintelligible. The first chapter con-
cludes with some verses eulogising him who knows the
meaning of the Vedas. The second chapter opens with a
statement of the canons which he lays down for the deriva-
tion of words. In the case of those words where the
accentuation and formation are grammatically regular and
where there is a direct connection between the meaning of
the word and the appellative power of the root, there is no
difficulty: but where no such thing is possible, we should
only look to the sense of the word and try to derive it either
on the ground of some common meaning or even of some
common letters. It is with the fifth सई of the 2nd अर्थम
that the derivation of the regular lists of words begins.
I wish to draw your attention here to two important points regarding यास्क who is alleged to be the author of both treatises. The first is that यास्क is far prior to पाणिनि as is evident from the facts that पाणिनि quotes his name in the चतुर्यस्कादिविषयों गोवे (II. 4. 63), that many grammatical संज्ञाś occur in पाणिनि's work which he does not define, being probably well known in his time and having been already well defined and explained by his predecessors; whereas in the very beginning of यास्क's work, the author thinks it necessary to explain the distinction between nouns and verbs. The same conclusion follows from the fact that an improvement on the treatment of prepositions is to be observed in पाणिनि's grammar, both as regards the different sub-divisions of them and their meanings. The second point to be noticed is that यास्क, the author of the निरूठ, is a different person from यास्क, the author of the निष्णु, and for the following reasons: In the first place यास्क himself says towards the end of the first अध्याय of the निरूठ, that there were कथिस who had a direct revelation of दर्ष. They communicated the मश्स by oral instruction to those who came after them and had not such a knowledge. Their successors again becoming unfit for oral instruction, prepared this work (viz. the समासाय or निष्णु), the Veda and the वेदांस. Here यास्क the author of निरूठ distinctly says that the निष्णु was the work of some former कथिस. In the second place, although यास्क invariably explains the words, according to their order in the निष्णु, he in one case makes an exception, viz., with the words दाते and अहंपरस्य (IV. 17). In illustrating the use of these words, यास्क quotes a part of a verse from the वेद in which both the words occur, but in a different

order. On this, ज्ञेन्द्र in his वृत्ति on the निर्मक remarks: "The order of the words in the मन्त्र is अक्षारार्थ द्वारा but in the समाःप्राय, the order is reverse." Hence it is known that the समाःप्राय is related by some अनुवस्थान and that the commentator is different from them. Lastly at the conclusion of his work, यास्क says: "A salutation to यास्क". Here he must have been doubtless thinking of his ancestor, who was the author of the समाःप्राय.2

I cannot leave this subject without asking each and every student of the Rigveda to read the book and to remember that but for यास्क's attempts at explanation, howsoever unreasonable they might appear to us sometimes, (notwithstanding that the existence of some traditional authority for the interpretations and derivations he offers is implied), many a verse of the Rigveda would have remained absolutely unintelligible to us.

The fifth वेदांस्त्र is कल्प (ritual), which is specially intended for the proper application of the Vedic texts. The कल्पान्त्रांस proper are based upon the बाह्यां, which are full of rich material, and these pre-suppose a methodical and fixed distribution of the sacrificial rites amongst the different kinds of priests. They contain the rules referring to sacrifices, with the omission of all things which are not immediately connected with the ceremonial. They are more practical than the बाह्यां, which for the most part are taken up with mystical historical, mythological, etymological and theological discussions. The following remarks of वास्यां in his commentary

2. The authorship of the निर्देश्न and the निर्मक has been also discussed by Karmarkar and Siddheshwar Varma in the Proceedings and Transactions of the First Oriental Conference, Poona, pp. 62 ff.—V.S.S.
on the बौधयण छृतs will serve to give you an idea of the nature and purpose of the कल्पस्रृतs:

तत्त्व ततार्थायस्मंद्राद्वतना दिष्टा व्यवस्थितो वेदराष्टः। विधिविधितमर्थे-
वायुप्रजीवितं ममेण स्मृतमेणुस्तोऽकरी भवतितसः। ततथ चोदितानां कर्मणां सुखा-
ध्वनिशाय भगवान् बौधयणः कुलपकल्पयत्। यतो श्रावण्यानामानन्त्यं हुरवशोभतया
अतो न सैः सुखं कर्मांव्रोध द्विति कल्पस्रृत्राणीमानि प्रतिनियतानान्त्यरान्तौः
चकुः पूर्वोचयः। कल्पस्य बौधयणवात्स्यप्रकरणाद्वपादिभः प्रकर्ष्युप्यक्ष्यः । ।

There are two कल्पस्रृतs for the हौदृ priests, one by आश्लापण, and the other by शाळ्पावण. Of these the आश्लापण श्रीतद्वृत is
divided into two main parts, each part consisting of 6 अव्यायs, and
each अव्याय being again divided into several कण्डकाः. They deal with द्रवि and चिरिक्षास and such other Vedic
sacrifices.

There are several छृतs for the अव्याय priest, of which the छृत of बौधयण and आपस्तम्भ (belonging to the कुण्याज्ञ्वंद्र), and
those of काल्यचायन (belonging to the शुक्यज्ञ्वंद्र) may be men-
tioned here. The छृतs for the ceremonial of the उद्यां थ्र priests,
who followed the स्वामेन्द्र, are ascribed to लॉम्यायण and याश्लायण,
both following the authority of the तांपञ्चायण.

"The कल्पस्रृतs are important in the history of Vedic
Literature, because they not only mark a new period of
literature and a new purpose in the literary and religious
life of India, but they contributed to the gradual extinction
of the numerous श्रावणs which to us are, therefore, only known
by name. The introduction of a कल्पस्रृत was the introduction

1. Max Muller, op. cit. p. 170: 'The kalpasutras have the advantage of
being clear, short, complete and correct'.

2. For a synopsis of the contents, see the edition of the text
published in the Bibliotheca Indica series.—V. S. S.
of a new book of liturgy . . . In a short time, the authors of कृताक्त� became themselves the founders of new चारणाः, in which the द्वार्शेष were considered the most essential portion of the sacred literature, so that the hymns and भाषणाः were either neglected or kept up under the name of the hymns and भाषणाः of the new चारणाः having ceased to form by themselves the foundation of an independent tradition or school."

To the same category of literature belong two other classes of द्वार्शेष, the ग्रहुद्वार्शेष and the सामायाचारिकद्वार्शेष. Both are included under the common title of स्मार्तद्वार्शेष, in opposition to the कृताक्तां, noticed above. These latter deal with rites and sacrifices enjoined by the Vedas and thus derive their authority from स्मृति (i.e., मर्यादा and भाषणा.) The former, however, derive their authority only from स्मृति or immemorial tradition. The ग्रहुद्वार्शेष deal with ceremonies performed by the married householders, chiefly for the benefit of the family; whereas the सामायाचारिकद्वार्शेष deal with rules to be observed by the rising generation regulating the various relations of everyday life. It is these, also called as ग्रहुद्वार्शेष in which are to be discovered the originals of the later metrical law-codes such as the महृद्वार्शेष, याज्ञवलिकम्भ्रमति and others. Of the ग्रहुद्वार्शेष there may be mentioned here, the पारस्कर ग्रहुद्वार्शेष (belonging to the माण्डलिक शाखा of the वृहद्धेक), the गोविन्द ग्रहुद्वार्शेष (belonging to the सामायाचारिक), and the आश्वामत ग्रहुद्वार्शेष and शाहस्त्रायण ग्रहुद्वार्शेष (belonging to the कृताक्त). The आश्वामत ग्रहुद्वार्शेष consists of four अध्यायाः, being sub-divided into 24, 10, 12, and 2 sections respectively. The topics dealt with are: पाकवण्ड, the sacrificial ceremony which is intended to impart

1. Max Muller, op. cit. p. 186, f.
to a man an aptitude without which he would be excluded from the sacrifices, and from all the benefits of his devotion; विशिष्ट, offering oblations to Gods; चौँकक्रमी the ceremony of cutting the hair of the child; उपासना the ceremony of investing him as a student and handing him over to a युह, under whose care he is to study the scriptures and to perform all the offices of a ब्राह्मचारिण or a religious student; समावर्तन, returning from the युह's house, after having served his apprenticeship and grown up to manhood; विवाह, marriage and other ceremonies relating to the life of a house-holder, domestic rites in which certainly there is more of human interest than in the great sacrifices described in the शैतान्त्रिकs. The offerings themselves are generally of a simple nature and the ceremonial does not require the assistance of a large number of professional priests. A log of wood placed on the fire of the hearth, an oblation poured out to the gods or alms given to the जानकारणs; this is what constitutes a पाकःय.¹ In all this उम्मा ritual is disclosed that deep-rooted tendency in the heart of man to bring the chief events of human life in connection with a higher power, and to give to our joys and sufferings a deeper significance and a religious sanctification.

The last वेदामक to be noticed is ज्योतिष or astronomy, which is represented by one little tract, the object of which is not to teach astronomy, but to convey such knowledge of the heavenly bodies as is necessary for fixing the days and hours of the Vedic sacrifices. In जानकारणs and ज्योतिष्कs, we find frequent allusions to astronomical subjects, and even in the hymns we find traces which indicate a certain advance in

¹ The several kinds of spiritual or metaphorical युहs described in स० IV of स० श्री may be noticed in this connection.
the observation of the moon, as the measurer of time; the intercalary month is referred to in the Rigveda (I. 25. 8.)

In conclusion I wish to draw your attention to some miscellaneous works of less importance belonging to this period, which scarcely deserve the name of literature. Such, for instance, are the अतुकमणि's or systematic indices to various portions of the ancient Vedic literature. Amongst these the most important is the सर्वांगक्रमणी of the Rigveda, by काल्यायन. It gives the first words of each hymn, the number of verses, the name and family of the poets, the names of the deities, and the metres of every verse. बहुक्रिक्तिक्रिया tells us in his बद्रीनाथी, a commentary of this सर्वांगक्रमणी, that before काल्यायन there existed one index of the poets, one of the metres, one of the deities, one of the अनुवाक्ष (the old chapters of the Rigveda), and one of the hymns, and that these indices were composed by शीनक to whom the well-known work बहुहेंतत्ता is also ascribed. For the यजुवेद, there are three अतुकमणि's one for the आर्येय शाखा of तैत्तिरिया, the other for the शाखा of the बृहस्पतिय and the third for the मायोंद्वेद शाखा of the बाजसेनायिन. For the सामवेद the oldest अतुकमणि is the आर्येय ब्राह्मण, "other existing अतुकमणि's being much later. For the अथवेद there is one इहितस्वार्तक्रमणी.

Besides these अतुकमणि's there is a class of works called the परिशिष्ट (appendices), which deserve a mention in passing. One of them is the तत्रणवृह ascribed to शीनक, a treatise on the various schools into which the Vedas had branched off, briefly narrating the traditions relating thereto.

The style of the परिशिष्ट's is less concise than that of the चर्चा. The simple अतुत्रुत शीनक preponderates. Still the परिशिष्ट's
have not yet fallen into that monotonous uniformity, which we find in works like the मानवमंबूद्ध or the later दुर्गाणिस. They therefore, may be considered the very last offshoots of Vedic literature, but they are Vedic in their character and they must be supposed to have originated at the expiring moments of the Vedic ages. Their object is to supply information on the theological or ceremonial points which had been passed over in the बृहस्पतिस, most likely because they were not deemed of sufficient importance, or because they were supposed to be well-known to those more immediately concerned. The perfunctory and superficial treatment of the subject matter in these works bears witness to incipient intellectual and literary degeneracy.
LECTURE III.

THE ARRANGEMENT OF

THE RIGVEDA.

Rigveda is not a book—but it is a compilation—its unique character—
Principles of arrangement—अष्टक, अष्टयाय and कर्म-मण्डल, अनुवाक and
चूक-क्रिय, देवता and छन्दस्—The internal arrangement of the several
मण्डलस्—The अष्टक hymns—The अष्टयाय hymns—Earlier and later क्रियस
—the criteria for distinguishing between older and later hymns—grammatical
forms—vocabulary, peculiarities of संस्करण—Metre—Rigveda hymns
found in अष्टवेदम्—Criterion of ideas.

In the course of the last lecture I tried to give you a
general idea of the Vedic literature, including both the Veda
proper and works related thereto. In this lecture I propose
to deal with one book in particular and that is the संहिता of
the कर्मेव. Here, however, in the beginning, I have to warn
you that when we call the Rigveda a book, we must not under-
stand the statement literally. If a book means a work
written by one man, implying unity of time and ideas, well,
the Rigveda is far from being a book. It is rather a compila-
tion composed of several books which can be individually
distinguished from each other. The form in which the संहिता
of the कर्मेव has come down to us clearly shows that the
different hymns were composed long before they were
brought together and systematically arranged. That the
different portions of the संहिता represent chronologically
different stages, follows from various indications of language,
vocabulary, style, grammar, metre, and lastly ideas. As I
said in my last lecture the Rigveda stands by itself, in point
of language and thoughts, apart from other works belonging to the Vedic canon. There is something which characterizes the Rigveda and stamps it with an individuality of its own. In spite of this unity, however, there is a variety or plurality in the Rigveda itself. This most important fact every student of the Rigveda must bear in mind. Though the Rigveda is much more natural in character than other संहिताः and is not purely liturgical like others, still there are distinct traces of a deliberate arrangement and the influence of priests, which would be made clear, when we consider the divisions into which the संहिता is divided.

There are two ways of dividing the contents of the Rigveda, one into अष्टकम्, अष्टमाययम्, and वर्गम् and the other into मण्डलम्, अनुवाकम्, and एकम्. Of these, the former is unimportant since mere convenience of study is at its root. The Rigveda is divided into eight अष्टकम्, each अष्टक consists of eight अष्टमाययम्, and each अष्टमाययम् consists of several वर्गम्, a वर्ग being usually made up of five क्रमम् or verses, sometimes more and sometimes less. This is the division popular with the बैदिकम् with whom a वर्ग is the measure of a lesson. This division is purely mechanical and comparatively modern.

The second division, however, though no doubt also mechanical in character, has some scientific historical principles to support it. That it is very old follows from the fact that it was known even to the ब्राह्मणस्. There are ten मण्डलम्. The first मण्डलम् contains twenty-four अनुवाकम् (sections); the second, four; the third and fourth, five each; the fifth, sixth, and seventh, six each; the eighth, ten; the ninth seven; and the tenth, twelve अनुवाकम्. Each अनुवाकम् consists of a number of क्रमम् (hymns), and each क्रम is made up of a.
number of verses. In order to understand the principle of arrangement which underlies this division, it is necessary to remember that every ऋषि has a कृषि, देवता and छन्दस् (a seer, a deity and a metre), without whose knowledge the meaning of the hymn cannot be properly understood nor can the hymn be efficiently applied:

अविदित्वा कृषि छन्दसों देवतां योगमेव च।
योऽच्चिदापैष्टपेच्छलप्राप्तं पापीयास्यं।

What these कृषि, देवता and छन्दस् mean is briefly stated by Kaśyapa in the beginning of his सर्वांगकौमणि:

यस्य वाक्यं स कृषि:। या तेनोच्च्यं सा देवता।
यद्वयपरिमाणं तच्छल्ल:।
अर्धङ्गस्व कृषिः देवताः छन्दोंभिप्रायावान्।

About the देवताः and छन्दों I shall speak more fully in subsequent lectures. As for the कृषिः, I have told you already that they are not, from the orthodox point of view, regarded as composers or writers but as seers, as सार्वग remarks in his commentary on the very first verse of the Rigveda:

अत्यतिश्रयो वेदस्य परमेश्वरायद्रे ग्रहेऽऽऽ दर्शनानां।

Now coming back to our ten मण्डलस, we notice that मण्डलस II to VII are homogeneous in character and arrangement, while I, VIII, IX, and X have different principles underlying them. The मण्डलस from II to VII are each ascribed to one कृषि or one family of कृषि. Thus the कृषि of these मण्डलस are गुरुसमान, निशामिन्द्र, बामबेच, भानि, भर्त्राज, and वसिश्त respectively or their descendants. Not only does the existence of a common seer characterize these मण्डलस, but there are definite principles underlying even the sequence of the hymns in each मण्डल itself. Thus as a rule, the first group of hymns in each
मण्डल is addressed to अश्वि, the second, to हन्त्र, and the rest to miscellaneous deities. Further the arrangement of the hymns in each of the groups proceeds on the principle that every following hymn has a less number of verses than the preceding one, with only a very few exceptions about whose character there prevails a doubt. As an example of this diminishing order of verses, we may examine the seventh मण्डल:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hymns following the law</th>
<th>Exceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>अश्वि group</td>
<td>1-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>हन्त्र</td>
<td>18-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विश्वदेवांs</td>
<td>34-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>महूर्तs</td>
<td>56-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सूर्य, महूर्तs and वरुण</td>
<td>60-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अशिथि</td>
<td>67-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उपस्</td>
<td>75-80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus it may be seen that all violations of the law of the diminishing number of verses occur at the end of a group. The explanation probably is that the very short hymns which stand at the end of each group, were at sometime through whim or misunderstanding combined. So also if allowance is made for later additions, it may be seen that these Books II to VII form a series of collections which contain a successively increasing number of hymns.

No such definite principle of arrangement can be discovered with regard to the eighth Book, though the कण्य family predominates amongst its ऋषिः.

The ninth मण्डल has a peculiarity of its own as far as the arrangement is concerned. All the hymns in this मण्डल
are, without exception, addressed to one deity and that is the पञ्चमान सोम, the clearly flowing सोम. The hymns are composed by the same कण्ठिन as those of books II to VII. Thus it seems probable that all the सोम hymns of the कण्ठिन of books II to VII were taken out and collected together into one separate book, and at the same time arranged with regard to the metre. Thus we see that hymns 1-67 are in मायन्त्री metre, 68-86 in जगति, 87-97 in नित्रुम्य and the rest (98-144) in miscellaneous metres.

मण्डल I and X form the youngest portions of the Rigveda. Of these, मण्डल I contains 14 groups, each ascribed to one common कण्ठि and having hymns arranged according to the deities, that is they are arranged on the same principles as in Books II to VII. Thus, to take an instance, the first group of मण्डल I is made up of 11 hymns, all ascribed to वैष्णविन्ध सुण्डरनदा, of which hymn I is addressed to भस्म, 2 to वायु, 3 to बालिन्द्र and इत्यादि and the rest to इन्द्र.

It should seem, therefore, that these shorter collections forming Book I were later prefixed, as it were, to the family Books (viz. Books II to VII), which latter must have served as the model for the internal arrangement of the former.

The tenth मण्डल is indeed an aggregate of supplementary hymns, clearly showing their familiarity with the first nine books. The only principle which connects the different hymns of the मण्डल is numerical. In this मण्डल, we find a series of collections arranged in the descending order of the number of hymns in each, and extending from hymn 1 to 84. From hymn 85 to 191 we find single hymns arranged in the descending order of the number of stanzas contained in each.
From all this it appears that मण्डलs II to VII generally formed the oldest portion, the nucleus, as it were, to which मण्डल I was prefixed and मण्डलs VIII, IX and X were affixed. That even the ancient Brahmans looked upon the Rigveda as made up of three portions follows from the fact that the कविः were divided broadly into three divisions: 1st शतरथिन: (i.e. the कविः of the first मण्डल each of whom seems to have contributed nearly 100 verses), 2ndly माध्यमा: (i.e. the middle ones, referring to the कविः of II to VII), and 3rdly हुङ्खकः: and महावकः: (i.e. कविः of shorter and longer hymns.\(^1\))

We have also to notice here a group of eleven hymns known by the name of वाणिजिष्य, which stands by itself and which is generally put at the end of the eighth मण्डल.\(^2\) They are not recognised by older writers, nor reckoned in the division of मण्डलs and अध्यास्त nor commented on by सारण, though mentioned in कामस्यांस्मरीतितोद्वेवव: That these do not naturally belong to the place where they are found is quite clear. The earliest interpretation of the name वाणिजिष्य is found in तैत्रीयारण्यक. I. 23:

श तपोद्वत्तमः। श तपस्तप्ता शरीरमूढ्यत। तस्य यन्त्रांसमात्तितीतोद्वेवः। केवलो वातरस्या क्रपय उदवितवः। ये महाले वैश्वानसः। ये बालाले वाणिजिष्यः।

The fact that these disturb the regularity of both the मण्डल and अष्टक divisions shows that they were later additions.

I have also to notice here the शारी hymns, which are peculiar in character. They resemble the hymns which we

1. Cf. आश्चर्यायन-मुद्रा-मुद्र, III. 4.—अष्ट क्रपयः शतरथिन: माध्यमा, हुङ्खकः विश्वास्तिसिं नामवेदोऽविशेषर्मः पिछः, प्रायः पालसायाः हुङ्खकः महावकः इति.

2. They are printed as hymns no. 49—59 of Mandala VIII in Max Muller's edition of the Rigveda—V.S.S.
find in the साम and यज्ञवाल, being evidently composed for sacrificial purposes. There are ten of these scattered about in the ten मण्डलs. They generally contain eleven verses each, addressed to eleven separate deities in the following order: verse 1 to भगवत; 2 to तत्त्वज्ञान or नृत्यास (two other aspects of भगवत); 3 to हय (gifts); 4 to व्रहि: (sacrificial pile of grass); 5 to देवी: द्वार:; 6 to उपसानकर्ता; 7 to देवी होतारी (i. e. भगवत and भारिण etc.); 8 to सरस्वती, हया and भारती; 9 to लक्ष्मी (the creator); 10 to वनस्पति (the tree of the sacrifice); and 11 to स्वाहाकृति.

The position of these artificial hymns necessarily presupposes a deliberate arrangement on the part of the collectors.

You know that the text of the Rigveda is found in two forms, संहिता and पदपाठ. In the latter the words or पदs are separately shown; whereas in the former, they are combined by the rules of संहि. Now we find that six verses in the Rigveda (VII. 59. 12; X. 20. 1; X. 121. 10; X. 190. 1-3) are not found analysed in the Pada-text, but only given there over again in the संहिता form. This shows that these verses were not acknowledged as truly Rigvedic, a view justified by internal evidence.

In the hymns themselves, we have indications of the earlier and later generations of क्रिपिस, and also of earlier and later hymns. Here I shall content myself with giving references from the seventh मण्डल only.

VII. 18. 1. ये है भगितिक इन्द्र विश्व बाह्य जरितारो आसन्वनात्।

VII. 22. 9. ये च पुरुष ऋषयः ये च नृत्स: इन्द्र विभाग्य जनपदं विभ्रा:।

VII. 29. 4. उत्तो घा ते पूर्वस्य इदं सन्ते ये च पूर्वस्य युन्याः स्त्रियाः स्त्रियाः।

VII. 53. 1. ते भिन्न ते पुरुषः कवयः गृण्यः।

VII. 76. 4. त इन्द्र देवानां सघन्माद आसन्तः क्रियात्ततानं: कवयः पूव्यः।
VII. 91 4. पुरा देवा अनवशास आतन्।
In all these passages old and new कष्ठs are spoken of:
VII. 56. 23. भूरी चक महतः पिर्याणि उक्ष्यानि।
VII. 15. 4. नवं छूण्डमन्ग्रेष्ये दिवः द्येनाय जीजनम।
VII. 59. 4. अभिव आवर्षु मांसतित्वियसी।
VII. 61. 6. प्र वां मन्माणि क्रच्छे नवानि कृतानि चह जुजुपनू इमानि।
VII. 93. 1. शंखि छ स्तोतं नवजातमय इन्द्राणि त्वमद्विगुणा जुपेयाम।

In these passages, old and new songs or prayers are spoken of. From these allusions, it is quite evident that the hymns of the Rigveda were composed by different generations of sages, and that the composition extended over a long period of time.

When we have once admitted the fact that the ten मण्डलs of the Rigveda have gathered up the work of many periods and that the original composition of the hymns was probably the work of several centuries, then we can discover several criteria by which to distinguish earlier from later hymns. I shall here briefly notice only some of them.¹

First is the criterion of grammar and language. It has been found by a searching scrutiny of the particular grammatical forms in the Veda that certain forms are more frequently found in earlier hymns. Here follow some examples:

1. From nouns in आ, the inst. sing. mas. or neut. ending in आ e.g. चर्मा I. 168.1a, हिमा X. 37.10 b, उष्णa IV. 32.10 a, and so on.

1. Contrast Keith, Cambridge History of India, vol. I. p. 78: "The results produced by the most elaborate and systematic attempts to apply the methods of the higher criticism to the Rigveda have hitherto failed to meet with general acceptance."—V,S,S.
2. Old declensional forms from radical stems in आ; e.g. धिमिये, चूचिपे, क्रियक; जासत्त्व, and so on.

3. The inst. sing. in ई; e.g. अचिस्ती, अग्रहस्ती, ऋती, प्रहस्ती, सर्थी, अर्थी, हस्तच्युती, and so on.

4. The neut. plural in उ; e.g. उरु, विपातु, वचु, बीचु, सुबन्नु, and so on.

5. The vocatives in व् and म्: from stems in वन्त् and मन्त्; e.g. अद्रिव्, सहस्त्, स्वाप्त्, हरिव्, हविभम्, and so on.

6. The forms मद्य, दुम्य, असम्य, sometimes found in the text in संधि combination, to be restored in accordance with the metre; e.g. VII. 29. 1a दुम्य (required by the metre); VII. 32. 21 c; VII. 90. 2 b; असम्य VII. 74. 5 d; VII. 78. 1 d; VII. 79. 4 a; VII. 81. 6 b.

7. Unaugmented forms of historical tenses; e.g. तक्षत्, इत्सवत्, प्रयित्त, नरत्, युवत्, etc.

8. All forms of the perf. subj. act.; e.g. चिकित्, जुजोष्; तत्तन्, दीव्य्, द्वर्पक्, मामह्, सुरुष्, etc.

9. Perf. part. without reduplication (except विद्वंत्); e.g. विद्वंत्, द्राक्षान्त्, मीब्रह्वांत्, and साम्बांस्.

10. Forms of the 2nd per. dual and plural of the Root-aorist, having strong stems; e.g. कर्तौ, कर्तौ, कर्तौ, गन्तौ, पात, धातन.

11. The aorist imperative forms in धि; e.g. कापि, जेपि दशि, धाशि, नेपि, माशि, याśि, वाशि, etc.

12. The aorist imperative form बोधि, whether from दुधौ or दु.

13. The middle participle in सान from the दौ aorist; e.g. अचस्यान, कमस्यान, मन्दस्यान, सहस्यान.
14. The infinitives in तथे; e. g. द्रव्ये, इत्यवादे, औपित्ये, वीत्ये, औसात्ये.

15. The infinitives in छैै, in वने (e. g. दावने, etc.), in छे or आसे (e. g. अर्जने, कासे, काहसे).

16. The pronoun स्व, त्य.

The following words are characteristic of the earlier portion of the Rigveda:

अक्तु ‘beam’; अत्य ‘swift’; अभिपिि ‘help’; अबसू and its derivatives like अबसू, etc.; अन्जीपिि ‘direct’; शिति ‘dwelling’; चन्द्र ‘delight’ and चन्द्रस्, चन्द्रिण्य, etc.; चर्पणि ‘mortal’; compounds ending with चन्द्र (e. g. अचन्द्र, पुरुचन्द्र, etc.); the verb and adj. तुज्; compound ending in तुर ‘conquering’ (e. g. द्रातुर, द्रासुर, etc.); compound’s beginning with तुवि, (e. g. दुविजात, दुविजेच्च्च ‘etc.’; ‘gift revel’ and its derivatives संसन, संस, संसिद्ध, पुरुसुसर, उदंसर, उस्म, दस, etc.; मन्नद ‘thought’, वाज ‘prize’, विम ‘a poet’; श्रव: ‘glory’,

On the other hand words connected with disease, magic and popular belief, as also technical terms, chiefly of ritual and philosophy, are characteristic of the later parts of the Rigveda which are allied to the अथर्ववेद.

Certain peculiarities of संधि also may be pointed out as characteristic of the earlier parts of the Rigveda. Thus we find that as a rule final अ and आ are combined with an initial vowel or diphthong following; and final इ, ई, उ, ऊ are regularly combined with similar vowels, But before dis-similar vowels they are regularly used with hiatus, except perhaps in the case of disyllabic prepositions followed by the augmented tenses of the verbs to which they belong.
So also words ending in अः, ए, ओ lose their final element, before an initial vowel following, and are therefore all alike treated as ending in अ with hiatus; and similarly words ending in ऐ and ओ are treated as ending in आ. But duals both of nouns and of verbs ending in ऐ are unaltered.

According to the rules of classical Sanskrit, final अः becomes ओ and final ऐ is unaltered, if the next word begins with आ, but the initial आ is lost. This संधि is comparatively rare in the Rigveda proper or its earlier part, but is very common in the later portions. We find on the whole that a hiatus is more common than the combinations, though we have instances where संधि takes place in position in which it never takes place in classical Sanskrit, e.g. in the case of duals ending in आ, ऐ and ओ especially when followed by इ.

Secondly, we have the criterion of metre. The metres which are combinations of eight-syllabed and eleven or twelve-syllabed feet like उष्णह, कक्कुर, ब्रह्मी, सतोव्रह्मी and अवति, which are practically unknown in later literature may be presumed to belong to the more distinctively early parts of the Rigveda. The Vedic अनुद्रम can be also easily distinguished from the later or epic अनुद्रम. Here I give two verses representing the two kinds of अनुद्रम:

Vedic अनुद्रम

tuῳ वछ्य गोमत अपावर्ति विषम ।
tuῳ देवा अविभयः तुज्यमानास आविचः ॥ I. 11. 5.

Epic अनुद्रम

वापरत्म उपामन्यद पिनिर्भ स्मा हुनलम ।
केशी विषय पात्रेण यदृ श्लेष्याशिवल सह ॥ X. 136. 7
which, as you see, is very similar to the अनुद्रुम of the महाभारत and the रामायण.

Another criterion is the occurrence of a Rigveda hymn in the अथर्वेद. If a complete hymn or a fragment or even any part of it beyond one stanza is repeated in the अथर्वेद, it is a strong indication of the later character of that hymn; cf. for instance VII. 55. 5—8; VI. I 59.12.

There is last of all the criterion of subject matter. Broadly speaking the Rigveda hymns may be divided into two classes, religious and secular. The great majority of hymns are invocations and adorations of the gods therein addressed, whose essence is a simple outpouring of the heart, a prayer to the eternals, an invitation to them to accept favourably the gift reverently consecrated.

On the other hand there are hymns containing references to the details of ritual, the particular kinds of priests and their functions, which show a general tendency to deify everything connected with sacrifice. Such hymns clearly mark a later stage as compared with the hymns described in the last paragraph. Briefly speaking hymns belonging to the earlier parts of Rigveda are prevailingly characterized by the following ideas: the kindling of the sacred fire before dawn as if to ensure the return of daylight and the preparation of the sacred drink and poetic inspiration; अधि and हन्त्र are the principal deities, the former is the homely priest and the messenger between men and gods; the latter is the physical god, warlike in spirit, who broke asunder the clouds and brought down rain.
On the other hand, the idea of addressing विद्रेष्टेवा: marks a later stage; likewise the deification of prayer, of the doors of the sacrificial chamber, of the कृष grass and so on.

So also दानस्तुतिः (or hymns in praise of the liberal donations from patrons and princes to priests) necessarily presuppose a fully elaborated ritual and the establishment of the practice of having hired priests to whom fees were paid. Further hymns which are philosophical in character, asking such questions as whence we come, who we are, where we go, are distinctly later in character and mark the period of transition from the मच्छ to the नाल्पण; likewise poetic riddles and satirical hymns belong to the later period. Hymns containing references to magic and exorcism and charms, which are distinctly allied to the contents of the Atharvaveda as also didactic hymns belong to a later period. In a word, all those passages which record for us, as it were, the first distinctively Indian efforts to lay the foundations of philosophy, astrology and magic are to be looked upon as later in character.

The Rigveda is full of myths; but they are boldly related in the early hymns of the Rigveda, generally in single stanzas; as for instance, the warlike deeds of रघु and the resources and cures of the अभिन्द्र. But in the later hymns of the Rigveda, the myths appear in a dramatic form, and the theme is not historical but social. The dialogue:¹ between पुराणस्य and उर्वरस्य (X. 95), the tale of अगस्त्य and लोपाभद्रा.

1. These dialogue hymns (variously called आस्त्रयान, संवाद or इतिहास hymns) are regarded by some as the earliest forms of the dramatic literature in India; others regard them as merely ballads, which is a more plausible explanation.—V. S. S.
(I. 179), and the tale of यम and यमी, the parents of the human race (X. 10), may be cited as instances. In such hymns, the poets for the first time wrestle with the moral and aesthetic problems associated with the relationship of man to woman. Misogynic ideas, which so conspicuously prevail in later Sanskrit literature have their germs in these later portions of the Rigveda. So also we have here the germs of the ascetic theories which afterwards became the conspicuous features of Brahmanism and Buddhism.
LECTURE IV.

HISTORY OF VEDIC STUDIES

MODERN PERIOD

The advance of oriental studies—the Asiatic Society of Bengal—Colebrooke—Friedrich Rosen—Roth, the founder of modern Vedic studies—St. Petersburg Lexicon—Weber—Max Muller—His sympathetic and liberalising spirit—Ancient Sanskrit Literature—Muir’s Original Sanskrit Texts—Haug’s ऐतरेय भाषण—Translations of the Rigveda—Wilson, Grassmann and Ludwig—Kaegi’s Rigveda—Vedische Studien by Pischel and Geldner—Whitney’s Grammar—Oldenberg’s notes on Rigveda—Concordance and Index—Pandit’s वैद्यार्थयत—Mr. Tilak’s two books—

In the course of the last two lectures, I tried to give you a general idea of the literature known as the Veda and of the Rigveda in particular. Now I shall proceed to speak on the method of studying the Rigveda and on the principles which should guide that study. But before doing that I believe it would be useful, for you to know what has been done in the field of the study of the Rigveda by modern scholars as well as by the ancients. Nay, it is even necessary for a student of the Rigveda to know, for without a knowledge of the work done in this direction he cannot confidently and critically proceed with the study.

It was about the middle of the eighteenth century that the great French writer Voltaire, in his Essai sur les Mœurs et l’Esprit des Nations highly praised the ancient wisdom of the Brahmanas which he discovered in the Ezour Veidam, which was afterwards proved to be a forgery by some
missionary of the name of Robertus de Nobilis. It was not till the year 1784 that the study of ancient Indian learning was based on a firm foundation, the year when the Asiatic Society of Bengal was founded. The following year saw a translation of the भगवद्ग०ता by Wilkins. The year 1805 however, marked an epoch in the course of Vedic studies, when Colebrooke contributed to the Asiatic Researches his paper "On the Vedas, the sacred writings of the Hindus". The paper is a lengthy survey of the whole of the Vedic literature extending over more than a hundred quarto pages, which may be read with advantage even to-day. It is of interest to read the conclusion of his essay, especially in the light of the present day condition of Vedic studies. "The preceding description," says he, "may serve to convey some notion of the Vedas. They are too voluminous for a complete translation of the whole; and what they contain would hardly reward the labour of the reader, much less that of the translator. The ancient dialect in which they are composed and especially that of the three first Vedas, is extremely difficult and obscure and, though curious, as the parent of a more polished and refined language (the classical Sanskrit), its difficulties must long continue to prevent such an examination of the whole Vedas, as would be requisite for extracting all that is remarkable and important in these voluminous works. But they well deserve to be occasionally consulted by the oriental scholars." ¹ How far this judgment is justified, I leave to you to judge. I have specially to recommend Colebrooke's instance to you, young students of the Rigveda, because this scholar had at

1. Colebrooke's Essays Vol. 1. p. 113
first a strong disgust for oriental learning, of which he was cured by no other antidote than the study itself of that learning. Do remember, my young friends, that he who once styled Wilkins the translator of भगवद्गीता "Sanskrit-mad" and the Asiatic Miscellany "a repository of nonsense" and the Institutes of Akbar "a dung-hill in which, perhaps, a pearl or two might be found," became afterwards a zealous orientalist, the first to light the torch of Vedic studies.

About twenty years later, a German scholar Friedrich Rosen recognized the true worth of this Vedic literature in the rich collection of Vedic MSS. mostly made available through the efforts of Colebrooke. He undertook with zeal the editing of the oldest work, viz. the Rigveda, but died in 1837, before the first eighth was published, as "Rigveda Samhita, liber primus, Sanskrite et latine" (1838).

It was in the year 1846 that a real, enduring impulse was given to the study of Veda, when the small but epoch-making work by Rudolph Roth, Zur Litteratur und Geschichte des Veda was published. "It inaugurated a movement which since then has irresistibly led all Sanskritists to the Veda." Roth occupies a unique position in the history of the Vedic studies. He gave an absolutely new turn to its course and is regarded as the founder of the inductive and historical method in that domain. The St. Petersburg Sanskrit-German Lexicon in seven volumes marks an era, and amply testifies to the indefatigable zeal and industry of Roth and Böhtlingk. In this stupendous dictionary every word is traced from the oldest to the latest

work of literature, from the Rigveda down to classical literature. All the passages where a word occurs have been brought together and thence by comparison its meaning is fixed. In this dictionary we can, as it were, see the history of every word from the period when the Aryans first settled themselves in the land of the seven rivers to the period which saw the bloom of the most elaborate and artificial (classical) literature. Almost all works then available have been drawn upon. The Vedic part was worked up by Roth, and the post-Vedic worked by Böhtlingk.

Next came A. Weber, another great German orientalist who gave a detailed and valuable survey of the Vedic books in his *Academische Vorlesungen über Indische Literatur, geschichte* (1852). His *Indische Studien* is a remarkable repository of oriental research in all its branches, Veda, philosophy, grammar, lexicography and so on; and though the conclusions at which he arrived may be sometimes wrong, still the work done and the author's versatility cannot but fill us with wonder and admiration.

From Weber we pass to another great scholar, the greatest in the field of oriental learning of our time, I mean, Max Müller. A versatile author, he has written on almost all the branches of the oriental study, Vedic exegesis, comparative philology, comparative myth, philosophy, grammar and so on. “The Hindus” said of Bloomfield, called him Moksha Mulara, during his latter days. It happens that मुक्त is the Sanskrit word for ‘Salvation’ and मूर्त means ‘root.’ To the Hindus his name means ‘Root-of-Salvation,’ or as we might say, with a different turn, ‘Salvation Müller.”

I do not imagine that Muller believed in the Hindu salvation, which is release from the chain of lives and deaths in the course of transmigration. But if freedom of mind partakes of the flavour of Salvation, 'Salvation Müller' he was. Max Müller's eminence as a scholar and writer is well-known to you; less generally well understood, perhaps, is the liberalising quality of his thought, which he exercised untiringly during more than half a century. Among Europeans he was pre-eminent for the spirit of sympathy and fairness which he brought to the study and criticism of Hindu religious thought."

The editio princeps of the Rigveda संहिता, the oldest and the most highly valued work of the Hindus, with the commentary of सार्यण was edited in England by this German Professor. This edition of the Rigveda placed Vedic studies on a firm foundation, and since its appearance, they have progressed with wonderful rapidity. Max Müller's Ancient Sanskrit Literature is another monumental work, which contains a detailed survey of the Vedic literature, and is an authority even to this day, notwithstanding the mass of New information brought to hand since then. Of course we may not agree with the learned scholar in all his conclusions, as for instance, his estimate of the contents of the Rigveda and its age; still the book has rendered valuable service to the cause of Vedic studies by the detailed information it gives in a systematic and interesting manner. Towards the interpretation of the Rigveda text also, Max Müller has made many contributions.

Next is to be mentioned the Original Sanskrit Texts edited by Muir in five volumes. Nothing can surpass the
industry and grasp of this scholar, and the wide range of literature which he draws upon. The Sanskrit student will find therein all important passages, with their translation into English, from the Rigveda down to the पुराणस and epics, bearing on any particular idea, followed by the views of different eminent scholars on the same. To quote the author's own words. 1 "In treating the several topics...I propose in each case to adduce first any texts bearing upon it, which may be found in the hymns of the Rigveda; 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. 2 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." The topics treated are numerous and varied; e.g. the origin of the four castes, the mutual relation of ब्राह्मणस and क्षत्रियस, affinities of the Indians with the Persians, Greeks and Romans, the origin and authority of the Vedas, Indian mythology, society and life in the Vedic age, and so on. I have no hesitation in recommending these volumes strongly to every student of the Rigveda, especially as they illustrate the method of collecting facts, critically reviewing them and drawing sound conclusions from them.


2. The स्मृति, according to Muir, includes (1) the ब्राह्मणस such as the निरुक्त, (2) the शैल and गृह यज्ञस (3) the institutes of मन्त्र (4) the इतिहास and पुराण.
Haug's edition of ऐतरेय ब्राह्मण deserves a mention here, especially on account of the learned and informing introduction affixed to it, though his view that the यजुर्वेद must be older in character than the Rigveda has failed to meet with general acceptance.

Here is the place to mention the several translations of the Rigveda. The oldest is that by Wilson. This scholar was of opinion that the sacred books of the Hindus could be best interpreted by one who has imbibed the Indian spirit; that Indian commentators were best qualified for the task and that a foreigner, notwithstanding his impartiality and desire to know the truth, is very likely to carry his own prejudices into his work, which may be opposed to the spirit of the original. Thus he thought that in the absence of any better Indian commentary, सार्वाणि's commentary on the Rigveda was the best interpretation, more correct than any coming from a European scholar. Hence he translated the hymns of the Rigveda just as they were interpreted by सार्वाणि. Thus the translation though useful in its own way, especially for the understanding of सार्वाणि where he is obscure or ambiguous, has lost much of its authority in the light of the later researches in the field of Vedic study.

Two German translations of the Rigveda, one by Ludwig and the other Grassmann, deserve to be noticed here, the former being prose and the latter metrical. No doubt many times they propose fanciful interpretations, and they are prone to effect emendations and alterations, which are sometimes not only unnecessary, but absolutely wrong. They proceed on the supposition that Indian interpretations are as a rule bound to be wrong and uncritical, and their
impatience to apply the so-called historical and critical method has sometimes landed them into curious blunders. We cannot follow the translations wholesale, though they are clearly pervaded by the spirit of criticism.

Grassmann's Dictionary of the Rigveda published in 1873-75 is a very useful work of reference which every student of the Rigveda should be in possession of. Herein under every word he gives all the passages without exception in the ten books of the Rigveda, where the word occurs, classifying them according to the different stages of meaning which the word in question passes through.

Kaegi's essay on the Rigveda (1880) is a model essay, briefly surveying the contents of the Rigveda. It is written in a very lucid style and the tone throughout is sober and reasonable.

*Vedische Studien* in three volumes by Pischel and Geldner are solid contributions to Vedic exegesis. They are the fruit of the long-continued study of the Veda by the authors, and the method of study can be best learnt therefrom. Most of the important words in the Rigveda, whose meaning is obscure or doubtful or about which scholars differ have been taken up for discussion and traced through not only Vedic passages but also other allied works. Some important hymns have been selected for study. They have been translated and notes on words and syntax have been copiously added. Some interesting legends like that of त्वेशी

and दुर्लक्ष्य have been traced historically. In brief, the book is such as a student of the Rigveda cannot dispense with. The authors are sane critics avoiding either extreme, giving due credit to सावण where he is right and fully recognizing the value of his contributions to Vedic interpretation.

Here I may mention also Whitney’s Sanskrit Grammar in which Whitney has attempted to review the language and the grammatical forms historically. In every chapter or department of grammar he mentions the forms which a particular inflection shows in the Rigveda, the श्राण्णs and other allied works. Thus, for instance, if you look to the declension of words ending in अ, you will find that immediately below the classical forms, Vedic forms like वेवास-, वेवभ-, बुगा, etc. are mentioned. The chapters on accent are also very useful. Thus Whitney’s grammar serves a purpose which cannot be served by any other book available up to now.

Oldenberg, a great Vedic scholar, has laid the Vedic student under great obligations by his monumental commentary on the Rigveda.¹ Therein, he takes up for consideration every hymn, and deals with all peculiarities, metrical grammatical exegetical and so on introducing them as a rule with some general remarks regarding the relation of the hymn to others or any particular traits which may be worth noting. What renders the work so very useful is the copious references it contains to other tretises dealing with the Rigveda, in German, French, and English. Thus in brief in

Oldenberg’s commentary, we have presented to us in one place, all that has been said on a particular verse of the Rigveda or any particular word of interest therein.

Much more has been done in the shape of papers and contributions, dealing with particular topics connected with the Vedic exegesis, for which you will have to refer to the numbers of the Journals of the German Oriental Society, the American Oriental Society, and the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland. I may mention amongst others, Lanman’s *Noun Inflection in the Veda*, Arnold’s *Vedic Metre* and Bloomfield’s American Lectures on the *Religion of the Veda*.

In a new field of study like the Vedic exegesis, much spade work has to be done, without which the progress of those studies would be considerably hampered. Bloomfield’s *Concordance to the Rigveda*, the recently published *Vedic Index* by Macdonell and Keith, are works of this character, clearly testifying to the patience and perseverance of European scholars.¹

Coming over to India, we may mention an attempt to interpret the Rigveda on modern lines by the late S. P. Pandit, who in his *मृदुल* attempted to begin a rational interpretation of the text, with translations in Marathi and English, supplemented with notes explanatory and critical. The attempt was very promising, indeed, but scarcely had the Pandit proceeded as far as the third मण्डल when he was suddenly carried away by the hands of death, and the work

¹ To these must now be added the following: Maurice Bloomfield, *Rig-Veda Repetitions* Cambridge (Mass.), 1916. (Harvard Oriental series, Nos. 20 and 24.)—V.S.S.
thus interrupted by Pandit's premature death, has not been taken up by any one.

B. G. Tilak's two books The Orion and The Arctic Home in the Vedas are original contributions of great value to Vedic criticism, characterized as they are by a sobriety of judgment and clearness of intellect. In the former Tilak tries to prove on astronomical grounds that the period of the Rigveda goes back to at least 4000 B. C., and that it is not possible to accept the late date fixed by European scholars. In the latter, he tries to refute the current theory about the original habitat of the Aryans, who he thinks must have been inhabitants of the regions about the north Pole.

In conclusion I may mention श्रुतिभाष which gives translations of the Rigveda in English and the several vernaculars of India. Though it serves a useful purpose by making the contents of our most sacred and ancient book accessible to the masses still to the Vedic student as such, it is of no great value.  

1. To the above list may be added the following, which have been important contributions to Vedic studies: 1. Arnold, Historical Vedic Grammar; 2. Bergaigne, La Religion Védique; 3. Delbruck, Altindische Syntax; 4. Geldner, Der Rigveda in Auswahl (Erster Teil, Glossar; Zweiter Teil, Kommentar); 5. Hillebrandt, Védische Mythologie, and Ritualliteratur; 6. Lassen, Indische Altertumskunde; 7. Oldenberg, Ueda forschung and Die Religion des Vedā; 8. Schroeder, Mysterium und Mimus im Rigveda; 9. Sieg, Sagenstoffe des Rigveda; 10. Zimmer, Altindisches Leben.—V. S. S.
LECTURE V

HISTORY OF VEDIC STUDIES

ANCIENT PERIOD

Explanatory passages in the ब्राह्मणस—प्रातिशास्य—निरुक्त of शास्क—
The discussion about the meaninglessness of मन्त्रस—The estimate of शास्क's service—Several explanations of one and the same word or passage—The नीरुक्तस—The ऐतिहासिकस—The याज्ञिकस—The नैसार्यस—Mere faith without reasoning, not sufficient for interpretation—The work of मीमांसकस—The वैदेशिकाकाश of सार्वभौमचार्य—The theological bias—no continuity of tradition—occasional misunderstanding of the Vedic spirit—The invaluable service rendered by सार्वभौम.

Next we have to consider the work done by the Ancients in the field of Vedic exegesis. If we go over the ब्राह्मणस, which themselves form a part of the sacred canonical works, and bring together all those passages which contain explanations of संहिता texts or derivations of words, we shall have before us a large mass of material, which will prove to be an important contribution to the Vedic interpretation. Even to critical European scholars, such explanatory references found in the ब्राह्मणस have proved of use to determine the meanings of words which are otherwise ambiguous, or unintelligible.

The प्रातिशास्य works noticed above (in Lecture 2) are also attempts in the same direction, though they relate more to the text and orthography than to the regular interpretation. Works like the सर्वांगकम्य of काव्यावलि and the कुष्ठाकम्य are important from the point of view of the preservation of the text, only indirectly serving the purpose of Vedic interpretation.
First and foremost as a direct attempt to interpret the Vedic texts, stands the निःस्रू of यास्क, than which no older work of the type is known to-day. Of course, it is to be remembered that even this old work must have been far removed in age and spirit from the period of the संहितास, as appears from the fact that यास्क often makes a twofold distinction, while explaining the meanings of words. Thus for instance, in the section on नियाल्प, he remarks:

इस्तेति भाषायाय अन्वयायायाय | अप्रिविवेद्य इस्तेति | नेति प्रतिष्ठाद्योत्यो भाषायाय | उभ्यमन्वयायायम् ॥

Here the distinction of the language of the scriptures or the Vedas (including both संहितास and बाळ्णास) and the language of intercourse in vogue at the time, is clearly meant. The language of the day must have differed considerably from the Vedic language, in order to justify the necessity of such references. But the same fact is proved beyond doubt by the discussion regarding the question whether the मन्त्रस are possessed of a meaning or not. On account of its great interest I shall quote it here in full: 

"Now, without this work, the meaning of the hymns cannot be understood: but he who does not comprehend their meaning cannot thoroughly know their accentuation and grammatical forms. Therefore, this department of science is the complement of grammar, and an instrument for gaining one’s own object."—Then

1. निःस्रू, 1. 4: “हस्त (has this sense) both in the common speech and the Vedic dialect: thus ‘like Agni’, ‘like Indra’, etc. The word न has the sense of negation in the common speech, and both (i.e. the sense of negation and comparison) in the Vedic dialect." —V.S.S.

2. Nirkuta 1. 15. See Sarup, op. cit., p, 16 f. for explanatory notes and comments on the above.—V.-S. S.
steps forth कृति who proceeds to object thus.—“If this निःस्त्र or the science of interpretation is intended to make the sense of the मन्त्रs clear it is useless, for the मन्त्रs have no sense. This is established by the following arguments:

(1) The statements (in the hymns and texts) have certain fixed words, and a certain fixed arrangement.

(2) The मन्त्रs are endowed with their forms by the ज्ञानस; thus,—“Spread thyself widely out”—उद्भवया उत्त प्रथस्वोऽसे ते यज्ञपति: प्रयताम्—वाजः संहिता 1. 22—“and so he spreads”—उद्भवस्वेति प्रथवति (शतपथ ज्ञानस 1. 3, 6. 8.).

(3) They prescribe what is impracticable; thus “deliver him, plant” “axe, do not injure him,” thus he speaks while striking.

(4) Their contents are self-contradictory; thus “There was but one Rudra, and no second” and again “there are innumerable, thousands of Rudras on earth” so also “Indra thou hast been born without a foe” and again “Indra vanquished a hundred armies at once.”

(5) A person is enjoined to do an act with which he is already acquainted thus “address the hymn to the fire which is being kindled.” (This is said by the अष्टव्व priest to the होतु.)

(6) Again it is said “Aditi is everything.” “Aditi is the Sky.” “Aditi is the atmosphere.”

(7) The signification of the मन्त्रs is indistinct, as in the case of such words as अस्प्रस्तु (I. 16: 93), यादृश्यन्त (V. 44. 8), जात्मावि (VI. 12. 4), कार्ण (VIII. 66.4).”

To these objections raised by कृति, यास्क replies as follows: “The मन्त्रs have a sense, for their words are the
same (as those in the ordinary language). A भाषण says
(एतरं, I. 4), "what is appropriate in its form, is success-
ful in the sacrifice": that is to say, when the verse, कङ्क्व or
बहुच, which is recited, refers to the ceremony which is being
performed.

1. As for the argument about the fixity of words and
their arrangement, this is the case in ordinary language also,
e. g., इन्द्राश्री, प्रिताश्री.

2. As for the मन्त्रs being endowed with their form by
a भाषण, the भाषण is a mere repetition of what has been
already said in the मन्त्रs.

3. As for the prescribing of something impracticable,
it depends on the statements of the scriptures, whether an
act is हिस्म or अहिस्म.

4. As for the contents of the मन्त्रs being self-con-
tradictory, the same thing occurs in ordinary language also;
thus "this भाषण is without a rival" "the King has no
enemies."

5. As for the enjoining of something with which a
man is already acquainted, people are in the same way
saluted by their names, though they already know them;
and the मुपक्ष (a dish of curds, ghee and honey) is mentioned
to those who are well acquainted with the same.

6. As for the statement "Aditi is everything," the same
thing is said in common language also: thus—"all fluids or
flavours reside in water."

7. As for the indistinct signification, it is not the fault
of the post that the blind man does not see it; it is the man’s
fault. Just as in respect of local usages, men are distin-
guished by superior knowledge, so, too, among those learned men who are skilled in tradition, he who knows most is worthy of approbation."

From this discussion, it is quite evident that in the days of यास्क, the meaning of the मन्त्रs had become obscure; what is more is that such questions as whether the मन्त्रs are meaningless or not were boldly raised and discussed, although कौशल may be merely a man of straw, used as a device only to teach more impressively, as the commentator दुर्गेन्द्र understands, or some real कवि representing some school like other निरस्कारs referred to by यास्क, as European scholars conjecture.

The very fact of the existence of the original निरस्क on which the निरस्क is a commentary, points to the conclusion that the sense of many of the Vedic words had been commonly forgotten. For, what occasion was there for compiling vocabularies of Vedic words, if the sense of these words was well known? The same thing is also clear from many passages in यास्क's work, in which he attempts to explain Vedic words by their etymologies (a process often tentative, which would have been unnecessary if their meanings had been perfectly known), or in which he cites the opinions of different classes of interpreters who had preceded him, and who had propounded different explanations.

Whether there was any regular tradition of Vedic interpretation preserved throughout the period which must have elapsed between the मन्त्रs and भाषणs on the one hand and the निरस्क on the other hand, it is very difficult to decide in the

1. Sarup, op. cit. Introduction, p. 72. gives additional reasons for assuming that Kautsa was a historical entity.—V.S S.
present condition of Vedic learning. Though the Indian commentators like शास्त्र may not be regarded as infallible, still they cannot be altogether neglected as the help they render is simply invaluable.

I quote here Roth's own remarks in this connection: "Vedic interpretation could impose on itself no greater obstruction than to imagine that the Indian commentators were infallible, or that they had inherited traditions which were of any value. Even a superficial examination shows that their plan of interpretation is the very opposite of traditional, that it is in reality, a grammatical and etymological one, which only agrees with the former method in the erroneous system of explaining every verse, every line, every word by itself, without inquiring if the results so obtained harmonize with those derived from other quarters. If the fact that none of the commentators are in possession of anything more than a very simple set of conceptions regarding, e.g. the functions of a particular god, or even the entire contents of the hymns which they are continually intruding into their interpretations, be regarded as a proof of their having inherited a tradition, it will at least be admitted that this poverty of ideas is not a thing which we have any reason to covet. In this set of conceptions are included those scholastic ideas which were introduced at an early period, indeed, but not until the hymns had already become the subject of learned study, and the religious views and social circumstances on which they are based had lost all living reality... What is true of Sāyana or any of the other later commentators, applies essentially to Yāska also. He, too, is a learned interpreter who works with the materials which his
predecessors had collected, but he possesses an incalculable advantage, in point of time over those compilers of detailed and continuous commentaries and belongs to a quite different literary period, viz. to that when Sanskrit was still undergoing a process of natural growth."

I am not prepared to go so far as to assert that याज्ञवल्क्य's explanations are altogether without the basis of tradition. Although there are several instances where the derivations proposed appear to be fanciful, still in a large number of cases, याज्ञवल्क्य's remarks are followed by शिरस्वत शाश्वत or योगिन विख्यातेः, which shows that याज्ञवल्क्य had in view some old authority in the form of a ब्राह्मण passage.¹ It is unfortunate that we cannot trace back all such instances to their original, owing to the fact that many a ब्राह्मण has been lost.

What sort of explanations and interpretations are attempted in the निरुक्त can be judged from the instances given below. In निरुक्त II. 16, याज्ञवल्क्य refers to the opinions of various former schools regarding the meaning of the word व्यूह.

तत्रैव व्यूहं । मेघं शिरस्वत नैरुक्तः । त्वार्योत्सर इत्येतिहासिका: । अपां च ज्योतिष्ठितं मिश्रीभवकर्षमेव वप्पकर्षम जातेऽः । तत्र उपमायेः युद्धवर्गं:; भवलि । अभिवधु खंड मन्त्रवर्गः; ब्राह्मणवादाध्य। विवृद्धया शरीरस्य सोतांसि निवारयांचक्कार । तत्त्वज्ञानमेऽपि प्रस्तुतिः ।

"Who was व्यूह? 'A cloud', say the नैरुक्त (etymologists). 'An Asura, son of लोक' say the ऐतिहासिक (story-tellers); the fall of rain arises from the mingling of the waters and of lightning. This is figuratively depicted as

¹ The ब्राह्मण quotations in the Nirukta have been collected and identified by Gune. Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume, pp. 43 ff.—V.S.S.
a conflict. The hymns and ब्राह्मणs describe द्रूम as a serpent; by the expansion of his body, he blocked up the streams. When he was destroyed, the waters flowed forth."

Then again यास्क in Nir. III. 8, alludes to the views of older writers regarding the Vedic word ब्रजजन.

Thus we see that several older interpreters of the Vedas, both classes and individuals, are frequently referred to by यास्क, though, unfortunately, none of their works are available. Of these, the नैस्क is the most general name, meaning the old expounders of the Veda, of the same type as यास्क himself, mainly taking their stand on etymological derivation. The ऐतिहासिकs who are generally referred to, while noticing differences in the conceptions of the Vedic gods, are those interpreters who take the euhemeristic view, according to which the gods of mythology were generally deified mortals and their deeds the amplification in imagination of human acts. In addition to exposition of the Veda in the stricter sense, there existed also liturgical interpretations of numerous passages such as we find in the ब्राह्मणs and other kindred treatises, in which it was attempted to bring the letter of the received text into harmony with the existing ceremonial. Such liturgical interpretations are called by यास्क, those of the याक्षिकs or persons skilled in sacrificial rites. Akin to theirs appears to have been the mode of interpretation adopted by the नैस्कानs. By this we must probably understand that method of explanation which, differing from the grammatical etymologies, referred the origin of the words and conceptions to occasions which were in a certain sense historical.
I cannot leave this subject without quoting the following passage, in translation, from the 12th section of the 1st परिशिष्ट, which refers to the antiquity of the मन्त्रs and the qualifications necessary for expounding them.

"This reflective deduction of the sense of the hymns is effected by the help of sacred tradition and reasoning. The texts are not to be interpreted as isolated, but according to their context. For, a person who is not a ऋषि or a devotee has no intuitive insight into their meaning. We have said before that among those men who are versed in tradition, he who is most learned deserves especial commendation. When the ऋषिः were ascending, men inquired of the gods, 'Who shall be our ऋषिः?' The gods gave them for a ऋषि the science of reasoning, the art of deducing by reflection the sense of the hymns. Therefore, whatever meaning any learned man deduces by reasoning that possesses authority equal to a ऋषि's."

Though this passage belongs to a chapter called परिशिष्ट (or supplement), and is regarded by Roth as the work of some author subsequent to शास्क, still it is sufficient to establish the fact that the ancients distinctly recognized the necessity of reason as a factor in the ascertainment of religious truth or the definition of ceremonial practice or the interpretation of important or obscure scriptural passages. That the ancients had at least an idea of the inductized method of interpretation follows from this; whether they could actually use it in practice or not, is a different question. This passage marks a stage of thought when mere faith was found to be insufficient, a view most emphatically expressed by शेकराचार्य afterwards, as opposed to the सांख्यs,
\textit{Navashikas} whose view is virtually, if not avowedly, founded on reasoning.

\textit{Panini}'s grammar, as noticed already, mainly deals with the classical Sanskrit\footnote{Recent research favours the view that in the \textit{Asthajyoti} there is the norm laid down for the language spoken in the higher circles of the society of the period.\textendash V. S. S.} and treats the Vedic forms as only irregularities. He, too, mentions that the \textit{ketu} (subjunctive) was peculiar to the Vedic dialect and that it altogether fell into disuse in later sanskrit.

\textit{Sanakaracharya} has written regular commentaries on all the principal upanishads which, no doubt, belong to the Vedic canon but we are not immediately concerned with them. It is only occasionally that passages from the \textit{sahitas} are interpreted by him, in the course of his argumentations, in his great \textit{bhagya}.

The \textit{Sharimanga} have made several contributions to the Vedic exegesis; the very object of the \textit{mimansa}, as Colebrooke says, is the interpretation of the Vedas. “\textit{Its purpose;}” says Samanatha in his \textit{mimansa}a, “is to determine the sense of revelation.” But the rules and canons which they lay down refer more to the application of the liturgical texts, and the ascertainment of the relative importance of texts when mutually inconsistent. The Vedic interpretation proper, they do not concern themselves with. However, to give you some idea of these rules laid down by the \textit{mimansa} they may quote here one such canon which is very frequently referred to in Sanskrit works. It runs thus.

\textit{Prathyayapakaranam}\textit{samahyam samanaye parashwadhivyadhiyapakaranadhistitau}\footnote{Jaimini Sutra, III, 3.}.  

1. Recent research favours the view that in the \textit{Asthajyoti} there is the norm laid down for the language spoken in the higher circles of the society of the period.\textendash V. S. S.  

HISTORY OF VEDIC STUDIES

("Direct mention, a mere indicatory mark, a sentence, context, order or place of mention and etymology, when any of these circumstances referring to the same text, lead to inconsistent conclusions, every following circumstance is weaker than every preceding one and thus must yield to it.")

The most direct and the most important contributions, however, to the Vedic exegesis are by the great सावणाचार्य, वेदार्थप्रकाश is a detailed commentary on the Rigveda संहिता which is preceded by a very informing and learned introduction.

सावण was the minister of डूकराज, the King of बिजलंगगर now lying in ruins, near Hampi on the Tungabhadra river, in the Bellary district. डूक and हरिहर who succeeded him, were brothers, who threw off the Mahomedan yoke and founded the empire of बिजलंगगर about the middle of the 14th Century A.D. It was under the patronage of these princes that सावण and his brother माघव, who was looked upon as Guru by the princes, did all their literary work and inaugurated a period of great literary activity. सावण also wrote a commentary on the ऐतिहासिक भाषण and अरण्यक, on the तैत्तिरीय संहिता and so on. माघव afterwards called विवारण स्लाम is the author of the well-known सर्वदर्शीसंग्रह or a compendium of all the philosophical systems, as well as of प्रभावशी the most popular metrical treatise on शंकस्वेदान्त.

In the वेदार्थप्रकाश, the commentary on the Rigveda सावण has paraphrased each and every word in the text, pointing out all grammatical peculiarities, giving etymological derivations of difficult and new words where possible, at the same time explaining the liturgical application of each and
every verse. That this commentary of सावण viewed from our standpoint is full of defects cannot be denied. To him, the Rigveda, along with all other so-called canonical works called the Veda, was a holy book, a store of wisdom, secular and philosophical, whose authority was not to be questioned. Every word of it was sacred. Naturally he could not entertain the idea of applying the rules of higher criticism to it, which were admissible only in the case of human compositions. And again, the theological point of view swayed very strongly with सावण. The संहितास mainly dealt with ritual, or at least were meant for application to ritualistic ceremonies, and throughout his work one can easily detect the theological bias. At the beginning of every hymn सावण, before commencing to paraphrase the actual text, first states the name of the sacrifice or the offering to which the hymn or its verses are subservient or at which they are to be recited.

Coming to actual textual explanations, we receive the impression that no living tradition relating to Vedic exegesis there was in the time of सावण. When a word is obscure, he generally proposes more than one explanation, without showing his preference for any one of them. Sometimes he has recourse to curious devices in such cases of difficulty, e.g. giving one case form the meaning of another, or connecting a verb with a subject without agreement in point of person or number. भावमन्येकायः (or the doctrine that a root can have more than one meaning) is brought in by him to

1. Compare also Macdonell on "The principles to be followed in translating the Rigveda" in the Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume, pp. 6 ff.,—V.S.S.
serve his purpose times without number. Then again सायण sees no objection to explaining words in an isolated manner, without caring to see whether the particular meaning which he assigns to the word in the particular passage holds good in other similar passages where the word occurs in a similar connection. Like यास्क, he depends mainly on etymological derivations, and he has no scruple to take as implied or understood any word or words to complete the meaning of the sentence.

He frequently refers to the सर्वानुकमणी, बहुद्वितता, passages from the भाग्यांs and आरप्यक्स; and as a rule he quotes fully the explanations of यास्क, wherever possible, beginning with the remark अत्र निरुक्तम. The Vedic myths he explains in the light of later पौराणिक ideas with whose influence, of course, he is strongly imbued. So also, while explaining the occasion of certain hymns, सायण quotes legends which are absolutely incongruous with the spirit of the Rigveda. One instance would suffice to show that the meaning of the hymns was altogether forgotten or most completely misunderstood in later times. Of course सायण is not to be held solely responsible for this, as this sort of misunderstanding had commenced even as early as the भाग्यांs. In hymn X. 121, beginning with हिरण्यगर्भ: समवर्तताः, the refrain of every verse is कस्मै देवाय हविषा विपेम, which literally translated, should mean, “What god should we worship, with an offering or oblation?”—a simple and perfectly natural question. A yearning of the human heart to search after that god who, being the beginning of the world, and the first germ and the shaper of all life, reveals himself all over in nature. He sees the divinity in its manifestation now here, now there,
now elsewhere, and again he always asks, doubting, seeking and longing, "Who is this god to whom we present our offering?"

Now let us see how Ṣaṅkhu has explained the word कर्मे. In the very introduction to the hymn, he remarks कर्मद्वाभिषेकः प्रजापतिविवाहः. Every hymn, nay, every verse, having reference to a sacrifice, must have a deity. In order to discover a deity where no deity existed, the most extraordinary objects, such as drum, stones, plants, were raised to the artificial rank of deities. In accordance with the same system, Ṣaṅkhu here (and he has the support of the बाहुवल्ल,) unmindful of the proper character of the hymn and of the deep longing of the poet for the unknown God, exalts the interrogative pronoun itself to the rank of a deity and acknowledges a god क or ‘Who?’ In his commentary on the first verse, he remarks:

अन किंशक्षेणंिनिःतवस्वपत्वात् प्रजापतितैं वर्तते। यद्य कृष्णेऽप्रयः कामयते इति क। कमेछित्र्यः। यद्य कं सहं सदूपत्वात् इत्यादे। अथवा इदेन प्रृथः प्रजापतितमाट्यं महस्वं तथं प्रत्यय अहं कः कीड़तः स्यामित्युक्तवान्। स इद्वः प्रत्येके यद्वैं ब्रवीति अहं कः स्यामिति तदेव तं भवेति। अतः कारणात्क इति प्रजापतिरिहायलेइ।

Thus we have here four different explanations. The idea that these ancient hymns were written simply for the sake of their sacrifices and that whatever interpretation they thought fit to assign to these acts must be borne out by the hymns has vitiated the whole system of Indian exegesis. It might be justified perhaps, if it had only been applied to the purely sacrificial hymns, particularly to those which are found in संहिताः of the सामवेद and the यजुर्वेद. But the Rigveda, too, has experienced the same treatment at the hands of our
commentators, and the stream of tradition flowing from the fountain-head of the original poets has, like the waters of the हरस्वती disappeared in the sands of a desert. Not only was the true nature of the gods completely lost sight of, but new gods were actually created out of words, which could never have been intended as names of divine beings as we see in the instance just given.

So far I have pointed out the defects in सायण’s work, viewed from the modern critical standpoint. But I have not yet told the whole truth. There is another side to the picture. Let us imagine what the condition of Vedic scholarship would have been to-day, without this वेदार्थप्रकाश of सायण. Then only can its full worth be realised. The great Vedic exegesis of the 14th century has left no word unexplained, howsoever obscure it may be. I cannot do better than quote an extract from Max Müller’s preface to his Vedic Hymns:

“...It is well-known to them who have followed my literary publications that I never entertained any exaggerated opinion as to the value of the traditional interpretation of the Veda, handed down in the theological schools of India and preserved to us in the great commentary of Sāyaṇa. More than twenty years ago, when it required more courage to speak out than now, I expressed my opinion on that subject in no ambiguous language and was blamed for it by some of them who now speak of Sāyaṇa as a mere drag, in the progress of Vedic scholarship. Even a drag, however, is sometimes more conducive to the safe advancement of learning than a whip; and those who recollect the history of Vedic scholarship during the last five and twenty years know best that

with all its faults and weaknesses, Śāyaṇa’s commentary was a *sine qua non* for a scholarlike study of the Rigveda. I do not wonder that others who have more recently entered on that study are inclined to speak disparagingly of the scholastic interpretations of Śāyaṇa. They hardly know how much we all owe to his guidance in effecting our first entrance into this fortress of Vedic language and Vedic religion, and how much even they, without being aware of it, are indebted to that Indian Eustathius. I do not withdraw an opinion which I expressed many years ago and for which I was much blamed at the time, that Śāyaṇa in many cases teaches us how the Veda ought not to be, rather than how it ought to be, understood. But, for all that, who does not know how much assistance may be derived from a first translation, even though it is imperfect, nay, how often the very mistakes of our predecessors help us in finding the right track? If now we can walk without Śāyaṇa,¹ we ought to bear in mind that five and twenty years ago, we could not have made even our first steps, we could never at least have gained a firm footing without his leading strings. If, therefore, we can now see further than he could, let us not forget that we are standing on his shoulders."

But things have grown much brighter for सायण. A positive worth is discovered in सायण’s work by Vedic scholars like Pischel and Geldner; and in many cases it is सायण who hits upon the right and the only right meaning of a word or a passage, though of course no earnest seeker after truth would attach any worth to his grammatical and etymological subterfuges. We may take one instance to

1. I doubt this very much even to day
illustrate the truth of this. Roth—who was the first to attack conservative Sanskritists and to assert that any conscientious European exegetes could interpret the Veda better than सांवण—remarks that all the Indian commentators explain the word पुरीष as ‘water’; whereas, the word really must mean quite the opposite, i.e., ‘land.’ Now this is not quite correct. No doubt सांवण, in many of the passages in the Rigveda where the word occurs, explains it as उदक. But in X. 27. 21, he explains the word पुरीषात as उदकात मण्डलात, thereby hitting upon the original meaning of the word even more correctly than Roth himself. पुरीष means ‘orb, circle’ and is there used to denote, just like the word मण्डल, ‘region, domain, lands earth’ as opposed to the ‘sea or ocean.’ While सांवण in his commentary on RV. I. 163. 1, explains पुरीषात as सर्वक्षामानं पुराकुड़काद; in the same verse, however, as it occurs in तैं सं 4. 2. 8. 1, he explains it as पुरुषशक्तिसंपन्नमहतोदङ्गात; and महीषर explains it as पशो: सकाशाद in वा सं 29. 12. In Rigveda V. 55. 5, सांवण explains पुरीषाण as पुरीष उदकं हे तदन्त:; while in तैं सं 2. 4. 8. 2. as पांशुकाद भूमदेशान. In तैं संहिता 4. 3. 1, सांवण says, पुरीषशब्देन नयादिगतः सिक्तता उदयन्ते. In the same way महीषर explains, the word in वा सं 13. 53, who never seems to give the meaning of ‘water’ but paraphrases it always as परक, पुरण, परक वरतः; while on वा सं 11. 44, he says: पुरीषशब्देन पांशश्रुच्या मुदयते. Thus we see here, that the meaning which Roth gives to the word पुरीष was well known to Indian scholiasts and was accounted for in a more correct manner.¹

It was remarked above that there appears to be no unbroken tradition of Vedic exegesis; and this distinctly follows from the fact that सांवण in a large number of cases

proposes a number of different derivations of one and the same word. He mentions several schools and works, but unfortunately he does not throw any light upon the exact sources of information of which he makes use in his own interpretation of the Veda. Thus he has made use of भद्रम्रस्थम्य, स्कन्तस्वामिन्, कण्डितस्वामिन्; he also refers to नैरुक्तः, एतिहासिकः, पौराणिकः, भाष्यिकः, संस्कृतान्वितः, आत्मविदः, उद्दशासनम्; he also mentions एव भाष्यंक ह, अपरे केचन, and ushers in different views with such words as अन्य आह, अपर आह, कष्पिरह.

Several other commenataries on the Rigveda are mentioned, but we know nothing definite about them. Thus there are रावणभाष्य, कौशिकभाष्य, and युद्धार्थरमाला. Again देवराम in his commentary on the निरुक्त, mentions the वेदभाष्याणि of स्वस्वामिन्, राह्येवभौनिवास, माधवदेव, all of whom seem to be older than साम्याण.

महीपं तत्त्र are the great and equally important commentators on the युद्धवेद, but we are not concerned with them here except when we have to refer to their interpretation of verses common to both the Rigveda and the Yajurveda.
LECTURE VI
THE METHOD OF STUDYING THE
RIGVEDA

The method is everything—The object of including Rigveda in the curriculum—The orthodox view—the historical stand-point—wanting the spirit of inquiry—the historical and comparative method—the golden mean—a concrete illustration of the method—the words अर्थि and अर्थ in the Rigveda.

I have given you some idea of the work done by ancient and modern scholars in the field of Vedic exegesis. Now I should like to make a few remarks on the method of studying the Rigveda. Method is important in every branch of study, but more so still in the matter of the study of the Rigveda. At school and at college you study several subjects not so much to bear the results or the concrete facts in mind, as to receive a particular training of the intellect and emotions, which object is gained not by the mechanical cramming of facts but by the particular method which has been inculcated in your mind and which has become a habit with you. The spirit of an honest search after truth is the chief thing in all education. To collect facts with accuracy, to shift them with a spirit of honest inquiry, criticize them with a liberal broad-mindedness not allowing yourself to be influenced by patriotism or bias, at the same time trying to understand the tradition, if any, with due sympathy and

1. Compare A. A. Macdonell on "The principles to be followed in translating the Rigveda" in Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume, pp. 3 ff.
—V. S. S.
then only to draw a conclusion where possible; this is the habit without which no one can be a scholar, especially in the field of the study of the Rigveda. And it is with the object of engendering this habit, that the Rigveda is included in the curriculum of our University. It may be even of some use to commit to memory the meanings of some words and the translation of some verses; but that is not all. If you have not acquired patience and perseverance in the search after truth with an unprejudiced mind, well then the time you have spent in the study of the Rigveda has been wasted.

The orthodox Pandits regarded the Veda as revelation. The primeval sages like विश्वामित्र and वसिष्ठ, शृण्मद्द्र and अर्जुन had द्वारा revealed to them; their task was only to communicate it in the same form to others. As such the highest wisdom was contained in it; its authority was not to be questioned. But the elaboration of the ritual exerted in course of time a sinister influence over the interpretation of the Vedic texts, which were solely regarded as subservient to that purpose. The theological standpoint of view prevailed and the only available complete commentary on the Rigveda was written by a typical theologian.

Nor is it possible that there was any strict continuity of tradition reaching upto the time of सारण as was shown above. सारण scarcely waits to ask himself whether the meaning which he proposes for a particular word is justified by the occurrences of the word in other passages. The spirit of inquiry is wanting. Hence dogmatic assertions are made without any qualification. He could not be content with leaving a question open, even though there be not sufficient material to arrive at a decision.
When, however, European scholars took up the study of the Rigveda, they proceeded very cautiously. But even amongst them there was once a school of the so-called conservative Sanskritists, headed by Wilson, who held that चायण's commentary was the only safe guide through the intricacies and obscurities of the text. Against these there stepped forth Roth, who revolutionized the whole thing and may be credited with having laid the foundation of the modern Vedic scholarship. Induction and comparison were the guiding principles of his method. He brought together the several passages where a certain word occurred, classified them, and fixed upon the stages through which the word has passed and thus gave, as it were, a history of the word from beginning to end. No misguided patriotism could blind him. But Roth went to the other extreme in his zeal to combat the conservative Sanskritists. Having lost faith in Indian commentators as a class, in his zeal to demolish the edifice of tradition, he raised a structure based upon reason, one prejudice taking the place of another. Many of Roth's conjectures are thus now found to be unsustainable if not totally wrong, though no doubt the credit of first raising the curtain in the drama of Vedic exegesis is his.

As, however, the study of the Vedas advanced more and more, the golden mean came to be followed. Due sympathy for traditional interpretations of Indian commentators, combined with the spirit of honest search after truth with patience and intelligence has come to be the principle guiding the course of Vedic studies. I believe that the best and most effective means of bringing home to you the nature of this method is to take a concrete instance and to apply
the method to it. I now propose to determine the meaning of the words अर ि and अर ि, which occur so frequently in the Rigveda. In the first place, to narrow our field, let us bring together all the passages in the 7th मंडल where the forms of अर ि and अर ि occur, and see how सारण interprets them.

अरित: as well as अरित: occur in VII. 64. 3. सारण explains both, as अरित: a god mentioned along with मित्र and व्रज: and further remarks: अरित: द्वारभानमात्रराधिमं.

अरित:—VII. 47. 1—सारण-पापरहितम; अरित:—VII. 90. 4—सारण पापरहिता: In the latter passage it is to be noted that the पद्वास has अरित: though the word is interpreted as made up of अ and रित, by almost all commentators.

The form अरित: occurs in a very large number of cases in the 7th मंडल itself:

VII. 8. 1—nom. sing. स्वामी, हस्तिया प्रेमको वा S.; 21. 5—nom. sing. स्वामी (हस्त: S.; 21. 9—gen. sing.—अरित: अभिन्नां अभिन्नम S., who does not give another word for अरित: but evidently takes it to mean अरे; 31. 5.—स्वामी (हस्त: S.; 34. 18—अरित: nom. plu. S.; 48. 3—अरित: S.; 48. 3—शून्याभिन्नमात्र: S.; 56. 22—अरे: शजो: सकाशाद (हस्त:): S.; 60. 11—ईरवति स्वत: प्रेमवति इवरि: स्तोता तस्य (मन्ये स्तोंखे) S.; 64. 3—see above अरि; 68. 2—अरे: अस्व- द्वितिरिहित: S.; 83. 5—अरे: शजो: S.; 86. 7—स्वामी S.; 92. 4—अरे: S.; 100. 5—स्वामी स्वत:ंनां हस्तिया वा S.

Thus, we see that the form अरित: is sometimes taken to be nom. sing. of अरित: sometimes nom. or accu. plu. of अरित: but very frequently, the gen. sing. of अरित. And the opposite

meanings of 'a pious man' and 'one who is not pious', 'friend' and an 'enemy' are attributed to the same word, which, no doubt, is a curious phenomenon, and involves great improbability.

As for the word अरि, ¹ all are at one in attributing to it both a good and a bad meaning, though it is improbable that one and the same word should mean both 'friend' (e.g. Ludwig I. 150. 1; V. 33. 6 and 9.) and 'enemy' (e.g. Ludwig. VIII. 34. 10; IX. 79. 3) or 'pious man' and his opposite (e.g. I, 9. 10; and I. 184. 1; I. 185. 9). Roth thinks that there are really two words; one derived from अर and the other अ-रि from रा. Grassmann assumes only one word, derived from अर; while Bergaigne thinks of only अ-रि (from रा 'to give or रै 'wealth') and अरि means a greedy man, an enemy or a poor man, thus a priest. He further says that अरि comes mostly from अरि and not from अरि. Oldenberg advocates the same view; and lastly Geldner thinks that the second meaning (viz. अ-रि) is inadmissible.

The right meaning of the word is taught by यास्क in नि V. 7, where he says that अरि means अभिन्न and इश्वर.

1. अरि= rich, the rich man, the patron, ruler. In VIII. 2. 13 and 14, the context distinctly shows that रेवि=मचवि= अरि.

So also in I. 150. 1 and 2, we have a contrast between the really rich man and the supposed rich man and there अरि=बनिन.

So in AV. 20. 127. 11, it is said of the glorifier of Indra, सर्वे इस्ते गुणाद्र अरि= 'every rich man will spend for thee with

¹ This note is abbreviated from Védische Studien by Pischel and Geldner, Vol. III., p. 72 ff.
full hands'. And this would indeed prove more attractive to the singer than the false hope of the nobility of the greedy, as in Oldenberg's translation 'even the greedy will fill thee'. So in I. 184. 1 and I. 185. 9 (अरि चिद्र अर्थः इश्वास्तराय, to one who is more liberal than the rich) the meaning इश्वर only suits.

The use of अरि in the sing. preponderates, while the only instances where the plural can be said to be used without doubt are V. 33. 2; VI. 20. 1; VI. 25. 7; VII. 48. 3; VII. 92. 4; X. 89. 3.

The word अरि as used in connection with the war horse दुधरिकारवं and the horse of Pedu means the same thing. Thus हृष्या अर्थः I. 116. 6; जोश्वत्व अर्थः I. 118. 9; चक्कौल अर्थः IV. 38. 2; all mean 'to be invoked by a rich man' and not by a poor man. Or अर्थः in these cases may be the abl. rather than the gen. and the expressions mean 'who is more praised than a rich man'. For such a use of the abl. giving the adj. the sense of the compar. cf. अरित्रि वां दिवः पृथु I. 46. 8. So also in VIII. 19. 36, we have महिषो अर्थः सत्यति; 'the noble lord, who is more liberal than every rich man.'

If we compare the various passages containing the phrase अर्थ आ, we find that the word विन्ध generally precedes it; by placing these passages side by side with others in which विन्ध and अरि come together we shall see that अरि means इश्वर, the 'rich man', and is contrasted with विन्ध which means 'the general class of men, the mass.'

IX. 61. 11—एता विन्धानि अर्थ आ हुण्डनि मांवमाणां वनामहे; 'the honours of men, down to the rich; even of the rich man.'

X. 191. 1—विन्धान्यथे आ.
VI. 45. 33; VIII. 94. 3. In all the passages आ=अभिविष्ट आ=अभिविष्ट and the idea is ‘all even including the rich’.

X. 28. 1—विशेष हि अन्यो अरि: आजगाम, ‘every other man, even the rich, has come’.

VIII. 1. 22—विशेषतः आरित, ‘glorified by all, praised even by the rich man’.

I. 61. 9—विशेषतः स्वरि:, ‘praised by all, he to whom even the rich man is well-disposed (तौभन: अरि: यस्मे)’. अरि and वरि are on a level and refer to the same persons, instead of meaning opposite persons (e.g. poor and rich). Thus in VI. 25. 7 अस्माकासि...अर्थः सूर्यः, ‘rich patrons’; cf. अस्माकासि च्ययः I. 97. 3; and V. 10. 6, also अस्माकासि मधवन: VII. 78. 5 and VII. 92. 4.

X. 20. 4—अर्थः विषाण गाढः एति. Here an antithesis between the rich man and the ordinary man is meant.

So also I. 4. 6—उत न: सुमर्गाँ अरि: वोचेऽस्य: इस्मक्रत्यः.

III. 43. 2—अर्थः चर्चणि: आः अर्थः ‘come to us across the ordinary people, even the rich.’

VIII. 34. 10—आ यथि अर्थः आ परि स्वाहा सोमस्त पीतवे.

Also I. 9. 10. In I. 126. 5 we have अरिषायसः गा:, ‘cows which satisfy or nourish even the rich.’

So also cf. VII. 100. 5, where अर्थः=‘of a rich man’. After having fixed the general meaning इब्दि for अरि, we now come to other more particular meanings of the word, following from the general one.

2, अरि=मधवद्र, the patron, the rich यज्ञान.
VII. 92. 4.; X. 39. 5. साप्तं—अरि=गन्ता, पति='वजमान'; VII.
64. 3. बच्चया न आद्य आरि: हुऽते 'so that the patron can re-
commend us to another generous donor, or to king हुऽत '.

VII. 34. 9—उपमं केवल अरि: 'the standard, the type of a
patron.'

So अरि: गिरि: 'the song of the patron,' i.e. the song ordered
by the वजमान and recited for him by the priest, cf. also I.
122. 14; X. 148. 3.

3. अरि=मध्यवर्त् हन्त्र Cf. V. 33. 6.

As greed and niggardliness are also associated with the
rich man who does not give away riches or utilise them in
performing sacrifices and rewarding priests, अरि then came to
have the bad meaning, though this cannot be established
etymologically. By the side of such expressions as रेखता
पण्यम् IV. 25. 7, रेखान्त्र अद्वा आरि: VIII. 45. 15; we have also अरि
अद्वा आरि: IX. 23. 3. Notice the word कर्नं—which lit. means
'a bad master'—meaning 'a niggardly person'. So also in
classical Sanskrit literature riches are often denounced,
which easily accounts for the change of meaning of the
word अरि from 'a rich man' to 'a greedy man'. Thus in II.
12. 4 and 5 अरि is used in this sense; cf. also 81. 9, where
हन्त्र is asked to confiscate the wealth of the अरि. The same
idea is met with in IX. 23. 3; V. 2. 12; I. 33. 3; VIII. 21. 6.
In all these passages, the अरि is spoken of with so much
contempt that अरि comes to mean 'an enemy'. The idea
that a rich man is hated on account of his riches and that
riches makes men enemies of each other, is very frequently
met with in classical Sanskrit literature. Thus अरि first means
'the rich rival,' or 'patron of the opposite party', and then the
‘hostile patron’ and the ‘enemy, rival.’ He who thinks this change of meaning too forced and artificial, should remember the word आरि which means a ‘nephew’ and ‘rival’.too.

Thus the word आरि means a ‘rich man’, ‘greedy person’ ‘rival,’ ‘enemy’. It is difficult to determine which particular meaning the word has as the meanings themselves are difficult to be distinguished in a cut and dry manner. When the description refers to a battle, or when even a sacrificial meeting is represented as a battle, then the bad meaning is applicable.

Thus in VII. 48. 3—विशाल अर्थः—all the rich rivals, and अर्थः गत्रोः: — of the rich enemy; cf. VIII. 65. 9—विशाल अर्थः विपक्षित: अतिर र्यः: ‘Leave unheeded all the singers of the rich rival’.

Cf. II. 23. 5—अति यद्यो अहोऽ:...सकिम्, ‘the wealth, that is more worthy than that of the rival’.

VII. 68 2—सिर्स अर्थः हवनानि शुद्दं न:; ‘unheeding the invocations of the rival, listen to ours.’ Also cf. IV. 29. 1; VIII. 33. 14; VIII. 66. 12; VIII. 65. 9.

VII. 31. 5—‘मा नो निदे च बक्के अर्थः र्यः: अरायणः; and cf. VIII. 48. 8.

Also अर्थः अरायणः, ‘the bad will of the rival or the enemy; VI. 48. 16; VII. 83. 5: etc.

As for the word अर्थः, Naigh. II. 22 gives अर्थः as one of the synonyms of देश. पाणिनि III. 1. 103 has अर्थः स्वामिक्षये: . In the Veda it is used to mean ‘master, ruler’; cf. VIII. 1. 34; VIII. 51. 9; IV. 16. 17; X. 34. 13; VII. 65. 2; II. 35. 2; IV. 1. 7; V. 16. 3; VII. 8. 1. On VI. 47. 9, सावण has अर्थः वनस्प्य स्वामि अर्थः कक्षितः.
Even in those passages, where अर्य and दास are mentioned side by side, अर्य need not mean an 'Aryan,' but only a 'master, lord' e.g. in VII. 86. 7 अर्यपली and दासपली are used of waters, meaning respectively 'owned by Indra' and 'owned by robbers.' Cf. VII. 6. 5; and X. 43. 8.

In classical Sanskrit अरि means only 'enemy,' अर्य is obsolete and अर्य means the 'Aryan.'
LECTURE VII

THE DIFFERENT VIEWS HELD REGARDING THE CONTENTS OF THE RIGVEDA

The orthodox view - the Vedas are inspired and infallible - The idea that the संहिताः and ब्राह्मणस are inferior to the उपनिषद्व - passages referring to the making or composing of hymns - a superhuman character ascribed to the ऋषिः - How to reconcile the contradictory ideas - The view that Vedas are a babbling of primitive people - Religious, philosophical and secular hymns - the wedding hymn X. 85. - The funeral hymn X. 18. - Historical hymns - Danastutis - A humorous hymn - Didactic-gnomic hymns - formulas of incantation - poetical riddles.

Now we proceed to consider and discuss the different views held regarding the contents of the Rigveda. The orthodox view is that the Rigveda is the eternal storehouse of highest knowledge, that it is inspired or is of divine origin, and that it is endowed with supernatural efficacy. Inspiration and infallibility are the two chief attributes of the Veda. It is of interest to know what opinions post-Vedic writers held in this matter, and whether they are confirmed by an examination of the contents of the Rigveda itself. To begin with, I may quote the following passage from the शतपथ ब्राह्मण X. 4. 2. 21–23: "Then he looked around upon all beings. He beheld all beings in this triple Vedic Science. For, in it is the soul of all metres, of all hymns of praise, of all breaths, of all the gods. This, indeed, exists. It is an undying thing. For that which is undying (really) exists. This is that which is mortal. प्रजापति reflected, 'All beings are comprehended"
in the triple Vedic Science; come, let me dispose myself in
the shape of the triple Vedic science."

You know the well-known verse in the दुहूष्ट:—
ब्रह्माध्यासात्त्ववहुतः ऋचः सामानि जानिने।
छन्दोत्ति जानिने तत्त्वात् यजूर्वासायणं॥

From the अथार्थवेष्ट्र and from the शुरुआत a large number of
passages may be quoted bearing on this subject, which all
agree in preaching that the Veda had a divine or mystic
origin. All this while, however, there was another idea
running through all sorts of works, viz., the inferiority of the
सुहिता proper in comparison with the उपनिष्ट्व or अध्यात्मग्ना।
That the Veda deals with only कर्म, whose fruit howsoever
glorious and pleasing at first is after all perishable; while
झान or knowledge alone is the efficient means of highest
bliss, is an idea met with everywhere. The Vedic hymns,
though a divine origin is, no doubt, allowed to them, are at
all events depreciated, as parts of the inferior science, in
contrast to the श्रद्धालय or knowledge of Brahma, the highest
of all knowledge. In this connection I may adduce the well-
known passage from the छान्दोग्य उपनिषद् (VII. I. 1)

अथीड़ि भगवः इति ह उपसाध सत्तुक्कारं नारदः: ते...होवाच यदेत्तथ तेन
मोपस्वतः। तततत्र उद्धम्यमिति स होवाच॥ १॥ अर्यवर्ध भगवोद्वेष्ट्रम् यथेवेष्ट्रः
सामवेदमधयवर्णं चतुर्थामितिहास्यपुराणं पञ्चमं वेदानां वेदं पित्यां राशि देवं निधि
वाकोधाक्षमभक्ष्यं देवविभ्रं श्रव्वतियां भूतात्मां क्षत्वाभि गद्वत्वां गद्वत्वां सप्तदेवजन-
विभागवेष्ट्रमं देववेष्ट्रमं ॥ २॥ सोहः भगवो मश्वविभागवेष्ट्रम मायविभागवेष्ट्र खेत्र मे
भगवद्वेष्ट्रभेस्तका श्रीकावानायर्द्विभागवेष्ट्र: सोहः भगवः: गोचारम् तः मा भगवानमथक्य
पारं तारातन्त्रिति त होवाच यदेत कैविचेदधण्डोत्तेन मायवेष्ट्रः ॥ ३॥ नाम वा अर्यवर्धे
यथेवेष्ट्र: सामवेद आधयवेष्ट्रत्थ्य: इतिहास्यपुराणं: पञ्चमो वेदानां वेदं: ... ॥ ५॥ त
यो नाम ब्रह्मस्युपासे यवत्तादो गतं तथाय यथाकामाचारे भवति यो नाम ब्रह्मस्युपासे
स्त्रेतस्ति भगवो नामो भूय इति नामो वाव भूयोपश्चीति—तन्मेके भगवानमथी: इति.
In this passage, all the Vedic संहिता and other branches of knowledge are spoken of as being mere pedantry, not able to free you from misery. But the knowledge of the soul by which alone you can get beyond misery is something over and above all this learning. The same thought finds expression in the भगद्वद्वीतिए II. 42 ff.

यामिन्द्र गुप्तेष्वा वाचां प्रवृद्धियविपक्षाष्टिः
ब्रेद्वादरता: पार्थ। नार्यद्वीत्तिनं वादिनः II ४२ II
कामात्मन: स्वगर्गपरा जन्मकर्मफलप्रशाम
कियास्तेष्वबुधवत्
ब्रेद्वाधिविशेष्यय: बेदा विद्येनिद्रुष्यो भवाजन्न
यावानरघुश्च modifications स्वरे: संप्लुतोदित्रेके।
तावानसेविण्यैव बेदेण्य ब्राह्मणस्य विजातम: II ४६ II

Here, the Vedas are condemned as being flowery speech dealing with actions and their rewards, of no value to the possessor of the knowledge of Brahma. That the Veda deals with something supernatural which cannot be made known by ordinary perception and inference is the idea running through the following extract from the वेदार्थप्रकाश of माधवाचार्य on the तैत्तिरिय यजुरवेदः

इद्मात्रस्विनिधिपरिहारायोगिककुरापार्य यो ग्रन्थो ब्रवाचति स बेदः। अत्तैकक अथात्मेन पर्यप्याद्वमाने व्यापरयाते।

In the जीवनीविन्यासमालाविन्स्तर (I. 1. 25 and 26), the idea that the Veda had any personal author is refuted as follows:

पोषणेयं न वा ब्रेद्वाकथक्यु स्वार्थपर्षेत्ता। काठकादिसमाल्यानााक्यपत्वांच्छान्यवाक्यव्रुः। समाल्यायपक्तवेन वाक्यव्रुः तु प्रार्थतम। तत्क्षण्ड्यपम्बतिस्यात्ततोपिप्रेषेतुः।

The same view will be found to have been held by all post-Vedic writers, that the Vedas are not the work of a

personal author, that their authority is self-evident, that, therefore, they are eternal and self-evident. Here I may explain the meaning of अपृथ्वेयत्व, which is so frequently asserted about the Vedas. The नैवाद्यिकs, while admitting the unquestionable authority of the Vedas and basing their ideas of the self thereupon, assert at the same time that they are the works of ईश्वर, the Highest Self, who is all-pervading, omniscient and free from desire, happiness etc. They argue that just as the works of ordinary type are written by human authors (e.g. रघुवंश by कालिदास and so on), so also the Vedas, being as much compositions as रघुवंश must have some author and that is none but ईश्वर, who is far superior to ordinary souls. Hence the authoritativeness of the Vedas. Against this the Vedantins argue that the वेदs are not पौरुषवेय but they are अपृथ्वेय and this अपृथ्वेयत्व is technically explained by them thus:

नाहि तावतुरुप्येऽगार्यंमाणंत्वं पौरुषेयत्वं, युग्ममेधपि अध्यापकपरंपराय पौरुषेयत्वम्।

This the अपृथ्वेयत्व consists in the fact that the Vedas in this creation are exactly like those in the previous creation and so on without beginning.

If, however, we turn to the Rigveda itself and examine its contents with a view to determining the question before us, what do we find? We find a very large number of passa-

1. वेदान्तपरिमाणा end of आगमपरिषेद्व.
ges where we have a distinct reference to the facts, that
(1) the hymns were composed or made by the sages or कवि́s
with whom they are associated and (2) there are old and
new कवि́s and hymns spoken of separately.

Thus we have VII. 35. 14 इंद्र बहु कियमार्ण नवीयः; VII. 37. 4
बहु कृष्णवति हरियो वतिष्ठा; VII. 97. 9 अहंकाराय वतिष्ठिः अहकारि, and so on.

In the following passages, the word तत्त्व, 'to fashion
fabricate' is applied to the composition of hymns: VII. 7. 6 मन्त्रें
ये वारं नर्वा अत्तंत्र; II. 19. 8; II. 35. 2; VII. 15. 4 नमः तत्त्वमस्य...
जीजनम्; VII. 22. 9 इत्यं भागाणि जनयन्ति विष्णूः; VII. 26. 1. तस्मा उक्तं
जनयं बहुजुजोपत्; VII. 31. 11. इत्यं बहु जनयन्ति विष्णूः; VII. 94. 1.
इत्य...पूर्वस्तु स्व: अभ्याक्षुद्धितिप्रवाहे.

It is, of course,quite possible that in some cases this
making or fashioning of hymns may mean nothing more
than uttering or reciting the prayers on the occasion. The
passages in which ancient and modern कवि́s, and old and
new hymns, are spoken of have been given above in
Lecture III.

By the side of these there are, however, other passages
in which a certain superhuman character seems to be
ascribed to some of the कवि́s and divine inspiration is
supposed to have given rise to hymns, to which also a
mysterious or magical power is ascribed. I may here refer
to one such passage in connection with the कवि́ वति, the
author of the seventh मण्डल—

VII. 33. 7 to 13 verses—वन्यः कृष्णवति युवनस्वरूपः etc.

In VII. 87. 4 and VII. 88. 4 there are references to
knowledge supernaturally communicated or favours divinely,
conferred on वति. The same is said of विष्णुभिन्न, the author
of the third मण्डल in III. 29. 15; III. 43. 5; and III. 53. 9.
वाच्य is personified and highly eulogised in X. 125, and the
divine speech is described as having entered into the क्रिप्स:
in X. 71. 3.

यज्ञेन वाच्य: पद्यमायमयू तामन्वविन्दन्तू क्रिप्सु प्रविध्यम।

In the following passages, a miraculous power is attrib-
uted to the prayers of the क्रिप्स

III. 53. 12–विभाजन्ति रहति ब्रह्म इन्द्रं भारतं जनम।
VII. 33. 3–एवं यह कं दामासं दृष्टासम प्रावृह इन्द्रो ब्रह्मणा वो वसिद्धा:।
VII. 33. 5–वसिद्धस्य मूलत: इन्द्र: अशोतव तरं तत्सुर्गव अकृणोदो लोकम।

At the same time, we have passages in which the क्रिप्स,
distinctly speak of their own consciousness of ignorance and
inability to fathom the profound depths of the universe and
knowledge, as against the omniscience ascribed to them by
later writers, e. g. I. 164. 5, 6 and 37.

How are we to reconcile all these various ideas present
in the Rigveda? It is quite clear that some of the ancient
क्रिप्स entertained a belief, though, no doubt, indistinct and
hesitating, in their own inspiration. This belief was not
then suffered to die out in the minds of later generations.
On the contrary it grew up by degrees into a fixed persuasion
that all the literary productions of these early sages had not
only resulted from a supernatural impulse but were infallible,
divine and even eternal.

I have above referred to the idea that the संहितास of the
Veda though regarded as revelation, were considered inferior
or lower in character, as compared with the अध्यात्मशाख in the
उपनिषद्व. This view was furthered by the मीमांसकाः and in
साम्याय's commentary we see that the ritualistic purpose is pro-
minently held before our view in the interpretation of the text.

Now coming to the views held by the moderns in this matter, I have first to refer to the view that the Rigveda is merely a collection of poems, which suggested themselves to the ṛṣis on the spur of the moment. The Primitive Aryans were children easily susceptible to the influence of their surroundings, highly imaginative, simple and innocent.

This view has been now almost abandoned or substantially modified, as the hymns of the Rigveda have come to be studied more closely and critically. That the Aryans of the Rigveda were not absolutely primitive, but that they were in a sufficiently advanced stage of civilization is a fact most clearly proved by the contents of the hymns themselves.

Coming to a more particular examination of the contents of the Rigveda, we may divide the hymns into three classes,—religious hymns, philosophical hymns, and secular hymns. As remarked already, the religious hymns form a very large majority. What the prevailing religious thought and belief is, we shall consider in another lecture. Suffice it to say here that all those hymns which are definitely addressed to divinities, containing a eulogy of them and requests for the granting of riches, progeny, and cattle and so on are included in the class religious. The philosophic hymns, very few in number, are those which refer to such questions as who I am, whence I come, what is the prime cause of the universe and so on. These also will be dealt with elsewhere. Here I shall deal at some length fully with what I have called the secular hymns. It is impossible to distinguish them sharply
from the religious hymns, but here we mean by secular, those hymns which are not specially addressed to divinities.

We may best begin with those hymns which mark a transition, as it were, from the religious to the secular aspect of thought; those for instance which refer to the wedding rite, or funeral rites, ceremonies which are partly religious and partly secular. In this connection the 85th छूँ of the 10th मण्डळ is most deserving of study. The marriage of सौम and बृज is the theme of this hymn, a pattern of married union in general. "As Sun and Moon ever support each other and alternate in their office, on the constant fulfilment of which depend not only the prosperity of all inanimate nature, but also the possibility of intercourse between men and the ordering of civil relations, even so man and wife must work together in harmony, and with united powers untiringly fulfil the duties laid upon them in their vocation for the advancement of the family." 1 I recommend the hymn to you for study, as it throws considerable light on the rite of marriage. The bridegroom with his right hand takes the right hand of the bride and says:

"I take thy hand in mine for happy fortune that thou mayest reach old age with me, thy husband. Gods, अय्यमन्त्र, भग, सतिविन, पुरातिनि, have given thee to be my household's mistress." 2

What an important part was played by the wife in the Aryan household, and how sacred and dignified the rite of marriage was regarded can be best judged from the admonitions and good wishes contained in the closing verses of the

1. Kaegi op. cit., p. 75.
2. RV. X, 85, 36.
hymn, with which the newly married couple are greeted. I may quote here only one verse (X. 85. 46.) in translation:

So rule and govern in thy home
Over thy husband's parents both;
His brother and his sister, too,
Are subject likewise there to thee.

The next hymn to be noted in this connection is the funeral hymn—(X. 18), which should be carefully studied as it gives us a good idea of the most solemn rite prevalent amongst the Aryans.

We may pass to a consideration of the so-called historical hymns. They are historical only in the sense that they refer to the victory and triumph of some princes or princely families. Although the really historical gain is very meagre, and the statements are exceedingly deficient, still these fragments give us a glance into the active, war-disturbed life of the Vedic times. The kings seek to win the favour of god इन्द्र and secure for themselves success against their enemy; but this they can do only by means of a prayer poured from their heart and fashioned after the model of the ancients, in honour of that god, for which they employ priests like विष्णुमित्र and वसिष्ठ, who in their turn highly eulogise the liberality of the patron princes, compare VII. 18; VII. 33; I—7; and VII. 83:

In this connection are to be noticed the so-called दानविशिष्ट or praises of gifts. These are portions, not of the very highest poetical order, interpolated among or added to the original hymns, which while praising the generosity of the princes who bestowed presents on the किस्सि's throw light
on the names of tribes and kings and also on the families of
singers and their genealogies. As an instance of such a
वास्तविक see verses 22–25 of VII. 18; also V. 30. 12–15.¹

We may also notice a humorous hymn (VII. 103) in
which the poet banteringly likens the awakening of the
frogs at the beginning of the rainy season, their merry
croaking and their jollity to the songs of priests intoxicated
with Soma. Muir and Max Müller regard this hymn as a
satire, but Haug and Bühler think that frogs and priests are
mentioned together only because both have reference to rain.
This is one of the three rain-bringing hymns, the others
being VII. 101. and 102.

There are also many instances of a didactic-gnomic
kind in which proverbial thoughts and sententious maxims
are brought together in the form of a verse; the ripe
practical experience is summed up briefly. Thus X. 117 is
a collection of sayings, so also the Song of Wisdom, X. 71.

About women several things, favourable and unfavour-
able, are said in a sententious manner. Thus VIII. 33. 17—
"Woman's mind is hard to direct aright". X. 95. 15—
"There can be no friendship with women, their hearts are
those of hyenas". On the other hand, we have a more
favourable verdict in V. 61. 6—7—"And many a woman is
better than the man". Also in X. 27. 12 the idea is that
maidens are often wooed for the sake of their riches. VI. 58.
5—even an ugly man becomes beautiful if he has only cows
or riches.

¹ The examples are: VI. 47. 32; VII. 1. 32. ff; VIII. 4. 20 ff; VIII. 5.
37 ff; X. 62. 8; I. 126. 1; VIII. 46. 33.
Formulas of incantation and exorcism are also to be found in the Rigveda, though their proper sphere is really the आयुर्विद्या. The healing of a sick person is accomplished in X. 60. 12; Indra heals a woman afflicted by skin disease in VIII. 80; in X. 161. 2 and 5 one who is near to death is recalled to life. A bad omen is averted in X. 164. 5; in X. 145 a girl seeks to overthrow a successful rival. A maiden awaiting her lover seeks to put the household to sleep in VII. 55. 5—8.

Before concluding, I have to refer to the so-called poetical riddles or श्लोकs in which things are described not by their names but by enigmatical expressions, by symbolical and mystical references, numbers playing an important part. Hymn VIII. 29 is a good instance, the simplest of its kind. In verses 4, 5, 7, 8, of this hymn, the gods इन्द्र, वरुन, विष्णु and अश्विनिस are spoken of, without their names being mentioned, but they can be guessed from the very short descriptions typical of them. Much more intricate and difficult are the symbolic descriptions of Heaven and Earth, Sun and Moon, the atmosphere, the cloud, rain, the Sun's rays, the year, seasons, months and so on. See hymn I. 164. 1

1. Mention should be made here of another category of hymns, the so-called आयुर्विद्या hymns, which are regarded by some as the earliest forms of dramatic literature in India, and by others as ballads.—V.S.-S.
LECTURE VIII
RELIGION AND MYTHOLOGY OF THE RIGVEDA

No fixed religion, but a procession of ideas—not primitive but civilized—the practical and utilitarian character—a hieratic religion—a religion of the upper classes—enjoyment of the present life—simplicity and sincerity—transparency of conceptions—arrested personification—comparison with Greek Mythology—Henotheism—the threefold division—
A difference in the conceptions of Gods in the Rigveda and in the 
पुराणस्—अङ्गी—His three forms—His birth—the messenger—important attributes—the myth of अङ्गी concealing himself—ृक्त्र—opaque and Indo-European—God of physical power—the national hero of the Aryans—
His exploit over बुध्र—The Storm theory—the Dawn theory—the Spring theory.

A very large number of the hymns of the Rigveda is religious in character; and hence you would be desirous to know what religion these hymns contain. But let me tell you at the very outset that it is a very hard task, nay, almost an impossible task, to answer exactly the point. Because in the first place, most of these hymns are mere prayers generally connected with some sacrifice or other, and in the second place, there is no attempt at system, the collection being nothing but individual prayers addressed on very varied occasions, by different घरियों who were perhaps separated from each other by long intervals. Thus, we have in the Rigveda a procession of thoughts, not a fixed, stereotyped result. We see here how the ideas were formed and how they progressed: we have not got one systematic whole, in which everything is complete and finished. Thus what
I shall attempt in this lecture, is merely to indicate to you what ideas prevailed in the age of the Rigveda, as indicated by the hymns which we are studying.

According to one view, which was very strongly advocated during the early stages of the Vedic study, the Vedic religion is very primitive, the Vedic people being almost semi-barbarians. They were mere children dazed and overawed by the different natural phenomena, and stupefied with wonder and admiration. As a German nursery rhyme asks, “Tell me how white milk can come from the red cow,” so the Vedic ऋणि is struck with wonder that in the raw cows black of hue or ruddy, is stored the ripe milk, glossy white in colour; and this miracle is praised again and again as an evidence of divine power.¹

But a careful study of the hymns would show that this view is not tenable. That the Vedic people had a civilization of their own; that the hymns mark a certain advanced stage in artistic and metrical development; that the hymns are meant to serve a definite purpose, they were ancillary to the sacrifice: these are facts which every student of the Rigveda will easily see for himself. That the sense of artistic fitness was active in them clearly follows from such passages as: I. 109. 1; I. 62. 13; II. 19. 8; VII. 7. 6; I. 171. 2; VII. 64. 4—in all of which the hymn or song is described as ‘well hewn’ ‘well fashioned as a war chariot from the hands of a skilled artisan.’ cf. also X. 119. 5:

अहि तद्वेद वन्धूरे पयंजामि हर्षा मतियम ।

A striking feature of the Vedic religion is its practical and utilitarian nature. The hymns, though highly poetic and

¹. See RV. I. 62. 9; I. 180. 3; II. 40. 2; and so on.
inspired in character, are all at the same time incidental to the sacrifice. They are recited or sung by the priests or bards on occasions of sacrifice whether as mystic spells to accompany and sanctify the offerings or as rhapsodies to elevate and cheer those present. The ऋणिः offer prayers and oblations of सोम or Ghee, expecting in return rewards from the gods, such as long life prosperity, cattle, warlike sons and so on. ‘Reciprocity, frank, unconditional reciprocity becomes an accepted motive : cf. the following instances from the 7th मण्डल : 1. 5, 23, 24; 8. 6; 15. 4, 9; 16. 9, 10; 82. 7; etc.

Another trait of the Vedic religion which naturally follows from the above, is that it is essentially a religion of priests, a hieratic religion. The priests occupy a very important position in the ritual; they serve as mediators between princes and gods. Not only sacrifices but such important matters as the issues of a combat between rival princes or clans solely or at least mainly depend on the the prayers of the priests. The priests propitiate the gods with prayers and offerings and the gods thus persuaded, actually take part, as it were, in the combat and make their favoured party victorious, rooting out and crushing the hostile army. cf. VII. 18. Also see VII. 83, where the वृक्षा invoke the assistance of हनुम and लक्ष्मी in favour of their patron सुदास : “The enemies have circumscribed me, hear our call and come to us with succour; you heard the prayers of these in the cries of war; effectual was the service of the सुदास’ priest.”

In this connection we are met with a curious idea that both the parties in a combat call upon the same gods for

1. Bloomfield. Religion of the Ueda, p. 184,
assistance, but the gods go to one party whom they want to favour; and the other party meets with a crushing defeat. "The men of both the hosts invoked you in the fight, इन्द्र and वरुण, that they might win the wealth, what time ye helped जुझाल with all the दृष्ट फॉक, when the ten kings had pressed him down in their attack." The same idea is seen with regard to sacrifices, where also the priest always prays to the god thus—"Come to our prayers, O इन्द्र, thou who knowest; let thy steeds be yoked and guided hither; men of all kinds, indeed, invoke thee; still give thy ear to our prayers only, O all-impeller." Thus the question arises, were the gods not able to be present at all sacrifices simultaneously?—I think the following verse answers the question: "With Soma, they brought Indra from a distance, over Vaisanta, from the strong libation; Indra preferred वालिङ्ग to the Soma pressed by पाण्डुष्ट्र, वायत."

What is meant by all this is that a righteous sincere prayer and a rich offering pursuaded the gods to attend and bring success with them. The spiritual conception that he who has Faith and God on his side has also success or victory with him, seems to be present here, and we need not trouble ourselves with such questions as whether the Vedic gods had personal forms or not and if they had them, how they could be present at all the sacrifices simultaneously—questions which occupied later theologians and even the author of the निरुक्त.

Thus, we see that the patrons or princes, for whom the priests conducted the sacrifices, found themselves between

1. RV. VII, 28, 1,
2. RV. VII, 33. 2.
two exacting agencies. On the one hand, there were the gods to whom they were to make rich offerings; on the other hand, there were the priests to whom they were to give fees and gifts. The दानस्थितिः or praises of the liberal gifts conferred by certain rich patrons on priests distinctly point to this fact.

Another trait which strikes us is that the Vedic religion is a religion of the upper classes. The religion of the Rigveda presupposes an established household of considerable extent; a wealthy and liberal householder, elaborate and expensive materials, and many priests, not at all shamefaced about their fees. It is to be distinguished from the popular religion, the religion of the poor, with its humble rites and its childish reliance upon sorcery and the medicine man, which is the religion of the अथवा विद्या and the गृहगुर्जः.

The great object which the worshippers or householders would secure is not immortality or Heaven, but a long life for full hundred years, prosperity, warlike offspring, in short, all pleasures of this earth. Conquest of enemies, freedom from diseases, abundance of food and drink seem to be the happiest ideal which the Vedic ऋषिः placed before themselves. “आँसि, bestow upon our chiefs and nobles that famous power, that wealth which feedeth many”, says बलिन्द्र (VII. 5. 9). “With precious things, oh Indra, thus content us; may we attain to thy exalted favour. Send our chiefs plenteous food with heroic children. Preserve us evermore, ye gods with blessings” (VII. 24. 6). “A hundred autumns may we see that bright eye, beneficent to gods, arise; a hundred autumns may we live” (VII. 67. 16.)
A spirit of healthy joy in the life we live seems to pervade the Rigveda. It is only in very rare instances that immortality or dwelling with gods in heaven is referred to. Thus in VII. 57. 6, we have द्वात नो अशृवतप्रजायि "give us of अशृत for the sake of the offspring." But even here we are not certain of what the word अशृत means. Roth explains the line to mean "Add us to the number of the people of eternity (i.e. to the blessed):" But Grassman takes the word to mean nothing more than 'water'; while Grassman takes it to mean 'long life' only. Similarly in VII. 76. 4, we have: "They were the god's companions at the banquet, the ancient sages true to law eternal. The fathers found the light that lay in darkness, and with effectual words begot the dawn." Thus here the ancestors of the ऋविष are spoken of as being associated with the gods as companions and friends; cf. also I. 154. 5. The last verse of VII. 59 also contains a prayer "so may I be released from death, not reft of immortality." But the character of the verse is highly suspicious and the verse also occurs in बाजसमेसी संहिता 6. 30. Thus in the Rigveda there are no indications whatsoever of the later doctrine of निध्वस्थि or Renunciation. The Vedic Religion is essentially optimistic.

The hymns of the Rigveda are all praises and prayers addressed to gods who are personifications of the powers of nature; fact which has greatly contributed to give a poetic colouring to them. The early dawn, the bright rising sun, continue to fill the Vedic कृषि with reverence and a sense of wonder, even after hundreds of years, since these natural forces were turned into gods. The singular interest and importance of the Vedic poetry and the Vedic religion lie in
this fact that these priest-poets, in their heart of hearts, are not mere technicians, but keen observers of the great facts and acts of nature, and worshippers of the powers whom they fancy at work in nature; and that in spite of the plenty of time which was more than enough to have stiffened all nature-worship into mere admiration, fear and adulation of personal god's, they had not in general become forgetful of the forces in nature from which the gods sprang. "Its fiercely glowing sun, its terrible yet life-giving monsoons, the snow-mountain giants of the north and its bewilderingly profuse vegetation could hardly fail to keep obtruding themselves as a revelation of the powers of the already existing gods." Though the Vedic श्रविन्द्र had made a great deal of advance in their spiritual conceptions and cannot be regarded as primitive barbarians, still, all through this advancement, we cannot lose sight of the first touch of nature. In their conception of सर्वित्रु, इन्द्र, and वरुण and of other gods, though the personification has advanced, no doubt, sometimes quite sufficient to make distinct personal gods of them, still we can see through these gods and glimpse the original from which they sprang. It is this transparency of the Vedic pantheon, which is a most surprising phenomenon. What may be called arrested personification is the very genius of the religion of the Rigveda. To take one instance, the god सर्वित्रु is described thus: "through the dusky firmament advancing, laying to rest the immortal and the mortal, borne in his golden chariot, सर्वित्रु cometh, who looks on every creature." So also the various myths con-

1. Bloomfield, *op. cit.* p. 82.
3 RV, I, 35. 2.
nected with Ṛgveda, in the form in which they are found in the hymns of the Rigveda are quite transparent and their origin in natural phenomena can be clearly seen. Thus, as the Ṛgveda of the Rigveda work their way slowly from the single and separate gods in the Rigveda to the later conception of the absolute One Being, they, all this while, with all their too human sordidness and all their natural fancifulness seem to see the great realities of the world with their eyes wide open, whether it be the single and separate manifestations of nature as in the Rigveda, or nature as a whole as in later books. The hymns of the Rigveda most clearly teach the fact that mythology, properly speaking, “is the first and fundamental adjustment of the individual human life to the outer active, interfering, dynamic world, which surrounds and influences man from the moment when he opens his eyes upon the wonders of its unexplained phenomena.”

This arresting of personification in the Rigveda may be best reallv the student by recalling another mythology, that of the Greeks. This is also based upon nature, but nature is soon forgotten, or if not entirely forgotten, much obscured by after-born movements. The personification there is complete. Thus, Zeus whose eye sees all and knows all, who is the beginning, the middle, on whom all is founded, is at the same time, the flippant, breezy Jove to whom the poets ascribe foibles and vices barely excusable in a modern roué. Homicide without end, parricide and murder of children, are the stock events of their mythology. Thus we have a complete humanization in Greek mythology. As opposed to this, many gods of the Veda are scarcely

1. Bloomfield, op. cit., p. 82.
more than half persons, their other half being an active force of nature.

What has been said so far about the gods of the Rigveda is, of course, generally true. For, there are a few cases such as the personification of the doors of the sacrificial chamber, of the sacrificial post, of the chariot and so on. But these are only exceptions and do not belong to the Rigveda proper.

One more trait of the Vedic Religion I have to notice before I leave this part of the subject and proceed to the consideration of the individual gods. It is called Henotheism or Kathenotheism by some scholars. It consists in the tendency to raise the particular god to whom you are addressing prayers for the time being, to the most exalted position. This is done for most of the gods in turn. "The god in question, alone, is present to the mind of the singer; with him for the time being is associated everything that can be said of a divine being; he is the highest, the only god, before whom all others disappear, there being in this, however, no offence or depreciation of any other god." Thus often times, it is not possible to distinguish one god from another owing to the similarity of attributes, though there can be marked out some attributes and functions which are distinctly characteristic of this or that god.

The gods may be divided into three classes according to the regions or worlds they occupy. वास्तवः says: "The Etymologists opine that there are only three deities: अश्रि on

the earth; बाद or Indra in the अन्तरिक्ष or mid-air and दर्श in heaven. One and the same deity is called by several names, owing to the wondrous or miraculous powers which it possesses or because of the different functions it has to perform, corresponding to which it receives the different names. Or (it may be held) that there are as many different deities as there are names, because there are as many different prayers.” यास्क further discusses the question regarding the form of these gods (अष्ट आकारविन्त्तने देवतानाम) in the course of which he states three different views, viz. that the gods have human forms, that they have not human forms, and lastly that they have partly human forms and partly not. This very fact is a further proof in favour of the arrested personification spoken of above. Before I proceed to point out the special attributes and functions of each god individually, I have to notice one fact and it is that the gods of the Rigveda substantially differ from those of the later उराण्स. It is, no doubt, a very interesting subject to trace the character of every god from the times of the Rigveda down to the latest mythological works and to mark the differences which correspond to the different stages in the history of the Indian mind. Not only have the characters of the gods changed even so far as to make recognition difficult but their mutual relations also have been altered immensely and he who was a very prominent and dominating god in the Veda has been reduced to the remark of a minor deity in the उराण्स, and vice versa. Thus, Agni and Indra stand out most prominently in the Rigveda, and their importance is not shared by any other god; but in the उराण्स, if they have not paled down into utter insignificance, at least they have
been reduced to a comparative subordination, by the side of the triad, that has put every other god in the background though, no doubt, Indra continues to hold his position as a suzerain amongst the thirty-three gods. The same is more strikingly true of वरुण, who in the Rigveda is the god of justice, as it were, the lord in the moral domain, who watches the conduct of men and punishes them, but who, in the उग्राण, is merely a deity presiding over water, to whom no significance is attached whatsoever. On the other hand, विष्णु illustrates the opposite phase of rising to prominence from a position of comparative insignificance.

Moreover some new gods have found a place in the उग्राणs who were not at all known to the Rigveda. Thus महदेव and शंकर, ठस्मि and पार्वेती, ऊधेर and द्वारेजय, are figures not at all known to the Rigveda. On the other hand, उपच and पर्ज्ञि, भग and अर्यमच, have ceased to exist as deities, not to mention the fact that सौविष्ट, दृष्ण, मिन्न, चर्यि, who are so many different godheads with distinguishing characteristics, have later on come to be mere synonyms, all signifying but one god.

The god that stands out most prominently in the whole of the Vedic pantheon, is Agni, only second to Indra in point of the number of hymns addressed. Agni is a most striking instance of what I have above referred to as arrested personification. अग्नि is both an elemental phenomenon, and a personal god. Though the word अग्नि is Indo-European, in as much as Latin has ignis, Lithuanian has uēnis, old Slavonic ognī, still, god Agni, with all the diverse shapes it possesses, is in every essential a product of the poet-priests of the Rigveda.
Agni is spoken of under three forms, the Fire on earth, the Lightning in the atmosphere, and the Sun in the heaven. Agni is generated from the आर्तिष्ठ (the sacred fire-sticks) which are often described as the mothers; cf. VII. 1. 1 and VII. 3. 9. He is also described as being generated by Indra between two clouds or produced from waters. He is very frequently described as the son of strength (सहस: गुरः, ऊर्जो नयत) and so on, perhaps because of the strength or powerful exertion required for rubbing together the two sticks before fire is generated by friction therefrom.¹ Though Agni is none but the fire enkindled in every house every day, still its household aspect is not at all present to the mind of the Vedic आपि. It is only the cosmic and ritualistic aspects that are mainly dealt with. आपि dispels darkness, frightens away the demons of the night, and heralds light:

यो अपाचीने तमति महति: ।
प्राचीर्वकार दृष्टम: शचीर्षि: ॥ VII. 6. 4.

आपि is very young, because he is kindled fresh every morning. He begins the sacrificial day. He is the oldest priest, is fed with ghee and rises into flames. He issues from the trees which he consumes, thus he is the eater of his mothers. He is bright-jawed (हुंडित्व), with a head of light (सुरुवातीं), with a face of ghee (हुंडप्रस्तीक), the lord of the people (विश्वति VII. 15. 7), the lord of the house (हुंडपति VII. 19. 2). He is the immortal domestic priest, concentrating in his own person all the sacrificial offices (VII. 16. 5). Not only is he the arch-priest, he is also the arch-sage (कर्मि VII. 15. 2), काव्यिकतु and so on. Then the lead from an arch-priest and an arch-sage to a godhead is not difficult. He is

¹ Bloomfield, op. cit. p. 159.
the great god who is the messenger between gods and men. He hastens with his steeds and is often asked by the worshippers to bring the gods to the sacrifices or to convey the offerings to them:

प्रियं चेतिष्ठमरति स्वध्वरं।
विन्दस्य दूतमगुति॥ VII. 16. 1.

Not only does Agni perform an important function from the sacrificial point of view, he also drives the दस्कु in the jungles and brings great booty to the Aryans (VII. 6. 3).

अभ्रि is connected with the अब्ध्रिर्, who are often described as the seven priests who brought down अभ्रि from the heavens or first enkindled him for man. In this connection must be also noticed मातिरिव, a semi-divine being who like the Greek Prometheus was the first to introduce अभ्रि to men on the earth. This entity may be nothing more than the fire of lightning generated from the clouds,¹ and striking trees and plants, whose germ अभ्रि is often described to be given out when they catch fire.

Thus, we see that अभ्रि is cosmic, ritualistic and divine, through all these stages, however, retaining its elemental or natural character. There is one myth connected with अभ्रि which has been later developed into a neat story, by the पुराणस. The function of carrying the oblations to gods was solely अभ्रि's, so that it so happened that it became impossible for the gods to subsist without him. अभ्रि however, got tired of his work of serving gods and men and concealed himself in the waters. But the god यम discovered and betrayed him and वरण as the spokesman of the gods, at last.

¹. Contrast Zimmermann, op. cit. p., CXVII, f.—V.S.S.
induced अभि to resume his task of expediting the sacrifices to the gods. For this I may refer the student to hymns 51 and 52 of the 10th मण्डल. This has been turned into a very neat story in the महाभारत. 1

The next important god is Indra, to whom the largest number of hymns in the Rigveda is addressed, almost one-fourth of the total number of hymns. It is not possible to say exactly what phenomenon of nature is represented by this god, because so many personal attributes are ascribed to him that we cannot easily pierce through the god’s personality. Thus he is an opaque god, as compared with the transparent अभि. Indra’s name, however, occurs in the Avesta as Andra where he is degraded to the status of a demon. But his chief vedic epithet इत्रहस्व is the same as that of the abstract genius of Victory Verethraghna in the Avesta, and the Armenian dragon-slayer Vahagn. 2

We may briefly sum up the attributes of the Vedic Indra as follows. Indra is born of the Heaven and the Earth (VII. 20. 5), and he drank शोम as soon as he was born (VII. 98. 3); Indra is ancient, youthful, strong, agile, martial, undecaying, all-conquering, lord of unbounded wisdom and of irresistible power. He has a beautiful chin, wears a beautiful helmet (सुशिल), has golden arms (हिरण्याक्ष, VII. 34. 4), a golden chariot, with green steeds (हरिताप्त). His horses are yoked by the power of prayers; his weapon is the thunderbolt; no one can equal him in his fondness for drinking Soma. Exhilarated by Soma, he slays the enemies and

1. See Vanaparva Adh, 224; Salya. Adh. 48, verses 16 to 22.
demons (VII. 22. 1, 2 and VII. 29. 1). At a single draught he drank the contents of thirty pails that were filled with Soma juice (VIII. 77. 4).\footnote{Cf. \textit{Nirukta.} V. 11 and the various interpretations of the fact given there. Also \textit{R.V. X.} 119 which graphically describes the bragging of Indra under the influence of Soma}.

In the company of विष्णु, he encounters the hostile demons variously called by the names of ब्रज, अहि, छग, नगचि, शुर, who shut up waters, he slayes them and liberates the waters (VII. 99. 4 and 5). He breaks the cities of the Asuras (पुष्कर). Heaven and earth quake at the crash of his thunder. Indra is a terrible warrior, a gracious friend, a god whose shafts deal destruction to his enemies, while they bring deliverance and prosperity to his worshippers (VII. 27. 3; 37. 3; 31. 6.). He is the most fatherly of fathers, has love and sympathy for mortals (VII. 23. 5). He controls the destinies of men, he is the enemy of the irreligious, a destroyer of the Dasyus and a protector of the Aryas.

Three traits stand out most prominently from amongst the highest divine functions and attributes of Indra. First, he is the god of physical power and dominion over the external world and he is not generally associated with the spiritual elevation and moral grandeur which is specially discernible in ब्रह्मण. \textit{“The coarse grain and the fleshiness of his character arrest very unfavourable attention. Indra embodies so completely the human qualities of brag and bluster, gluttony, drunkenness and lust, as to make him the peg upon which to hang scepticism.”}\footnote{Bloomfield, \textit{op. cit.} p. 174.}
The third point to be noticed is his exploit over द्रुत्र. The second verse of I. 32 runs thus: "He slew the dragon who lay upon the mountain. God वद्रुठ्ठ forged for him his heavenly club. Like roaring cattle, down came the waters, flowing swiftly to the sea." The same feat is eulogised in verses 6 and 7 of that hymn. Now what is meant by this slaughter of द्रुत्र by Indra? Who is द्रुत्र? Who is Indra? What are these waters which were compassed by द्रृत्र and which were afterwards liberated by द्रृत्र?

Several theories have been proposed to explain the symbolism. Even the Nirukta contains more than one explanation. According to Nirukta II. 15 the credit of suggesting the Storm-theory must be given to the school of the Nairuktas. According to this storm-theory, द्रृत्र is the malignant, evil spirit viz. the cloud which has held fast the waters, towards the end of the summer and the advent of the rainy season and Indra is none but the god of rain, who pierces through the cloud and causes the waters to flow forth and come down in showers. In this interpretation the पवित्र or गिरि into which the waters were confined has to be understood as a cloud. There are other places also in the Rigveda, where the word पवित्र is generally understood to be a cloud, e.g. I. 19. 7 य इति सन्धित पवित्रानि तिरि सकुरुमण्यम् where the
is nothing but the अन्तरिक्ष, i.e. the middle world between पृथ्वी on the one hand and वायु on the other; and पर्वत is the cloud. साधारण also takes here पर्वताद्रि-मेघार. On this Max Müller notes that “in old Norse klakkr means both cloud and rock; nay, the English word cloud itself has been indentified with the Anglo-Saxon clod, rock.” This storm-theory is followed by most of the Western scholars including Max Müller. But there are several objections to it.

Generally, wherever this exploit over ह्रद्र is mentioned several other things are associated with it. Let us take the typical verse where it is stated that Indra, the dragon-slayer set in motion the flood of waters of the sea, generated the sun and found the cows (II. 19. 3). Now all these three phenomena cannot be accounted for by the above theory. So the dawn theory is put forth. Indra is the sun exterminating nocturnal darkness and pouring floods of light for the world of living beings. The rays of the sun may be the cows. This, however, only explains a part; and “there appears to be a confusion” says Macdonell “between the notion of the restoration of the sun after the darkness of the thunderstorm, and the recovery of the sun from the darkness of the night at dawn”, which is nothing but admitting our inability to explain the myth satisfactorily.

Besides there may be raised several other objections against the storm and dawn-theory. Thus the fact that there is in the Veda another god पर्वत, the real storm and rain god, throws suspicion over Indra as the god of storm and rain. Moreover, in several places it is distinctly stated

that Indra caused the rivers to flow to the sea from the mountains which were cleft by him. Now, sufficient reasons have not been pointed out why शरद should mean ‘a cloud’ and rivers, ‘the flow of rain.’

Thus a third theory is proposed by Hillebrandt. According to this theory, the waters are those of rivers and mountain-streams; their confiner is the frozen winter, when the rivers are at their lowest level,—conceived as a winter-monster by the name of द्रृष्ट्र or the confiner, who holds captive the rivers on the heights of glacier-mountains; and thus Indra is no other than the spring or summer sun, who frees them from the clutches of the winter-dragon. This may be called, for convenience’s sake, the Vernal theory. But this phenomenon would be worth the name, only in extremely northern countries, so as to be represented by the fierce and obstinate contest between Indra and श्रद्ध, as described in the Rigveda.

But against all these theories there obtrudes one passage, II. 12. 11—

य: शंखरं पर्वतेणू विषयतं चतवारिष्ठं श्रद्धक्षिप्तविद्वृत्त।
ओजयमानं यो अहिं जघान दाषं शयानं स जनास हृत्र: ॥

Here it is said that Indra found out the demon lying in the mountains, and the time of the commencement of the contest is evidently given in the words चतवारिष्ठं शरदि, which has been so far translated by Vedic scholars as ‘in the fortieth year’. That शरद may mean ‘a year’, since the year began with the शरद season in Vedic times as is proved from

1. Hillebrandt, Vedische Mythologie, Vol. iIII; p. 157. (See also now Zimmermann, op. cit., pp. CV. ff.—V.S S.)

2. Bloomfield, op. cit. p. 179.
several indications, we need not question. That the construction according to which चत्वारिंश्या́ is adj. loc. sing. of the ordinal, qualifying शारदिः, which is a word of the feminine gender, is grammatically unobjectionable, goes without saying. But no one has explained what is meant by the fortieth year or fortieth autumn. Does it mean that the phenomenon represented by the हुन्द myth, took place once in forty years? The suggestions that the passage may refer to a famine or drought that occurred after forty years or that it may represent a forty years’ war between the Aryans protected by हन्द, and शंवर, the chief of the aboriginal races dwelling on the mountains, have to be dismissed as being too far-fetched, and imaginary.

Hence a new interpretation is put on the myth by Mr. B. G. Tilak, based on his theory of the reminiscences of the Arctic Home of the Aryans in the Rigveda.¹ According to this interpretation, the passage refers to the annual struggle between light and darkness, because in the polar or circum-polar regions there is the long night of six months and the long day of six months, of course having a comparatively long twilight at both ends. The waters are the cosmic waters which were supposed to surround the earth just like ether, in the world of light above and the world of darkness below; which caused the sun, the moon, and the stars to move with them. If these waters therefore ceased to flow, the consequences would be very serious; for the sun, the

¹ J. D. Nadirshah (Proceedings and Transactions of the First Oriental Conference, Poona. pp. 84 ff.) adds one more name, Airyana Vaejo, to the long list of places which are believed by different scholars to have been the home of the Early Aryans.—V.S.S.
moon, the stars, would then all cease to rise and the world would be plunged in darkness. Thus we can fully understand the magnitude of the mischief worked by द्रव्य by stopping the flow of these waters.\(^1\) The mountains into which these waters were put up may be some metaphorical mountains supposed to exist on the border of the nether world and this earth, just as, for instance, the sun is supposed to rise from the Meru mountain. Thus the conflict with द्रव्य commenced in शत्रु, the beginning of the long night, and ended at the end of the night or the year; cf. X. 62. 2 where the Angirases, the assistants of Indra in his conquest of the cows, are said to have defeated Vala, at the end of the year (परित्यागे). I may sum up the interpretation in the words of the author himself thus:—\(^2\) "If Indra is described as the leader or releaser of waters (अपान नेता or अपान चन्द्र), the waters do not mean the waters in the clouds but the waters or the watery vapours which fill the universe and form the material out of which the latter was created. In other words, the conquest over waters was something far more marvellous and cosmic in character than the mere breaking up of the clouds in the rainy season; and under these circumstances, it was naturally considered to be the greatest of Indra's exploits, when, invigorated by a hundred nightly Soma-sacrifices, he slew with ice the watery demon of darkness shattered his hundred autumnal forts, released the waters of the seven rivers upstream to go along their aerial way, and brought out the sun and the dawn, or the cows from their place of confinement inside the rocky caves where they had stood still since the date of the war."

1 Tilak. *C nelle Home*, p. 269.  
2. Ibid p, 295
LECTURE IX
RELIGION AND MYTHOLOGY OF
THE RIGVEDA
(Continued)

द्रुण associated with the spiritual domain—The preserver of द्रत
or moral order—the three aspects of द्रत—मित्र and द्रुण, अद्वर और मित्र—
Greek Ouranos, द्रुण a god of waters—The अधिक्र्ष्ण— their mythical
and legendary character—marriage of सूर्या—Legends explained by the
dawn and spring theories—the Arctic theory—Their comparative
insignificance in later mythology—the five solar gods—सुविज्ज the enliven-
ing aspect of the sun—सूर्य, the luminary—मित्र, the Beneficent—पूर्व, the
god of paths—अवज्ज, his three strides—various interpretations of the
same—the name सिपिष्ट—उपस, the most graceful creation of Vedic
poetry—The long and many dawns—VII, 76, 3—The philosophy of
the Rigveda—The progress from many gods to one I. 164—Ideas about
death and the world hereafter—X, 121—X, 90—the creation hymn—
Absence of pessimism.

Next we proceed to consider द्रुण, who is purely a Vedic
god, i.e. a god occupying a very prominent place in the
Rigveda but reduced to absolute insignificance in later
mythology. The sphere of द्रुण is quite opposed to that of
इन्द्र. The latter is associated with the domain of physical
valour and command of external nature, but the former is
principally concerned with the spiritual domain. Thus in
the hymn VII. 83 addressed to इन्द्र and द्रुण conjointly, we
have in verse 9 the functions of Indra and द्रुण mentioned
side by side, so as to bring out the contrast clearly:

उत्तमाप्यः समिष्ठेण जित्तते नवताद्ययो अभिरक्षते सदा।
Moral elevation and sanctity are the principal attributes of वरुण. Omniscience and undeceivableness are frequently ascribed to वरुण. वरुण stands out as the god of justice, watching the conduct of all people and setting his spies everywhere for the purpose. He controls the destinies of mankind, and beholds all the secret things, that have been and will be done. He seizes and punishes transgressors with his bonds or nooses; he is a barrier against the irreligious and the wicked; sinning mortals can hardly expect to escape him (VII. 75. 3). He watches or witnesses the truth and falsehood of people: सत्यान्तः अचर्येयम् जनायाम् (VII. 49. 3). His laws and ordinances are inviolable and we see the worshipper often approaching वरुण in a suppliant attitude pleading innocence and putting forth excuses for the sins and entreaty him to show mercy, full of a contrite spirit as he is. With all the awe and reverence which वरुण commands and inspires, there is at the same time, the element of homeliness and mercy; and the relations between वरुण and his worshipper are often described as being very intimate. The worshipper is often likened to a little child committing offences through ignorance or temptation too strong for its weak and puerile nature and again obstinately asking for indulgence, at the hands of the parent, i.e. वरुण.

The hymn VII. 86 is a typical hymn in this connection, for it depicts वरुण as a guardian of moral order, angry at the misdeeds of men.

वरुण is visible to the mental eye of his worshippers (VII. 88. 2). He is mighty and fixed in purpose, arrayed in a golden mail, surrounded by his messengers. His house
has a thousand doors (VII. 88. 5), he is foresighted and thousand-eyed (VII. 34. 10): he has the sun for his eye (VII. 66. 10); he is the king of all that exists (VII. 87. 6), a universal monarch, a self-dependent ruler. Power, martial strength and sovereign authority are also spoken of as belonging to वन्ध. He is called-अजुर (mighty), मार्चिव (VII. 28. 4), possessed of a mystic or miraculous power; वन्ध is a god of illimitable resources and knowledge.

Here may be considered the meaning of the word क्षत्र in the Rigveda. वन्ध is always spoken of as the preserver of क्षत्र, or as the spring of क्षत्र (II. 28. 5 क्षा क्षतस्त). This word क्षत्र in the Rigveda itself seems to denote three ideas, all allied to each other or one idea under three aspects owing to the difference of domains.

First of all क्षत्र represents ‘the cosmic order.” क्षत्र rules the world and nature. The regular recurrence of the natural phenomena, the rising and setting of the sun, the coming of dawns and so on are all regulated by क्षत्र. The gods themselves are described as born of the क्षत्र, as observing and loving क्षत्र (क्षतरजत, क्षतसन, क्षतहु, क्षतवान् VII. 87. 1).

From this, क्षत्र comes to denote the correctness and regularity of the cult of god-worship or sacrifice. There is some principle which guides and regulates the different aspects of the sacrifice, the coming of gods, the offering of oblations and so on, and that is क्षत्र. Thus the sacrifices are described as conducted by क्षत्र, as opposed to the magic rites and acts of witchcraft which may be, therefore, called अक्षत्र.

1 See Bloomfield, op. cit. 126; 129.
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Last comes the third phase in the domain of the moral conduct of man. The moral law which every righteous man must observe—it is the chief function of वरुण to see that it is observed—is called धर्म, which may be thus paraphrased by सत्य, and अशुद्धि would then mean असत्य.

Though the world of वरुण is chiefly the moral world, still no mean exploits in the world of nature are ascribed to him. वरुण fashioned and upholds heaven and earth (VII. 86. 1; VII. 87. 5; VII. 87. 6). He made the sun to shine and followed out channels for rivers. He knew the flight of birds in the sky, the path of ships on the ocean and the course of the far-travelling wind.

वरुण is very frequently associated with मित्र and there are several hymns in the Rigveda where मित्र and वरुण are addressed together (VII. 64 & 65). मित्र is of course the sun in his beneficent aspect, the god of day or light, and what can वरुण be but the god of darkness or night? Thus while commenting on VII. 87. 1 सारण remarks:

अस्ते गच्छन् सर्यो एव वरुणं इत्यच्चते। स हि स्वगमनेन राज्यितयति।

It is this very association of मित्र and वरुण, which has led Oldenberg to conjecture that वरुण should be the moon in contrast with मित्र who is the sun.

But according to most scholars, वरुण is connected with the chief, good and wise god of the Zoroastrian faith viz. Ahura Mazda or Ormazd, 'wise lord'. One reason for this connection, if not identification, is that Ahura is an exact phonetic equivalent of Asura, a title frequently applied to वरुण, though it must be remembered that many other gods in
the Rigveda are likewise called ‘Asura’ (lit. strong). The second and convincing reason is the dual partnership of Ahura and Mithra in the Avesta, which exactly corresponds to that of मित्र and वरुण in the Veda. Besides, the attributes and functions of Ahura Mazda are very similar to those of वरुण. Thus in the Zoroastrian system, Ahura Mazda rules the world and assigns to all good creatures and entities their respective places and activities. Ahura creates the divine order. He made a way for the sun and the stars. As a guardian of divine order Ahura is not to be deceived and so on. This is enough to establish the great similarity between Ahura Mazda and वरुण.

वरुण, however, belongs not only to the Indo-Iranian period, but to the Indo-European period, inasmuch as वरुण corresponds to the Greek Ouranos, on whose testimony वरुण should represent probably the encompassing sky. Thus in VIII. 41. 3 वरुण is described as embracing the universe. वरुण may be derived from the root वर to cover and thus may mean the sky that covers or pervades all.

1. The meanings of asura has been discussed in detail by Rajwade in the Proceedings and Transactions of the First Oriental Conference, Poona, pp. 1 ff.—V. S. S.

2. Vedic आत is the phonetic equivalent of an (Old-) Iranian word (transcribed in the defective orthography of the Avasta as) Asha. (Old-) Persian Arta, which latter appears as early as B. C. 600 in Iranian royal names; moreover, Ahura is called Ashahe Khao, which corresponds exactly to आतस्य which latter is an epithet of वरुण in the Veda.—V. S. S.

3. Worthy of notice is also the mention of the Vedic gods मित्र वरुण, हन्द and the नापल्ल in the Boghaz-koï cuneiform tablets discovered in Asia Minor.—V. S. S.
One more point I would touch before leaving the subject of वरुण, and it is his later conception as a god of water. No doubt, वरुण is connected with water even in the Rigveda. In VII. 87. 1 वरुण has not only cut out a pathway for the sun, but has led the watery floods of rivers onwards. In VII. 64. 2 मिथ्र and वरुण are called सिन्धुपति, 'lords of rivers.' In VII. 49. 3 वरुण is described as the sovereign of waters, going amidst them. This connection with water (which really is only one particular aspect or manifestation of the क्षत्रिय of which वरुण is the lord), may have probably led to the later conception in the पुराणas and even सांवल calls him जलाभिमानिनी क्षत्रियa while commenting on VIII. 58. 2, though generally he regards वरुण as the god of night. "When, on the one hand, the conception of वरुण as the all-embracing heaven had been established, and on the other hand, the observation of the rivers flowing towards the ends of the earth, and to the sea had led to the conjecture that there existed an ocean enclosing the earth in its bosom, 1 then the way was thoroughly prepared for connecting वरुण with the ocean, in later mythology."2

Next we come to the pair of gods, the अत्तिव (horsemen). Hymns 67 to 74 of the seventh मण्डल are all addressed to these gods. The character of these two deities is, however, very little defined, though they are, no doubt, an object of fervent worship. They are the sons of विक्रम and सरण्ण. They are often called 'sons of heaven' (दिशो नाथाता). They

1. Or it may be the ocean of aerial waters which made the sun and the moon to move, to rise and to set.
3. Their name implies only possession of horses.—V.S.S.
are physicians, asked to neglect the calls of other devotees and pass from house to house partaking of Soma. They come from a distance in a golden chariot, drawn by birds or bird-like horses. They are ancient, beautiful, bright, swifter than thought, possessed of wisdom and intelligence.

Of all the Vedic divinities the अश्विन्द have the most pronounced mythical and legendary character. A maiden by the name of च्या (i.e. daughter of the sun) is captivated by the youthful beauty of the अश्विन्द chooses them for her husbands and ascends their chariot. The most prominent characteristic of the अश्विन्द is, however, that they are the most reliable helpers in need. All sorts of men and women have appealed to them for aid and have not been disappointed. The अश्विन्द had made themselves so familiar with men that the gods had refused to admit them to a share in the sacrifice. This fact has led some people to conjecture that these अश्विन्द must have been two heroes of wondrous exploits and of unparalleled beneficent activity, so much so that they were afterwards deified and became the recipients of most hearty praise.

It is of interest to know what वास्क thinks of them. In the beginning of Ch. 12 he says: "Some say that they are the heaven and earth; others, day and night; others again, the sun and the moon." (All these are explanations according to the Nairukta school or the Naturalists). The ऐतिहासिक्स (Traditionalists) say that they are two kings of virtuous deeds. वास्क also remarks that their time is the hour between midnight and early dawn.

As said above, it is not easy to define exactly their character from the epithets applied to them. But let us see
if we derive any help in this from a consideration of the several legends connected with them. They have been all briefly summarized in the following extract from Macdonell’s *Vedic Mythology* (§ 21), which I quote here for convenience.

"The sage Chyavana, grown old and deserted, they released from his decrepit body; they prolonged his life, restored him to youth, rendered him desirable to his wife and made him the husband of maidens (I. 116. 10 etc.)...They also renewed the youth of the aged Kali (X. 39.8) and befriended him when he had taken a wife (I. 112. 15.)...The story most often referred to is that of the rescue of चूम्बु, son of ढुम, who was abandoned in the midst of the ocean (समुद्र) or in the water clouds (उज्जमणे) and who tossed about in darkness invoked the aid of the youthful heroes. In the ocean which is without support they took him home in a hundred-oared ship...They rescued him with animated water-tight ships...The sage रेघ, stabbed, bound, hidden by the malignant, overwhelmed in waters for ten nights and nine days, abandoned as dead, was by the आभिब्रज revived and drawn out as Soma is raised with a ladle. They delivered वनस्पति from...calamity and restored him to the light of the sun...They succoured the sage आशि सतवन्ति who...was plunged in a burning pit by the wiles of a demon...and delivered him from darkness...They rescued from the jaws of a wolf a quail which invoked their aid. To ऋग्राश्व who had been blinded by his father for killing one hundred and one sheep and giving them to a she-wolf to devour, they restored his eyesight at the prayer of the she-wolf (I. 116. 16; I. 117. 17, 18);

1. For आभिब्रज see especially hymns 112, 116, 117, 118 from the first मण्डल
and cured तस्र्वेजः of blindness and lameness (I. 112. 8). When विश्वद्व’s leg had been cut off in the battle like the wing of a bird, the अभिविर्देनः gave her an iron one instead.... The cow of श्रेष्ठ, which had left off bearing they caused to give milk (I. 116. 22). They gave to वेळ a strong, stiff, dragon-slaying steed impelled by Indra, which won him unbounded spoils (I. 116. 6)."

Now all these myths connected with the अभिविर्देनः have been explained on the Dawn and the Spring theories. Thus the recovery of the sun early in the morning from the darkness of the night, and the restoring of brightness to the sun in the spring, whose powers are mostly ineffectual in winter are the phenomena supposed to be referred to by these legends of restoring youth to an old man or curing the blindness of another. But these theories do not fully explain all the details connected with these legends. Thus, for instance, the places from which all the helpless persons are rescued are generally described as full of darkness, as being bottomless and watery (I. 182. 6); and the period of distress is generally spoken of as being 10 days or 10 days and 10 nights and so on. Besides the incident of ऋजुमः (I. 116. 16) killing 100 sheep and therefore being rendered blind remains altogether without explanation. So also the hymn V. 78, referring to अभि समवेति and especially its last three verses cannot be satisfactorily explained on the basis of the two theories proposed above. Hence another theory, briefly called the Arctic theory, has been proposed, according to

1. Comparative Mythology seems to favour the identification of the अभिविर्देनः with the Morning and Evening Stars. See Zimmermann, op. cit. pp. XCII ff.—V.S.S.
which all these legends refer to the long night and the long day. "The sun sunk in the nether world of waters and darkness and not merely a winter sun is the burden of all these legends, and the achievements of the Āśvins refer to the rescue of the sun from the dark pit of the nether world or from the bottomless ocean of darkness."1

The Āśvins and चर्चा have been identified or at least connected with the Greek Dioskouroi, the sons of Zeus, Castor and Pollux, and their sister Helena (which more resembles in sound, सरण्ख the mother of the Āśvins). The word अश्विन means 'one having a horse'; but this connection with horses comes out more strongly with the Dioskouroi, who are celebrated tamers of horses, riders of horses, and charioteers. They also were revered as helpers in need and were called Anaktes, 'protecting lords.'2

Thus we see that the Vedic Āśvins combined the cosmical as well as historical and human characters in a most conspicuous way. In later mythology they occupy an insignificant position, being merely physicians possessed of great physical beauty. The legend of व्यावाण referred to above has been transformed into a neat story in the महाभारत.3

Next we have to consider the five solar gods, सयन, चर्चा, मित्र, चसन, and विष्णु. Though many of the attributes of these gods are very similar so as to make it difficult to distinguish one from another, still there are some distinctive functions


3. About the birth of the Āśvins and their relation to वसिन्द्र see the extract from ब्रह्मदेवता quoted by सायण in his commentary on *VII.* 72. 2.
peculiar to each of them and there is no doubt that in the Rigveda these are not mere synonyms, but distinct entities.

सविट्ठ (lit. the impeller, enliven) represents, in distinction from others, the enlivening or quickening aspect of the sun; see hymn IV 54, of which every verse contains some form of the root हु in its various meanings, reminding the reader of the essential connection between the god सविट्ठ and the meaning of the root present in it. सविट्ठ is good-complexioned, he ascends a golden car, beholds all creatures. This सविट्ठ is sometimes expressly distinguished from ख्रेण; but sometimes they are spoken of indiscriminately. सावण says in one place that the sun is called सविट्ठ before rising, and ख्रेण from sunrise to sunset. लास्ख remarks: "The time of सविट्ठ's appearance is when darkness has been removed and the rays of light have become diffused over the sky."

ख्रेण more refers to the luminary itself. He is the son of ब्रह्म and आत्मिति; his wife is उपस्तु (VII. 75. 5). In another place the dawns are said to produce him (VII. 78. 3). He is drawn in a car by seven horses (VII. 63. 2); his path is prepared by the आत्मिय य (VII. 60. 4); ख्रेण is the preserver and soul of all things stationary and moving (VII. 60. 2): he is the vivifier of men (VII. 63. 2). He is far-seeing, he beholds the good and bad deeds of all mortal creatures, he is the eye of मित्र and वृण. In many places, however, a dependent and subordinate position is assigned to ख्रेण, and his divine personality is thrown into the background. The grand luminary becomes little more than a part of nature, created and controlled by those spiritual powers which exist above and beyond all material phenomena. The sun is thus one of the most transparent of gods; see especially I. 115.
मित्र was spoken of above as an associate of कृष्ण. He prominently represents the beneficent side of the Sun's power. मित्र stimulates people to activity, he holds fast the earth and heaven, he watches the people ceaselessly. Hymn III. 59 is specially addressed to मित्र alone, wherein चर्पणिः and यात्राजन are his distinctive epithets. It is to be noted that this is the only hymn addressed to मित्र alone, in the whole of the Rigveda. Elsewhere he is generally invoked along with कृष्ण. Thus it may be said that मित्र, though one of the oldest gods, owing to his identification with the Iranian Mithra, has lost his independent individuality in the Rigveda.

श्रवण is distinctly a shepherd god. "His chief claim to usefulness is that he knows the roadways; protects from their dangers such as wolves and robbers; guards cattle so that they be not dashed to pieces in the ravine; brings them home unhurt, when they have gone astray, and, in general, restores lost things. श्रवण drives the cows to pasture,...he carries a goad and his car is drawn by goats,...he lives on gruel." 1 Hymns 53-56 of मण्डल VI may be read in this connection. This श्रवण also cannot be anything but a sun-god since he is also described as lord of all things that stand or move and he is also the lover of एक्ष. He is called आधुण्ड 'glowing'; so also his ability as a path-finder and restorer of lost things points to an over-seeing heavenly body.

विष्ण is another solar deity of the Rigveda. The entire hymns and the separate verses in which विष्ण is celebrated are much fewer than those dedicated to the praises of दर्द.

Besides, in most of the passages referring to him, he is generally lauded along with a host of other divinities. From this it may be concluded that विष्णु was regarded in the Rigveda as being on a footing of equality with other gods, or even subordinate to many of them, though he forms one of the two great gods of modern Hinduism, sometimes being elevated to the highest place. The essential feature of his character is that he takes three strides covering the three worlds. शाखर्षण regards these three strides as three manifestations of one and the same god, as अशि on earth, as इन्द्र or वाघ in the atmosphere and as the sun in heaven. औगेनाम, on the other hand, interprets them as the rising, culminating and setting of the sun. Max Müller also interprets this myth as referring to the three stages in the daily course of the sun. In the शाखर्षण and later works, however, this feature is developed into the story of विष्णु appearing in the form of a dwarf and recovering the earth from the demons headed by Bali, by taking his three strides.

According to Tilak's theory, however, these three strides refer not to the daily course of the sun, but to the annual course when the year was divided, as at the circum-polar regions, into three parts, of which two parts or eight months, the sun was above the horizon and hence the two strides of विष्णु are spoken of as being visible; while the third part or four months, the sun went below the horizon into the nether world of darkness or of waters, providing continuous darkness, and thus the third stride is invisible. In I. 155. 6, विष्णु is described as setting into motion his ninety steeds with four names, which can only refer to the 360 days of the
year with the four seasons. So also in VII. 99. 4 and 5, विष्णु is associated with हरित, in the exploit over हरित, and विष्णु is described along with हरित as generating the sun, the dawn, and अश्व, and breaking the ninety-nine cities of शेखर— which points to the conclusion that the three strides of विष्णु should also refer to the annual course of the sun, with the long day and long night.

With this interpretation, the meaning of the word शिपिविद्ध may be well explained. The verse VII. 100. 6 runs thus: “What was there to be blamed in thee when thou declaredst ‘I am शिपिविद्ध?’ Do not conceal from us this form, since thou didst assume another shape in the battle.” यास्क (Nir. V. 7-9) proposes two interpretations: शिपिविद्ध may mean शेष हरित निरंगंहितं: ‘enveloped like the penis or with rays obscured (अष्टादशस्त्रिम).’ It may be a laudatory appellation also, meaning ‘one whose rays (शिपिवते:) are displayed (आचित्वते:)’

शिपिविद्ध refers to the temporary obscuring of the rays of the sun when he entered into the nether world (राजस: पारंके शिपिन्तं, VII. 100. 5). “The poet, therefore, asks विष्णु not to be ashamed of this epithet because, says he, the form indicated by the bad name is only temporarily assumed as a dark armour for the purpose of fighting with the Asuras, and as it was no longer needed, विष्णु is invoked to reveal his true form to the worshipper”.

Thus the story of चस्म and वास्तव is the story of विष्णु going down to the nether world dark or diseased, to plant his third step on the head of the Asuras.

2. Tilak, Arctic Home, p. 332.
3. शिपिविद्ध indicated some bodily affliction or skin-disease, though what it was exactly is not known.
or in a dark armour to help Indra in his struggle for waters and light, a struggle which lasted for a long time and resulted in the flowing of waters, the recovery of the dawn, and the coming out of the sun in a bright armour, after a long and continuous darkness.

Sāyaṇa generally derives विष्णु as व्यापनशील, but Bloomfield has proposed a new etymology—वि + स्त्र ‘through the back’, on the ground of a passage in the सामवेद (2. 1024):

इत्यते विष्णुविचर्चने प्रथिव्या अधि सानवि।
‘Vishnu strode through over the back of the earth.’

Some other heroic acts are also attributed to विष्णु. He is said to have established heaven and earth, to have made the atmosphere wide, stretched out the worlds. His greatness is described in one place as having no limit within the ken of present or future beings. “In the highest stepping place of विष्णु there is the fount of honey” (I. 154. 5).

Nothing can surpass the beauty of the hymns addressed to the goddess उपश्र; and as Macdonell remarks, this deity is the most graceful creation of Vedic Poetry, there being no more charming figure in the descriptive religious lyrics of any other literature.1 The seventh मण्डल contains seven hymns (75 to 81) out of the twenty hymns addressed to उपश्र in the whole of the Rigveda. The freshness and sweetness about these poems is simply indescribable. While reading such verses as “Lo, the rich dawn casts, as it were, her garment from her, and moves on, queen of the world: this beautiful and wonderful goddess brings heaven to life again and stretches to the ends of earth and sky” (III. 61. 4), we feel

1. Macdonell, op. cit. p. 46.
as if we are going to be held willing captives of a primitive Shelley or Keats.

The dawn is the daughter of the sky, and sister of the night. The sun is her lover. The glorious mistress of the world is borne on a shining chariot, drawn by ruddy horses, like a richly dressed dancing girl, she goes on smiling and confiding in the irresistible power of her attractions, unveiling her bosom to the gaze of the beholder. She dispels darkness, disclosing the treasures she had concealed, illuminates the world, awakens the five races of men, she is young, being born again and again, yet old and immortal; she is the life and breath of all. Even in this most ecstatic piece of poetry concerning the dawn, the Vedic poet-priest cannot lay aside his trait of practicalness and the sacrif-cult. The dawn is the herald of the sacrifice, with her appearance commences the sacrificial day, as it were, and she is often entreated to bring to the worshipper wealth, children, and slaves, to afford protection and to prolong life. The dawn is thus another instance of a transparent deity whose natural character is in no way obscured by personification.

Can it be the diurnal dawn, which could excite such ecstasy and rapture in the mind of the Vedic poet-priest? Of course, every one is aware of the fresh and sweet influence of the early dawn, which may justify the poetic ecstasy, all that is said about her in the Veda. But there are certain phrases and expressions which are used of her and which cannot be satisfactorily interpreted as referring to the daily dawn. The long, continuous dawns (VII. 76. 3; II. 28. 9; VII. 9. 1; VII. 63. 3), which were so long that even the whole of the Rigveda could be recited before sunrise; the circular
movement referred to (I. 123. 8 and 9; III. 61. 3; VII. 80. 1); the thirty parts of which they were made up (I. 123. 8; VI. 59. 6), all these go to show that the dawns referred to must be longer dawns, seems only at the circumpolar regions.¹

Before leaving this subject, we may consider the interpretation of the following verses in the seventh मण्डल, bearing upon the subject:²

तानीद्वानि बहुतायासवं या प्राचीनधिता सर्वंस्य।
यत्य परि जार ह्याचर्चन्ति उषो दृष्टे न दुन्यंतीव ॥ VII. 76. 3.

The verse means: “Those days were many which were aforetime at the rise of the sun and about which dawn, thou wast seen moving on, as towards a lover, and not like one who forsakes," which clearly establishes two facts that (1) many days passed between the appearance of the first morning beams and sunrise; and that (2) those days were faithfully attended by the Dawn which is possible only in the case of the circumpolar dawn.

Sāyān explains the verse in a farfetched manner, not understanding how several days could pass before sunrise and hence proposes to take the word अहहः to mean उज्ज्वलकालकाल and तानि = splendidours and बहुतानि अहहानि as accusative of time. Western scholars also take अहहानि as splendidours, lustres. Griffith translates “great is the number of mornings,” but does not explain further. So also III. 61. 3 and VII. 80. 1 I may deserve special consideration in this connection.

So far I have spoken of the mythology of the Rigveda. Before concluding, I should like to make a few remarks on the philosophy of the Rigveda.

² Tilak, *ibid.* p. 88 ff.
India is often spoken of as the cradle of philosophy. Nowhere are made so bold and daring attempts to solve the riddle of the universe as in India, where there lived kings like जनक and भजातश्रु, भागवत्लय and नारकेतार, scholiasts like शंकर and कुमारिन्द्र. So the student of the Rigveda will naturally be curious to know what philosophy is taught in the Rigveda. He has, however, to be warned that no cut and dry system is taught here, for which he has to go to the ब्राह्म. Nor do philosophic speculations form the main burden of the Rigveda, as they do in the case of the उपनिषद्व. However, the seeds of the उपनिषद्व thought are seen scattered about here and there in the संहिता of the Rigveda. Though the general religion of the Rigveda refers to a plurality of nature gods, still the tendency to monism is distinctly seen in some of the hymns. Just as the क्रिषिङ्ग thought that the several natural phenomena had some divine forces behind them which were personified into so many gods, in the same way they advanced one step further and came to think that all these were the aspects of one and the same all-pervading divine force which manifested itself in different ways. Thus, there was a transition from many gods to one god. Thus in I. 164. 46 we have: "They call it, देव, मित्र, देव्य and अश्व, or the heavenly bird वसुन्मत (the sun). The sages call the One Being in many ways; they call it अश्व, यम, मातरिक्षक. Here the several Vedic gods are stated to be but one being. This whole hymn (I. 164) is nothing but a collection of fifty-two verses of poetry, all of them except one (being riddles whose answers are not given. "The subjects of these riddles are cosmic, that is, pertaining to the nature phenomena of the universe; mythological, that is, referring to the accepted
legends about the gods; psychological that is, pertaining to
the human organs and sensations or finally crude and tenta-
tive philosophy or theosophy. Heaven and Earth, Sun and
Moon, air, clouds and rain; the course of the sun, the year,
the seasons, months, days and nights; human voice, self-
consciousness life and death; the origin of the first creature,
and the originator of the universe—such are the abrupt and
bold themes.”

In spite of the worldly character of the rewards asked
for by the Vedic ṛṣis, such as long life, cattle, warlike sons,
gold and so on, sometimes there seem to be haunting their
minds, ideas about death and the world thereafter. The idea
that the dead forefathers are dwelling in another world, in
the company of gods, where we ourselves shall have to go
after death, seems to be expressed or implied in several
places. Thus we have in I. 91. 1. “under your guidance,
O Indra, our wise fathers received their share of treasure
among the gods;” so also I. 125. 5. The thirst for life haunts
the mind of the ṛṣis and he leads himself to believe that the
life after death in the world of gods and fathers, is eternal,
at least as compared with the life on this earth. Thus in V.
55. 4. and V. 63. 2 that life is called अमृतत्व or immortality.

Questions concerning the beginning and origin of all
things were asked and answered in a crude and tentative
manner by the Vedic ṛṣis. Thus in the hymn X. 121,
हिरण्यगर्भ is described as existing in the beginning of the
creation, the sole Lord of beings, supporting heaven and
earth. In X. 90, the hymn popularly known as व्रजमुख, the
idea that the whole world is one being, the विराठपुरुष who

having pervaded the world from all sides, still remained over and above it, is dealt with. In the hymn X. 82, waters are spoken of as being the first substance or prime cause. In hymn X. 125, वाहु is represented as the companion and upholder of the gods and as the foundation of all religious activity and its attendant boons. Hymn X. 129 is a typical hymn in this connection. It is called the creation-hymn. Deussen says of this hymn: "In its noble simplicity, in the loftiness of its philosophic vision, it is possibly the most admirable bit of philosophy of olden times...No translation can ever do justice to the beauty of the original." "The avowed purpose of all philosophy is to account for the presence of the world and its contents as something which is not self-evident, and needs to be explained beyond the point of mere individual experience, or analysis through empirical knowledge. The creation hymn performs this act not without some unsteadiness and with petulance due to scepticism. In putting forth a fundamental principle without personality it does not fall far behind the best thought of later times inside or outside of India."

One thing, however, must be noted and it is that pessimism and metempsychosis, the two main threads which are woven in everything Indian, and which are the distinguishing traits thereof, are wanting in the early philosophy of the Vedas.
LECTURE X
SOCIAL LIFE IN THE RIGVEDIC AGE

Allusions to the names of rivers in the seventh नाम-क्रमम्—The country inhabited by the early Aryan colonists—villages and cities—forts—principal means of sustenance—different occupations and trades—gambling—family—marriage, the most sacred and important function—burning of widows—widow-re-marriage—state—formation of tribes—images of gods—caste-system.

It has been now indisputably proved by comparative philology that the Indians, Iranians, Greeks, Slavs, Germans and Italians had common ancestors, dwelling in a common country, whether it be central Asia or Norway, speaking a common language, in far distant ages. We also know from a comparison of the Avesta and Vedic Sanskrit, that after the separation of the eastern branch from the western, the former (i.e. Iranians and Indians) lived together for a long time, calling themselves Aryans, to distinguish themselves from other tribes.¹ After their separation from the Iranians, the Eastern Aryans (or Indians) passed into India through the Western passes of the Hindukush. The part of India which these Indian Aryans occupied, during the composition of the Rigveda is sufficiently indicated by topical references in the Rigveda, especially the names of rivers. Accordingly the Aryans must have first settled themselves along the banks of the Sindhu in the Punjab, where most of the hymns of the

¹ For a resume of different views held on the original home of the Indo-Aryan tribes, see Belvarkar, "The controversy over the original home of the Aryans, Jour. K. R. Kama Oriental Institute, 1923, pp. 89 ff. —V. S. S.
Rigveda must have been composed, before they passed to the regions of the Ganges, where later Brahmanism dominated and which saw the composition of the ब्राह्मण and समाजिक.

In the seventh मण्डल the following passages may be noticed as mentioning the rivers: VII. 18, 8, 9, 19, 24; 95 and 96 in honour of the सरस्वती.

The Sindhu, the modern Indus, sometimes designated सहन्द, is the much-praised सरस्वती (lit. rich in water) in the Rigveda, by whose greatness, the singers were inspired into most glorious strains. The other rivers mentioned are: बिलस्ना (lit. stretched out), now Jhelum; अजिन (black), now Chinab; पशुण्डा, श्रावन्ती, now Ravi; विषाद (fetterless), now Bias; छिट्टा (changed later on to सतद्र = hundred-coursed), now Sutlaj; and the खुआ. The Ganges, which in later times became the backbone of India, is mentioned in the Rigveda only once, in X. 75. 5; the खुआ (Kabul) and Suvastu (the Swat) are also referred to a few times. Thus East Kabulistan and the Punjab may be regarded as the country where the early Aryan colonists lived.

Villages and cities are referred to, e. g. I. 114. 1; I. 44.

10. Iron cities or fortifications are mentioned in VII. 3. 7; VII. 15. 14; VII. 95. 1. Although these are alluded to figuratively as the means of protection afforded by the gods, they,

1. Keith (Cambridge History of India, Vol. 1, pp. 79 ff.) sets forth and substantiates the results of recent research which favours the view that the main, though not the earliest, part of the Rigveda, had its origin not in the Punjab but in the sacred country of later Brahmanism, the land known in the साहित्य of the succeeding period as ब्रह्मस्त. — V. S. S.

2. See the important article by M. A. Stein, "On some river names in the Rigveda," in the Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume, pp. 21 ff.—V. S. S.
no doubt, suggest the idea of forts, consisting apparently of a series of concentric walls, as actually existing in the country at the time.

Cattle-keeping and agriculture are the principal means of sustenance.\textsuperscript{1} We frequently meet with prayers for herds of cattle, cows and horses, sheep and goats, especially the milch-cows which is “the sum of all good which Indra has created for our enjoyment.” As for food, frequent mention is made of त्रित (I. 23. 15; I. 117. 21 etc.). Rice is not referred to in the Rigveda but is named in the अथर्ववेद (cf. VI. 140. 2, त्रितमत्तव धृतमत्वाय मात्रमयं तिथम). Parched corn is mentioned several times (III. 35. 3 and 7; III. 52. 5); cakes and meal mixed with curds or butter (कुस्म) are offered to the gods (III. 52. 7; VI. 57. 2). Plants are frequently alluded to and are even invoked (VII. 34. 23; VII. 35. 5; especially X. 97. 15). The cutting up of flesh, apparently for sacrificial purposes is mentioned in I. 161. 10. In V. 29. 7, VIII. 12. 8 and VIII. 66. 10, mention is made of the gods cooking or eating large numbers of buffaloes. From this it may be inferred that they also formed a portion of human food. The drinking of Soma is referred to. The Soma juice was not only dear to Indra and other gods, but it was drunk by the worshippers themselves and its effects on them are occasionally described (VI. 47. 3; VIII. 48. 3). Wine (इडा) was also in use (VII. 86. 6; VIII. 2. 12).\textsuperscript{2}

1. A somewhat detailed description of social life in the Rigvedic age has been attempted by Keith in the \textit{Cambridge History of India}, Vol. 1, pp. 77 ff. Two earlier works dealing with the same subject in great detail are: Lassen, \textit{Indische Altertumskunde}, 4 Vols. and Zimmer, \textit{Altindisches Lehen}.—V.S.S.

2. Contrast Manu, XI. 54, 90, 93—97, 148 ff., 249.—V. S. S.
Different occupations and trades are mentioned. In this connection, one should read especially IX. 112. 1-4. The construction of chariots is often referred to, and the skill shown in the composition of hymns is compared to the art of the carriage-builder (II. 19. 8; II. 35. 2, etc.). Weaving was universally practised, as appears from the metaphorical use of the verb गृह ‘to weave’ for the composition of hymns (VII. 33. 9, and 12). The art of ship-building was known (II. 39. 4; I. 25. 7; VII. 88. 8f.) Rope-making is referred to in VII. 84. 2; working in leather in VII. 63. 1, VII. 89. 2, and VII. 103. 2. Agriculture is recommended to the gambler in X. 34. 13. Water courses, both artificial and natural, are alluded to in III. 45. 3 and VII. 49. 2, from which we may reasonably infer that irrigation of lands under cultivation was practised.

Gambling was the most popular form of recreation (VII. 86. 6). The whole of the hymn X. 34 should be read in this connection. Thieves and robbers are referred to in VII. 55. 3 and VII. 86. 5.

The state was founded on the family, at the head of which stood the father as lord of the house. Marriage was regarded as a most sacred and important function. "The Vedic singers knew no more tender relation than that between the husband and his willing, loving wife, who is praised as "his home, the darling abode and bliss in his house." The high position of the wife is above all shown by the fact that she participates in the sacrifice with her husband; with harmonious mind at the early dawn, both.

2. RV. III. 53. 4 and 6.
in fitting words, send up their prayers to the eternals. In the new home the young wife is subject to her husband, but at the same time mistress of the farm-labourers and slaves, and of parents and brothers-in-law.

All this is comprehensible only on the supposition that monogamy was the rule. And this is pointed to directly by the text (I. 124. 7; IV. 3. 2; X. 71. 4; I. 105. 2). However, there are some traces of the existence of polygamy, amongst Kshatriyas though it was, no doubt, the exception; cf. I. 62. 11; I. 71. 1; I. 105. 8 (=X. 33. 2); VII. 26. 3; VII. 18. 2; X. 43. 1.

The woman seems to have been free to make her choice of a husband, as appears from X. 27. 11 and 12.

Marriage was looked upon as a sacrament the aim of which was the mutual support of man and wife and the propagation of their race; therefore, it is the oft-repeated wish of the Vedic singer to beget a son of his own flesh, whose place could never be filled by adoption. See VII. 4. 7 and 8, which allude to the inferiority of the adopted son to the natural-born one.

As for the burning of widows the practice does not seem to be evidenced directly by the Rigveda; yet, from other indications we have to accept the probability that the custom was also observed now and then in the Vedic period. Atharvaveda 18. 3. 1 proves the immolation of the wife at the death of her husband as an old custom (पुराणम्भ.) But that the custom was not compulsory nor very general follows from such passages as X. 18. 7 and X. 40. 2. The

1. Cf. I. 122. 2; X. 86. 10; especially X. 85.
former passage is now regarded as a distinct sanction for widow-burning by reading अन्तः in place of अन्ये. That the usage only received decided sanction in late times is evident from the fact that "the Indian Law-literature, from the oldest times up to the late period, treats fully of the widow's right of inheritance and that the isolated references to the burning of widows in some of the law-books endorse it only as a matter of choice."

As for the question of widow remarriage, its general non-prevalence is naturally expected from the extremely important and sacred character of marriage. However, there is a passage which distinctly bears testimony to the fact that a widow was allowed to marry her husband's brother. In X. 40. 2 we have.

इह निर्देशा इह वस्तोरबिना इहाभिपिलं करत: इहीपतः ।
को वा शुद्ध विशेष देवरं मर्यं न योषा कृष्णेः सच्चिद्भ: आ ||

In elucidation of the comparison in I. 3, Roth in निष्क III. 15 refers to मनु IX. 69-70, where it is enjoined that in certain circumstances a widow shall be married to her deceased husband's brother. In verse 60 of the same अष्टाद्य of मनु, it is ruled that the union shall only subsist until one son has been procreated.

Allusions to conjugal infidelity and sexual immorality are only rarely met with (X. 34. 4; X. 40. 6; II. 29. 1).

Women are sometimes spoken of as ungovernable and fickle (VIII. 33. 17).

Untruth is condemned in IV. 5. 5 and the gods are said to punish lying (I. 152. 1; VII. 49. 3; VII. 84. 4).

1. Kaegi, op. cit. p. 113 notes.
On the foundation of the family rests the state. For protection against threatened attacks and for the purpose of marauding incursions into the territory of other peoples, coalitions were formed between tribes; but in times of peace the tribe itself formed the highest political unit. The government was monarchical as is to be naturally expected from its origin in the family. The king stood at the head. Several kings or leaders are mentioned in the hymns of the Rigveda. Thus ten kings are alluded to as having fought against स्वास्त (VII. 33. 3; VII. 83. 6 ff). In VII. 18. 2, Indra is represented as living in lights, as a king among his wives which appears to indicate the existence of royal polygamy. It was regarded as eminently beneficial for a king to entertain a family-priest and we find the liberality of different princes to the धर्मिः or priests by whom they were attended celebrated in numerous passages; cf. X. 173, in which blessings are invoked on a king.

About the religion and worship of the Vedic people, I have spoken at length in a separate lecture. An interesting question may be touched upon here, and it is this 'Did the Vedic Indians make images of their gods?' Max Müller says: "The religion of the Veda knows of no idols. The worship of idols in India is a secondary formation, a later degradation of the more primitive worship of ideal gods". On the other hand, the opposite view is put forth by Bollensen, according to whom, the use of such appellations as विषो नरि, दुर्वेशस in connection with gods proves not only that human forms were assigned to gods in imagination, but the gods were also actually represented iconographically.

He adduces in his support II. 33. 9; I. 25. 13; V. 52. 15; in the last passage the मन्त्र्स seem to be distinguished from their 'gods', i.e. from their images. The question, however, cannot be decided either way at present.

Do the Vedas contain the caste-system? Nothing dominates the life of a Hindu more than religious institutions; and no institution is more tyrannical in its influence than the caste-system. Its grotesque inconsistencies and bitter tyranny have gone far to make the Hindu what he is. Bloomfield condemns it downright and remarks: "The corrosive properties of this single institution, more than anything else whatsoever have checked the development of India into a nation. They have made possible the spectacle of a country of nearly 300 millions of inhabitants, governed by the skill of 60,000 military and 60,000 civilian foreigners."

This is not the place to refute or justify these remarks. We are only concerned with the question whether there is anything like the present caste-system evidenced by the hymns of the Rigveda.

It must be first stated that nothing like the present divisions and sub-divisions which have made the caste-system a caste-chaos has place anywhere in ancient Sanskrit literature. It is only the fourfold division into शार्मण, श्रवणि, वेश्य and शूद्र that is very frequently referred to. For the several passages in शार्मण, दुराण्यs and other works referring to caste and its origination, I may refer you to Muir's Original Sanskrit Texts vol. I.

In the hymns of Rigveda, however, there is only one passage referring to this four-fold division and that is

1. Bloomfield, op. cit. p. 5.
X. 90. 12. This hymn, known as the पुरुषव्रत is, however regarded by many scholars as being a very late production, on account of several indications of its modern character, such as the use of terms like गाहन and वैवष which rarely or never again occur in the Rigveda, the pantheistic ideas, which do not find a place in the older portions of the Rigveda, the smoothness and regularity of metre and so on. Thus it is argued that even the conception of the four castes is foreign to the Rigveda proper; and even this allusion is more an allegorical representation than a literal statement of facts.

Others, however, (Dr. Haug, for instance,) hold that the hymn may not be necessarily regarded as modern in character, because such cosmological and speculative conceptions are met with in about every part of the Rigveda and that the allegory is most significant and instructive.

Thus Dr. Haug remarks: "Now according to this passage, which is the most ancient and authoritative we have on the origin of Brahmanism and caste in general, the गाहन has not come from the mouth of this primary being, the पुरुष, 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 गाहन are teachers and instructors of mankind. The arms are the seat of strength. If the two arms of the पुरुष are said to have been made a सत्विक (warrior), that means, then, that the सत्विकs have to carry arms to defend the empire. That the thighs of the पुरुष were transformed into the वैवष means

that, as the lower parts of the body are the principal repository of food taken, the बृहस्पति caste is destined to provide food for the others. The creation of the शौर्य from the feet of the पुरुष 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." It is this verse 12 of the पुरुषोत्तम which is generally put forth as an evidence for the determination of caste by birth. By the side of this, however, may be cited the passage from the ब्राह्मणिकातृत्वा:

चातुर्वर्णेऽभयं सूर्यं गुणकम्विभागः।

which affirms that the fourfold division of caste depends upon qualities and actions (as opposed to birth). Even this passage is, however, interpreted by the orthodox people in their favour, by laying stress on the word गुणम्.
LECTURE XI
GRAMMATICAL PECULIARITIES OF
THE RIGVEDA

Vedic inflexional forms — Peculiarities of संधि— Peculiarities of
Declension— Peculiarities of conjugation—Infinitives and Gerunds—The
subjunctive—Peculiarities of syntax.

A general comparison of the Sanskrit of the Rigveda
with the Classical Sanskrit will show that the former is more
rich in inflexional forms than the latter, which has become
more rigid and less multiform. Thus, for instance, in the
case of the declension of nouns, where we had originally two
or three forms for a particular case-ending, we have now
only one; and in the case of the conjugation of verbs, whole
tenses or moods have become obsolete. Thus, there is
nothing in the Classical language corresponding to the sub-
jective in the Veda, and the Vedic infinitive has about
eight forms, while the classical infinitive has only one. In
the same way a greater variety can be marked in the Vedic संधि as compared with that of the Classical dialect. In
order to see the truth of all this, it is necessary to be
acquainted with the grammatical forms which the Vedic
Sanskrit has in contradistinction to the Classical idiom, which
we today proceed to note, with illustrations from the seventh
मण्डल, as far as possible.¹

¹ An admirable little synopsis of the main peculiarities of Vedic
Grammar have been given by Zimmermann, op. cit. pp. XLVII. ff., which
may be consulted with advantage. The subject has been comprehen-
sively treated by Macdonell in his Vedic Grammar (Encyclopedia of Indo-
Aryan, Research, I. 4, Strassburg, 1910),—V. S. S.
To begin with, in the matter of संचि in Classical Sanskrit, hiatus is generally forbidden; but in the Vedic Sanskrit, it is very frequent. Thus in innumerable instances य and ध are to be read as ṛ and ḷ, and less often a long vowel is to be resolved into two vowels, in order to make good the metre. As illustrations, compare VII. 4.8a; 6.3d; 14. 2c; 21. 4a; 22. 4b; 66. 11b; and so on.

2. The disappearance of an initial ḷ after a final ṛ or ḷ which is the invariable rule in Classical Sanskrit, is, in the Veda, only an occasional occurrence; and in this respect, there is no accordance between the written and spoken form of the Vedic text. The ḷ is many times elided where the metre requires it, while it is retained, where the metre requires its omission. Here are some instances: VII. 1.7a, 8a, 9a, 11a, 19b; 66.5c; 61.3d; 18.7c; 33.11b; 57.5c; 71.5a.

The final ḷ, ḷ, ṛ of a dual form are maintained un-combined with the following vowel, but the Rigveda shows many exceptions to this, especially before ṛव, e.g. VII. 72. 3c; 87. 2c; 104. 6d. The combination with ṛव following, without regard to the form of the ending (e.g. ḷ; ḷ, etc., or ḷम, ṛम, ṛस, etc.) is so frequent that the simplest explanation is the presence of the parallel form ṛ regularly used in Pañitä and in the verses of Buddhist Sanskrit.

5. The change of ṛ to ḷ effected by the preceding ḷ, ṛ, ḷ, takes place in the Veda, occasionally even when the latter belong to a different word, essentially unconnected. Especially the pronominal forms नष्ठ and नष्ठ are thus affected very often.
Original final स is retained after a nasal. Thus final आ, इ, ए, and क्र, become आ, इ, ए and क्र, the स after these nasalised vowels being treated as if it were after pure vowels. Thus we have: कूर्वरोक्त: (VII. 5.6c), so also 6.3b, 3c; 3d; 10. 3c; 11. 1b.

In the Veda, the final vowel of a word—generally अ, much less often ए or ओ—is in a large number of cases prolonged, usually when it is favoured by the metre, but sometimes even where the metre opposes the change. Such words are (1) particles like अम्क, अघ etc., (2) case-forms like एना, तेना etc., (3) verb-forms like उपना, स्था, भव्यता, विद्रा, दुस्ता, वेदा, कुही, कुर्वी etc., and (4) gerunds in य.

Next we proceed to the declension of nouns. Let us begin with the masculine and neuter nouns ending in अ. In their case, the singular of the instrumental (both m. & n.), shows a peculiar form, either ending in एना or आ. The following are instances from the seventh मण्डल: 18. 17 पेल्लेना; 55. 7 तेना सहस्येना; 71. 4 and 93. 7 एना; 32. 7 ला दित (ला instr. of ला); 13. 2 सहितवा; 20. 4; 23. 3; 58. 1; 61. 4; 97. 8; 100. 3.

The dual of the nominative and accusative (m. only), usually ends in आ; while वै is only exceptional. आ occurs generally, (1) at the end of a पल, (2) before consonants, and (3) before an initial vowel with which it is fused, but never before vowels. A good illustration where both forms occur side by side is 1. 184. 1 ता वास अथ ताक्षर दुस्तेन. Instances of forms ending in आ are VII. 1. 17; 2; 7; 18. 22; 70. 1; 50. 1; 67. 5. However, note 50. 2 and 84. 2 where आ occurs before consonants.

Next is to be noticed the plural of the nominative and vocative (m.). There are two endings आस् and आः. The forms in आस् are about one half as numerous as those in आः in the Rigveda. In the Atharvaveda, there are comparatively very few forms in आस्; thus the ending आस् is older and goes gradually out of use in the Vedic period; we have also many instances, where both forms stand often side by side; e.g. Rigveda, IV. 25. 8; VII. 97. 6. A पाद deficient by one syllable is often emended by substituting आस् for आः e.g. VII. 35. 14א. Other instances of आस् in the seventh मण्डल are 1. 9, 15, 17; 4. 3; 15. 9; 16. 3.

For the plural of the nominative, accusative, and vocative (n.) there are two endings आ and आः. The older (आ) has far outnumbered the younger in the Rigveda, though there are many instances where both stand side by side. In the Atharvaveda the proportion is much reduced, though the older form has held its own against the younger, better than any other similar Vedic form. Instances in the seventh मण्डल are 1. 18א; 3. 4א, 10א; 4. 1, 2; 5. 7; 18. 1; and so on. The genesis of the younger form can be best explained by supposing that there is a transfer from the आ declension to the आः declension, which is also shown by the co-existence of such forms as कुनिमा, कुनिमाणि etc. (VII. 19. 4; VII. 67. 9). Sometimes a पाद deficient by one syllable can be emended by reading आः for आ, e.g. VII. 4. 2.

For the plural of the instrumental (m. & n.) there are two endings एम्भु and एत्, both almost equally frequent in the Rigveda, the older however dying out gradually in the Vedic period. Both sometimes occur side by side. The only trace of the ending एम्भु in later Sanskrit is the pronomi-
nal form एमित्तू (from एमित्तू). Instances in the seventh मण्डत are: 2. 8; 11; 7; 2. 6.

Next, we come to nouns in आ. In the case of these (f.), for the singular of the instrumental, there are two endings, आ and अवा. The older ending is about as frequent as the younger. The older ending is generally applied to stems in ता or हस्हा (or या).\textsuperscript{1} Instances in the seventh मण्डत are: 1. 11; 18. 7; 23. 1; 32. 14, etc. One instance of the peculiar sing. dative fem. is the form अवी्रते in VII. 1. 19.

For the plural of the nominative (f.), आस is the very general ending, but in very few cases आल्प (perhaps extended from the masculine) is also met with. Thus we have VII. 28. 4 दुर्मित्तम: श्लित्तम; VII. 18।।

Next we come to stems in आ. For the instrumental singular, the final is only lengthened in the Veda. Instances in the seventh मण्डत are, 1. 1; 20. 2; 25. 1; 32. 15; 32. 21. For the locative singular, the final आ is changed to आ, (1) generally before consonants, (2) before an initial vowel with which it is fused, but never before vowels e.g. VII. 2. 5; 18. 19; 19. 3; 27. 1. Even masculine nouns in आ have sometimes a loc. sing. form ending in आ; e.g. अन्तरा or sometimes extended to अन्तरापि. The gen. and abl. sing. of mas. in आ is sometimes made by only adding the termination without having रुण: e.g. अवर from आरि. The nom. plural of fem. in आ is sometimes formed as in दूसरा.

As for nouns in र (m. & n.) we meet with such forms as abl. sing. वस्त्र: VII. 15. 4; dat. sing. कपे VII. 25. 4; loc. sing. सानवि; instr. sing. कला VII. 21. 6: 4. 5. Nouns in र fem. form

\textsuperscript{1} The addition of the younger ending to nouns ending in हस्सा or या would end in a clumsy combination.—V. S. S.
nom. plu. as in देवी:—2. 8; 10. 3; 5. 3; 26. 4; and instr. sing. as in समी. Nouns in नूत. have for their nom. plu. such forms as—कृष्णी VII. 56. 8; कृष्णी VII. 56. 12; अमती VII. 23. 3. In the case of fem. nouns in त्र, we have such forms as the acc. sing. तन्भि VII. 8. 5.

Nouns ending in क (m. & f.) have their nom. dual ending in श्च which occurs (1) at the end of a पद, (2) before consonants, (3) before an initial vowel with which it is fused, but never before vowels; e. g. मात्रा VII. 7. 3. कुंभे and अस्मे are often found used for हुष्मासु and अस्मासु.

In the case of nouns in अन, we have a peculiar loc. sing. form without any termination, e. g. व्योमन् (=व्योमनि), परिज्ञान (=परिज्ञान), etc.

Next, I may proceed to conjugation. Here I must content myself only with noting a few peculiarities which are very frequently met with. For a fuller and exhaustive treatment of the Verb-inflection in the Rigveda the student is referred to Avery’s Verb-inflection in Sanskrit.¹

The 1st pers. plural termination (पर्शिष्टक) of the present tense is महद् invariably in classical Sanskrit. But in the Rigveda, महिषि is found more frequently by the side of महद्, महिषि is found 117 times in the Rigveda, and 3 times only in the एक्षरेण जाह्न्य, but never in Classical Sanskrit. On the other hand, महद् appears only 21 times in the Rigveda, 4 times in the एक्षरेण जाह्न्य, and is the only ending in Classical Sanskrit. Thus it appears that the longer ending

was far in advance in the time of the Rigveda, that it was overtaken by the shorter ending in the period, and driven entirely off the field in the Classical period.

The 3rd pers. sing. ending (आत्मनेपद) of the present tense is sometimes इ instead of ते; e. g. भुज वी. 8. 4; VII. 26. 4.

The imperative 2nd pers. sing. deserves notice. The classical rule requires चि after consonants excepting nasals, ळ and र, and in the 9th conjugation, which substitutes आँ; चि after vowels (excepting अ and ए of the 5th and 8th conjugations, after a single consonant) nasals, ळ and र; after अ and ए following a single consonant, the ending is dropped. This rule is not observed in the Veda, but the ending चि is more frequently found. Examples from the seventh मण्डल are: शस्त्रि (1. 20), क्रृति (16. 6; 25. 5), क्षति (22. 4; 32. 1). The root ः shows the three successive stages श्याहि, श्याहि and श्य. Notice also forms like गहि (from गम्).

The longer endings ढः and तन इnstead of ध and त in the 2nd pers. plural are also met with in the Veda.

We also meet with in the Rigveda some peculiar forms of the 2nd pers. sing. having an imperative value, made by adding the ending चि to the root. Examples from the seventh मण्डल are: शेषि (18. 2), भवि (41. 2), यशि and चेति (16. 5).

Certain perfect participles whose stem is monosyllabic owing to the absence of the reduplication are met with; e. g. दान्धि, मीढः, साक्षात.

The infinitive presents a great variety of forms. A number of verbal nouns in various cases are used in such a way as to be assimilated to the infinitive. Thus, in addition
to the Classical infinitive in द्वृत्, which is, really speaking, nothing more than the accusative singular form of the root-noun formed by द्, we have the dative form from the same, used as an infinitive; e.g. अविष्टे (VII. 33. 1), अन्वेषिते (VII. 33. 8).

Infinitives are also found with the ending तवे (e.g. हन्तवे, अतवे), with the ending असे i.e. the dative singular of the root-noun ending in ऋ (e.g. चक्षसे, जीवसे), with the ending तवे i.e. the dative sing. of the root-noun ending in ति (e.g. वीतथे, अतथे), with the ending थे (e.g. सतंबै वII. 37. 1, शधैVAII. 43.1, पूणथे, जुयथे), with the ending तो: i.e. the gen. sing. of the root-noun ending in ह (e.g. एतोऽ, कर्तरे:;) and with some more endings.

In addition to gerunds ending in ला, we have those ending in लाय and ली (which is very common); e.g. हला, कृत्ती, भीली, भूली.

The subjunctive mood, whose remnant is seen in Classical Sanskrit only in the imperfect and aorist forms without augment, after the particle मा (prohibitive), is a very frequent formation in the Rigveda, denominated as दे by Sanskrit grammarians. Such forms as मनवति (VII. 8. 6), पत्ताति (VII. 25. 1), तारिष्ठत, जोषिष्ठत, माद्यते, ग्रहास्ति are illustrations of the subjunctive.

Next I may notice some peculiarities of sentence structure. The first and the foremost feature is the position of prepositions or उपसर्ग in a sentence. In later Sanskrit, the उपसर्ग, as a rule, must immediately precede the verb of which it forms a part, and no word is allowed to intervene between them. But in the Rigveda the उपसर्ग is
separated from the verb by one or more words. As instances may be given the following verses from the seventh मण्डल:
1. 4, 6, 7, 8; 3. 9; 4. 1; 8. 4; 21. 7; 24. 4; 60. 3; 86. 1; 86. 5; and many more.

Another peculiarity is that the preposition, once used with the verb, is alone repeated without the verb which is implied, and the preposition alone stands for the whole verb. Instances from मण्डल 7 are 1, 6, 86. 5. Sometimes the उपास्यांगिनि alone are used and the verb is implied, as in VII. 6. 1 and 3. Sometimes we meet with paranthetical sentences having no syntactical connection with what precedes or what follows, as in VII. 1. 15. Sometimes a relative sentence is used without a corresponding correlative sentence or without a word to connect it with the correlative sentence, e.g. VII. 1. 8 and 12.
LECTURE XII

VEDIC METRE

Reasons for the preference for metre—The meaning of the word चन्द्रस्—The most prominent of Vedic metres stated—A synopsis of the metres of the seventh मण्डल—Two schools of critics—those who maintain the text and admit metrical irregularity—those who advocate textual restoration—Textual restorations generally agreed upon—The number of syllables in foot, not the only rule—also rules of rhythm—Historical development—Four periods based upon metrical criteria.

If one casts a glance at the Sanskrit literature in general, he will find that the greater part is composed in verse. The epics, पुराणs, law-books, काव्यs, are all metrical compositions. And to this the oldest Sanskrit book, I mean, the संहिता of the Rigveda, is no exception. And this preference for metre of the old Vedic ऋग्भिष is but natural. For, in the first place, the language of nature clothes itself in metre. Deep, strong passions express themselves in metre; for a metre is nothing but a particular arrangement of high and low tones. Secondly, as the Vedic hymns were composed for sacrificial purposes, with a view to propitiate the gods, nothing could please the gods better than prayers sung. Mere recitations of prose formulae or lectures do not possess that attraction which naturally belongs to songs sung or hymns chanted. Thirdly, the metrical limitations served a most practical purpose; that of preserving and remembering easily what was composed, especially when writing was not in vogue. It is the experience of every one that a verse can be more easily and more permanently committed in memory than a mere prose statement. Hence, the necessity of putting rules of grammar and
whole lexicons in a metrical form. Students of Sanskrit need not be reminded of the कारिकास of grammar and अंगरक्षाः. And the credit of preserving without serious corruption the Vedic texts may be largely due to the fact that they are in a fixed metrical form. Hence, the statement in विशाः explaining the relation of छन्दः to the Veda: छन्दः पाती हूँ वेदस्य—
The metre is the feet of the Veda.

The word छन्दः is derived from चदि आहाद्ने, from which the name छन्दः is also derived; and who will deny that a composition clothed in a metrical form affords comparatively greater pleasure? बास्क derives the word from छद्द to cover and छन्दः is so called because it is the covering of the Vedic texts. By metaphor the texts of the Veda themselves came to be called छन्दः because their external form was metrical. Thus छन्दः became a synonym of वेदः and as the grammar and metre of the Veda are more irregular or rather much less regular, from the point of view of Classical Sanskrit, छन्दः came to mean ‘irregular’ or ‘whimsical’, and the word has come down to be so used even in our vernacular.

छन्दः, as I have already said in Lecture 2, is included in the six वेयास and the oldest work at present available is the treatise of पिन्धु which deals with not only the Vedic metres but with the classical metres also.

Broadly speaking, the Vedic metres are much less regular than the classical metres; in fact, there being no hard and fast rules regarding the quantity and order of the several...

1. Cf. यैंवभिग्नमाननात्मकांवस्यांनेव शुभाविम्मत: तुष्मन्दति छन्दस्वम् quoted from a शास्त्र by दृष्टि on Nir. VII. 42.
letters, the total number of syllables is the only criterion of distinguishing one metre from another.

From the metrical point of view, the Rigveda is made up of hymns, each of which consists of a certain number of verses and each verse consists of two or more feet, and each foot consists of a certain number of syllables.

The most prominent of the Vedic metres are:

| गायत्री   | 8, 8, 8   |        |
| उष्णकूट | 8, 8, 12 |        |
| पुरुषोत्तरकूट | 12, 8, 8 |        |
| कक्ष | 8, 12, 8   |        |
| अहुदुम | 8, 8, 8, 8 |        |
| भ्रह्मी | 8, 8, 12, 8 |        |
| सतोभ्रह्मी | 12, 8, 12 | 8, 8   |
| पाण्ड्व | 8, 8, 8, 8 | 8, 8   |
| प्रस्तारपाण्ड्व | 12, 12, 8 | 8, 8   |
| विराज्ज | 10, 10, or 11 | 11, 11 |
| विद्वन्द्व | 11, 11, 11 | 11, 11 |
| जगती | 12, 12, 12 | 12, 12 |

There are, of course, many sub-varieties of these metres, formed by altering the order of the various feet. The metres of the different verses in the hymns of the Rigveda are all exhaustively given in the सर्वावलिकमणि of काल्याण extracts from which are, as a rule, quoted by सावण at the commencement of his commentary on each hymn. Restricting ourselves to the seventh मण्डह, we find that the विद्वन्द्व

1 The names of the metres are followed by the numbers of the syllables in each of the several feet of which they are made up.
metres prevail mostly throughout the book with a very few exceptions of other metres. Thus, hymns 15, 31 (1-9), 55 (1), 59 (9-11), 66 (1-9 & 17-19), 89 (1-4), 94 (1-11), 96 (4-6), 102 are गायत्री.

Hymns 1 (1-18), 22 (1-8), 31 (10-12), 68 (1-7), are विराज्य अकाश्का; while 32 (3) is द्रष्ट्रा विराज्य (12, 8), and 34 (1-21), 56 (1-11) are द्रष्ट्रा विराज्य (10, 10).

Hymn 14 (1) is ब्रह्मती while 55 (2-4) is उपरिचाछ ब्रह्मती (8, 8, 8, 12). Hymns 16, 32 (excluding verse 3), 59 (1-6) 66 (10-15), 74 (1-6), 81 (1-6), 96 (1-2), have ब्रह्मती and सत्तोष्रह्मती in alternate verses. Such pairs of ब्रह्मती and सत्तोष्रह्मती are called प्रागाथ in the सबौतकमणि.

Hymns 41 (1), 44 (1), 46 (1-3), 50 (1-3), 82, 83, 89, (5), 104 (1-6, 18, 21, 23) are जगती.

Hymns 55 (5-8), 59 (12), 94 (12), 103 (1), 104 (25) are अष्ट्रु. One hymn only viz. 17 is द्रष्ट्रा श्रद्धु.

One verse viz. 50 (4), is अतिजगती also called स्त्रवरी (consisting of five feet having 10, 10, 11, 11, 11 syllables respectively). One verse 66 (16) is प्रसरणिक (12, 8, 8). One verse 96 (3) is परस्तारपाद्य (12, 12, 8, 8). And one verse 104 (7) is either जगती or श्रद्धु.

All other verses not mentioned in the above are श्रद्धु which may be thus said to be the prevailing metre of the seventh मण्डल.

It was said above that the only rule is regarding the number of syllables in a foot of the metre without any regard to the quantity or order of the several syllables. But
even this number of syllables seems to fail us now and then. For instance, where a foot ought to have 12 syllables in conformity with other feet of the same verse, it has 11, or where it ought to have 11, it has 10 and so on; thus in VII. 1. 3, the first line has only 10 syllables whereas it ought to have 11 syllables to be a foot of the बिराज्ञ metre (consisting of three feet, each of 11 syllables). Similar is the case of the 2nd line in the same verse. Now the question arises, 'Is it an irregularity of metre of which the Vedic poets were guilty? Or is there some mistake in writing the text, the recitation being quite conformable to the requirements of the metre?'

According to the answer given to these questions, there are two schools of Vedic critics. Some, having regard to the great antiquity and authority of the संहिता text, feel alarmed at any proposal to tamper with it, and are inclined in all cases of doubt to maintain the text and to admit a metrical irregularity. Others, again recognizing the general skillfulness of the Vedic bards, propose in the same cases textual restoration. Neither of these views must be carried to an extreme or followed to the exclusion of the other. We can neither regard the text as final nor the metrical standards as holding good without exception. The principle underlying the admission of either view in the present case, is clearly quantitative. The multiplicity of instances constitutes the proof. All commentators adopt without hesitation that hypothesis which accounts for the largest number of facts in the simplest way. If one textual correction will rectify ten verses, we make the textual correction; if the admission of one metrical variation or irregularity will accord with the text of ten verses, we admit the metrical
variation. Thus to decide which of these courses is to be followed in a particular case requires a detailed examination of the text.

Thus the following textual restorations have been generally agreed upon.

(1) Where the text, in accordance with the classical rules of संधि, combines the final vowel of one word with the initial vowel of the next, final अ, आ must occasionally, and final ए, ऐ, ऊ, ऋ generally, be read as separate syllables. Thus to take instances from the seventh मण्डल 1. 3a प्रहस्तः; 1. 3b हुष्मिशा; 3. 1d घूङ्खः; 8. 1d आ अभि; 4. 6s; 4. 7; 5. 2; and so on.

(2) Where the text omits initial अ after final अस् or ए, the initial अ must usually be restored as a separate syllable. Thus, in the seventh मण्डल, 1. 4a अस्मयो अज़िम्यो; 1. 19c अत्र अवी-र्तिते; 2. 10s वनस्पते अत, and so on.

(3) In numerous words and endings, the value of a separate syllable is either necessarily or optionally to be given to यू, यू, of the text. Thus in the seventh मण्डल—1. 11s इशिभाहु हृद्येः; 18. 12c सत्किवाय सक्षम्. Notice that in these two instances, the syllabic and consonantal values are found side by side; so also—5. 5; 6. 1b; 15. 15c; 19. 2a (हुव्रह); 32. 26b; 104. 4c, 20, 20b, 25b, and so on.

(4) In a few words, long vowels or diphthongs are optionally to be read as equivalent to two syllables. Thus, in the seventh मण्डल, 65. 1c; 86. 4s; 97. 3s we restore ज्ञेश्वर to ज्ञेश्विरः; 93. 1d ग्रेष to ग्रविष्ठः; 34. 14b; 36. 5d; 88. 1s ग्रेष to ग्रविष्ठः; 40. 6d; वात to वायत.
(5) A few words are regularly misrepresented: thus, for पावक we must always read पवाक; for बुजान: almost always बजान: for गूढवर्ण always गूढवर्ण. Thus in the seventh मण्डल we have 49. 2 and 3; 56. 12; and 57. 5, in which पावका: occurring at the end of the foot has to be read पवाका: to suit the closing rhythm. So in 89. 1 and other verses, गूढवर्ण has to be read गूढवर्ण for the same purpose.

There are other restorations also, though less certain in character. Thus,

(6) the word हन्द has to be read as a word of three syllables, though in a very large number of cases it is a word of two syllables. Thus VII. 19. 2a तुझे ह व्यविन्द्र: VII. 19. 6c: 20. 2a: 21. 5a: 22. 1a: and so on.

(7) The restoration of अभम् for आम् in the genitive plural of all declensions is required, generally at the end of an eight-syllabled foot; e.g. VII. 16. 2d; 16. 7b; 32. 11d; 32. 25d; 66. 3b; 74. 6b and so on. Verse I. 167. 10 illustrates in itself most of these restorations.

So far we have spoken only of the external form of the metre. Indian commentators generally stop here and hold that the internal form or the rhythm is even more irregular and free than the external, and is, therefore, a factor of little consequence. Modern critics, however, have, from a detailed examination of the text from the metrical point of view, come to the conclusion that there is no considerable part of the verse in which certain rhythms are favoured, and others avoided; that everywhere there exist metrical preferences.

1 Because etymologically the root vowel is long; see Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, Lautlehre, para 28.—V.S S.
Thus for instance, we find that at the end of a foot of 11 or 12 syllables, the last 4 syllables are generally न-म-त, while at the end of a foot of 8 syllables they are commonly न-म-त। A detailed study of this inner construction or rhythm of the foot has enabled Vedic critics to lay down certain metrical criteria which distinguish one period of the Rigveda from another. Thus, Arnold in his *Vedic Metre*, has arrived at four periods: (1) the *bardic period* or the period of originality and rivalry between the bardic families, to which belong hymns of मण्डलर्स VI, VII, and many more, and where a greater variety of inner and external construction is observed; (2) the *normal period*, in which perfection rather than originality of form is the aim, to which belong hymns of मण्डलर्स, III, IV, and IX, where two metres are almost exclusively employed, namely, तिहुष and गायसी where there is little variety but an attempt at uniformity and regularity; (3) the *cretic period*, where almost exclusively तिहुष and जगती metres are employed and the cretic rhythm is favoured, to which belong many of the hymns of the 1st मण्डल and a few of the 10th, a period of transition; and (4) the *popular period* the hymns of which resemble in form and character, the Atharvaveda, to which belong a large number of the hymns of the tenth मण्डल, and of which, the contamination of a तिहुष hymn by जगती stanzas is the characteristic.

Thus, the irregularity in rhythm and the quantity of the different syllables making a foot which an ordinary reader passes by, unnoticed, is only apparent and is the result of the inventive spirit sometimes leading to the construction of

1 For criticism see *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.* 1906, pp. 484 ff.; 1912, pp. 726 ff.—V.S.S.
new and harmonious forms. For, it is difficult to believe that a professional bard should without motive have left his verse with an irregular rhythm, when any European scholar, without serious practice of the art of versification, can put it into order for him with hardly a perceptible alteration in the meaning. Arnold expresses himself as follows regarding the skill and art of the Vedic bards: "...As works of mechanical art the metres of the Rigveda stand high above those of modern Europe in variety of motive and in flexibility of form. They seem, indeed, to bear the same relation to them as the rich harmonies of classical music to the simple melodies of the peasant. And in proportion as modern students come to appreciate the skill displayed by the Vedic poets, they will be glad to abandon the easy but untenable theory that the variety of form employed by them is due to chance, or the purely personal bias of individuals, and to recognize instead that we find all the signs of a genuine historical development..."
LECTURE XIII

THE AGE OF THE RIGVEDA.

Linguistic or literary theories—Max Muller’s view that the date of Rigveda falls about 1200 B. C.—Objections to the same—Views of Whitney and others—Astronomical theories—Haug’s view—Dikshit’s view—Tilak’s view—Jacobi’s theory.

No one now doubts that the Rigveda is the most ancient document of the Aryans, and that although it represents a stage of no mean civilisation, whether in respect of the development of language, or religion, or philosophy, still to us the Rigveda represents the most ancient chapter in the history of the Aryan history. Notwithstanding the universal agreement in this respect, there is still a diversity of views regarding the probable age of the Rigveda. On the question of the age of the Rigveda, the final word has yet to be said. I propose to-day to acquaint you briefly with some of the views held on the subject.

The materials for the re-construction of Indian chronology are supplied principally from (1) the literatures of the जान्मण्य, the Jainas and the Buddhists, (2) inscriptions on stone or copper plate, coins and seals, and (3) the accounts of foreign writers, chiefly Greek, Latin and Chinese. The question regarding the age of the Rigveda cannot derive any benefit from the last two sources, on account of its extreme antiquity. Thus the only source that remains is the literary evidence, on which are based the so-called literary or linguistic theories.

The most popular of such theories is the one first promulgated by Max Müller, who assigned the Rigveda
approximately to 1200 B.C. This date has been accepted very generally. The arguments adduced by Max Müller in favour of his view may be briefly stated as follows:

To begin with, Max Müller divides the Vedic Literature into four periods; the छन्दः period, the मन्त्र period, the ब्रह्मण period, and the चुर period, on the ground of the nature of language and thought, and the successive stages marked therein, every following period presupposing the existence of the preceding one. To the last or चुर period, belong two classes of works named अद्वैतमणीs and परिशिद्धs. Of the authors of अद्वैतमणीs there stand out two, more prominently than the rest, viz. शौक who wrote अद्वैतमणीs to the Rigveda and काल्याण who wrote two सर्वाद्वैतमणीs, one to the Rigveda, and the other to the White यजुर्वेद. Now if we compare these works, we find that शौक writes in mixed शैक्षs and takes great liberty with the metre; while काल्याण writes in prose and introduces the artificial contrivances of the later चुर, a difference which is quite in keeping with the general course of Sanskrit literature. Again शौक's index follows the original division of the Rigveda into मण्डलs, अद्वैतs and चुरs; while काल्याण has adopted the more practical and more modern division into अद्वैतs, अद्वैतs and चुरs. Both agree in following the united शा सूत्रs of the शा सूत्रs and ब्राह्मणs and in excluding the khilas (or supplementary hymns), but the latter has admitted the eleven ख़ा सूत्र hymns, thus bringing the total number of hymns from 1017 to 1028.

From all these indications, we are naturally led to expect that both शौक and काल्याण belonged to the same शा सूत्र and that शौक was anterior to काल्याण.
From what श्यूङ्रविन्ध्य remarks1 in his commentary on the सन्तोंक्तुक्रयमणी of कात्यायन while explaining the genealogy of the latter we can gather that there are four generations of teachers and pupils referred to first शौनक, second आश्वलायण, third कात्यायण, and fourth पताळिणि. This कात्यायण also identified with वरलिखि, is spoken of by सीमेंवेकत्र in his कथासिद्धांगार, as having become a minister of king नन्द at पाटलिपुत्र. If we can believe in this tradition, we get here a clue to ascertain the date of कात्यायण.

In the Ancient Sanskrit chronology two dates have been fixed beyond all doubt—the date of Buddha's death (which is 483 B.C.) and that of the coronation of अशोक (270 B.C.), which are regarded as the sheet-anchors of Indian chronology. चन्द्रगुप्त, the founder of the मेघ empire, who was succeeded by चिन्दुगुप्त, whose successor was the great अशोक, reigned between 321 and 297 B.C. It was this चन्द्रगुप्त who put down the नन्द, with whom कात्यायण is connected as minister. Thus कात्यायण's date is about 325 B.C.

पताळिणि the writer of the व्याकरण महानाथमण्ड has been now generally assigned to the second century B.C. which also, allowing sufficient period to elapse between him and कात्यायण, the writer of the वातिमक्षिक, points to the 4th century B.C. as the age of the latter.

आश्वलायण's date would then be about 350 B.C. and शौनक's about 400 B.C. But as शौनक's work cannot belong to the earliest productions of the एक्त period, and as some more works after कात्यायण must have been written during the एक्त.

1. See Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 233.
period, the बृहस्पतिन period may be supposed to have extended roughly speaking, from 600 to 200 B.C.

The same conclusion is confirmed by a consideration of the style and language of the works known by the name of the परिशिष्टs which are the last offshoots of the बृहस्पतिन period. What distinguishes these परिशिष्टs from the बृहस्पतिनs is that they treat everything in a popular and superficial manner. The tendency to make everything easy even to the extent of superficiality, leads one to think that the party which had to follow such tactics had to fight against a strong enemy who was gaining more and more ground in the course of time. Even the adoption of the बृहस्पतिन style proves that in the opinion of the authors of the बृहस्पतिनs, no one would listen to wisdom unless it is clothed in a garb of clear argument and communicated in intelligible language. Thus the बृहस्पतिन period must be contemporaneous with the gradual decline of Brahmanism and the steady rise of Buddhism, a stage of thought which is distinctly reflected in the परिशिष्टs. From this point of view also, it follows that the बृहस्पतिन period should extend from 600 to 200 B.C.

As the बृहस्पतिनs necessarily presuppose the existence of the बृहस्पतिनs whose complicated system of theology and ceremonial was sought to be simplified by the बृहस्पतिनs, the बृहस्पतिन period extends backward from 600 B.C., to 800 B.C., taking about 200 years to be the minimum period necessary for the progress of thought and literary activity, such as the establishment of the three-fold ceremonial, the composition and collection of the बृहस्पतिनs and the ramification of the बृहस्पतिन-चरणs.
The Vājāyūna period however, exhibits a stratum of thought perfectly unintelligible without the admission of a preceding age, during which all that is misunderstood, perverted and absurd in the Vājāyūna, had its natural growth. But even between these two ages, there must have been an age when the spirit was at work in the literature of India, no longer creative, free and original, but living only on the heritage of a former age, collecting, classifying and imitating. This may be called the Mantra period and may be supposed to have extended over two hundred years, viz., from 1000 to 800 B.C.

The three periods of Vedic literature spoken of so far, viz., the Chhuta, Vājāyūna and Mantra periods, all point to some earlier age which gave birth to the hymns of the early Śāvitas—a time when the songs which were collected with such careful zeal in the Mantra period, commented upon with such elaborate pedantry during the Vājāyūna period, and examined and analysed with such minute exactness during the Chhuta period, lived and were understood without any effort—a time characterized by spontaneity, originality and truth. This Chhuta period may be supposed to extend over 200 years, from 1200 to 1000 B.C. Thus the date of the Rigveda would fall about 1200 B.C.

The unsatisfactory character of this view is easily seen. In the first place, arguments based on the nature of language and thought are not, generally speaking, conclusive in themselves, unless they are supported by any other independent proof.

Secondly, the theory is based upon some assumptions which have yet to be proved conclusively—e.g. the identity
of the Vedic काल्यायन and the grammarian काल्यायन and the
historical importance to be attached to the statement of
षुक्ले & सोमेश्वरेन्द्र, which are the main planks in the whole
argument.

Thirdly, there is not sufficient reason shown why 200
years in particular should be assigned to each of the periods
in the Vedic Literature. We may as well assign 500 or
1000 years to each of them. And there are scholars who
have done so. Of course, Max Müller has concluded his
remarks with the following qualification:—“The chronological
limits assigned to the मन्त्र and बाह्य periods will seem to most
Sanskrit scholars too narrow rather than too wide, and if
we assign but 200 years to the मन्त्र period from 800 to
1000 B.C., and an equal number to the छन्दः period, from
1000 to 1200 B.C., we can do so only under the supposition
that during the early periods of history, the growth of the
human mind was more luxuriant than in later times, and that
the layers of thought were framed less slowly in the primary
than in the tertiary ages of the world.” It may be seen
that the estimate made by Max Müller is ridiculously low
even from the point of view of the progress of language and
thought. The difference of character between the Vedic
Sanskrit and the Classical Sanskrit is so great that it must
have required a very long period indeed for the language to
progress from one step of development to another, as may
appear probable from a comparison of the history of other
languages and it must be remembered that the Classical
Sanskrit, which we have at present, has been substantially
unaltered in nature and essence since the 2nd century B.C.
I mean since the महाभाष्य of पतंजालि. Even Max Müller himself
afterwards called this estimate too low and named the period from 1500-1200 B.C. as the period of composition of the Vedic hymns.

Similar estimates have been made by other scholars. Thus, Whitney calls the period from 2000-1500 B.C. the period of the oldest hymns—an estimate, says Kaegi which, if we take everything into account is certainly not too high and which has the greatest claims to probability. Benfey also says: "It can hardly be doubted that the most eastern branch had their abode on the Indus as early as 2000 years before the Christian era." Weber has placed the migration into the Indus land in the 16th century B.C.

Thus it may be seen that the linguistic or literary theories fail to fix with certainty the date of the Rigveda. As Kaegi remarks, the determination of the Vedic period deduced from the difference in language and in the religious and social views between the hymns and the fixed dates of Buddhism, can approximate the true period only by centuries.

But there are the astronomical theories which have advanced the question of the Vedic age considerably and which at least possess far greater certainty than the theories merely based upon a consideration and comparison of language and thought.

Thus Haug on the ground of a passage in the वेद अध्यात्मिक्य referring to the position of the solstitial points determines

1. The mention of four Vedic deities in the Boghaz-koi clay tablets has been brought to bear on the question of the age of the Rigveda, and the migrations of Indo-Aryan tribes. The yield in point of historical information is so scanty, that we must confess that it is yet too early to dogmatise over the results of this find.—V. S. S.
the age of the Veda. The position given in this passage
carries us back to the year 1186 B.C. which must be the
time of वेदांक ज्योतिष. Haug comes to two conclusions from this
reference: (1) that the Indians had made already such a
considerable progress in astronomical science early in the
12th century B.C. as to enable them to take such obser-
vations; and (2) that by that time the whole ritual in its
main features as laid down in the ब्राह्मणs was complete. Thus
he assigns the composition of the bulk of the ब्राह्मणs to the
years 1400-1200 B.C. Taking 500-600 years for the संहिता,
the age of the bulk of the संहिता falls between 2000 to 1400
B.C. The oldest hymns and sacrificial formulas being a few
hundred years more ancient still, the very commencement of
Vedic literature may be fixed between 2400-2000 B.C.

Shankara Bilkrishna Dikshit, in his भारतीय ज्योतिषशास्त्र has
hit upon one passage in the शतपथ ब्राह्मण which determines
the age of the work:

एक द्वे शीति चतुर्थिति वा अन्यानि नक्षत्राण्य्येति एव भूयिता यहोति
कास्ति-कास्ति-कास्ति-कास्ति-कास्ति-कास्ति-कास्ति-कास्ति-कास्ति-कास्ति-कास्ति
एता ह वै प्राच्ये दिशो न च चावते
सर्वाणि ह वा अन्यानि नक्षत्राणि प्राच्ये हिस्तब्बन्ते

शतपथ ब्राह्मण 2.1.2.

The phenomenon that the कृतिका were seen to rise
exactly at the eastern point from which they never swerved
(whereas at present they rise a little to the northern side
of the eastern point), points to a period about 3000 years
B.C. which must be, therefore, the time of the composition

1. 'सप्तबोधि विनादातिस्य श्रायचिन्द्रमसाहुसुदकृ
राजार्थि दक्षिणाकृत्त्र मायभाष्यायोः सदा'

Rigveda Jyot, verse 6.
of that भागण. The तैतिरिय संहिता which must have preceded the शतपथ, and which also mentions क्रुतिका and other नक्षत्रs, must be about 200 years before this period while the Rigveda संहिता, which is decisively older than the तैतिरिय संहिता must be still older.

 Tilak in his Orion has proved even a greater antiquity for the hymns of the Rigveda. He has endeavoured to show therein that "the traditions recorded in the Rigveda unmistakably point to a period not later than 4000 B. C., when the vernal equinox was in Orion, or, in other words, when the Dog-star (or the Dog as we have it in the Rigveda) commenced the equinoctial year". On the ground of the several astronomical references scattered about in the ancient Sanskrit literature, he has arrived at four different periods. The oldest period is the Aditi or pre-Orion period, with the vernal equinox at or near उनवेश, roughly extending from 6000 B. C. to 4000 B. C. It was a period when the finished hymns seem not to have been known and half prose and half poetical Nivids or sacrificial formulae "giving the principal names, epithets and seats of the deity invoked" were probably in use. The next is the Orion period, roughly extending from 4000 B. C. to 2500 B. C. from the time when the vernal equinox was in the asterism बाश्र्य to the time when it receded to the asterism क्रुतिका. The whole of the so-called बुधाकथि hymn (X. 86), which is very obscure, can be at least more satisfactorily explained than has hitherto been done both by Indian commentators and modern European scholars, on the supposition that it refers to the fact of the equinoxes coinciding with the Orion. This second period.

1 Tilak, Orion, Preface, p. iii.
is the most important period in the history of the Aryan civilization. A good many ṛ̣ṣaṇs in the Rigveda were composed at this time. This is the proper, most active, Vedic period. The third is the कृतिका period, commencing with the vernal equinox in the asterism कृतिका and extending up to the period recorded in the बंद्राक ज्योतिष i.e. from 2500 B.C. to 1400 B.C. It was the period of the तैत्तिरीय संहिता and several of the बालक्षण. The hymns of the Rigveda had already become antique and unintelligible by this time and speculations, often too free, about the real meaning of these hymns and legends, were indulged in. The fourth and the last period extends from 1400 B.C. to 500 B.C. or to the birth and rise of Buddhism. It was the period of the धर्म and philosophical systems.

Jacobi also has put forth a theory according to which the period of Rigveda goes back to at least 4000 B.C. This theory is also based on astronomical calculations connected with a change in the beginning of the season which has taken place since the time of the Rigveda.¹

---

¹ Festgruss an Roth, pp. 68 ff.—Indian Antiquary, Vol. XXIII, pp. 154 ff. A refutation of the theory has been again recently attempted in the Cambridge History of India, Vol. 1, P. 111 f.—Sir R. G. Bhandarkar has pointed out a new line of approach to the problem of the Vedic age. He suggests that the inquiry should take its start from the word Asura. Arguing on the line of the indentity of Asura and Assyrian, he comes to the conclusion that the origin of the hymnal literature may be pushed back to about B.C. 2500—V.S.S.
I. INDEX OF SANSKRIT WORDS AND PROPER NAMES.

(By N. N. Kulkarni, B.A.)

अंशि as the striking instance of arrested personification 132.

अंशि, the legend of, 132 ff.; the three forms of, 133; the messenger, 133; birth of, 133; important attributes and functions of 133 f.; myth of, concealing himself, 134 f.

अजातस्रज्ञ 159.

अवघिविद, division and contents of, 31 f.; historical importance of, 32; why called बह्सविद 32 f.; religion of, 126.

अफ्लक्षणि 56.

अपौष्ट्रयत्व, meaning of, 114.

अरि and अर्य in the Rigveda 104 ff.

अश्वं 36

अश्विन, legend of, 147 ff.; epithets of, 147 f.; mythical and legendary character of, 148; marriage of, with बृहस्पति 148; several legends of, 149 f.; dawn and spring theories about, 150; Arctic theory about, 150 f.; their comparative insignificance in the later mythology, 151; and बृहस्पति connected with Greek Dioskouroi 151.

अश्वधाययी 1 f.

आ

आध्यात्मिक hymns 63 f.

आरण्यक, etymology of, 37 f.

आश्चर्यलाबन श्रुत्कृत्व, contents of, 54 f.

इ

इन्द्र, legend of, 135 ff.; opaque and Indo-European God, 135; attributes and deeds of 135 f.; God of physical power 136; national hero of the Aryans 136 f.; exploit over धर्म of, 137 f.

इतिस 34.

उ

उणाविड affixes 47.

उपसर्गs in a sentence 179 f.; their relation with the verb 180.

उपनिषद, original meaning of, 39;

उपनिषदs 38 ff.

उपनिषदs, ten principal, 39; name of, belonging to different Vedas 39; gist of, according to शंकर 40 f.; contain no one doctrine 41 f.
उपरेष 36, 79,
उपसं and Fortune 10 f; the most graceful creation of the Vedic poetry 156; epithets and functions of 157; referring to long and many dawns 157 f.

ऋ
ऋत, 144 f.
ऋषि, देवता and छन्द, meaning of 60,ऋषिस earlier and later 64 f.

ॠ
ऐतरेय, legend of, 34.
ऐतरेय भाष्ण 33; a curious story regarding the origin of 34f; contents of, 35.
ऐतिहासिक s meaning of 90.

क
कपिल 6
कपिलकु, 52 ff; nature and purpose of, 53 f.
काव्यायन 60
कालिदास 3, 6, 36, 114.
कपूर, different senses of, 12.
कमारिक 24, 159
कुमार्यहुंदव, arrangement of, 30.
कॅथवाचार्यस, 35.

ग
गंगालय, 54 f; distinguished from सामयचारिकुल's 54.

घ
घन्स्तत, छन्द in the इन्द्रप्रथ, myth as explained by different scholars 139 ff.

च
चरण, explanation of, 45.

छ
छन्द the second वेदम्, 46; root meaning of 182.
छन्दोपायोपनिषद्, a passage from regarding inferiority of Vedas to ब्रह्मविदा 112.

ज
जगद्धर 45.
जनक 159.
जनमेजय 36.
जैमीन्यथायामालात्विधा, extract from, refuting human origin of the Vedas 113.
जपेश्व 6.
ज्योतिष 55 f.

ट
तानीद्यानिः बहुत्तत्त्वपत्व etc. (VII 76, 3) interpretation of, 158
तात्त्विक भाष्ण 35.
तात्त्विक यहुंंदव extract from, stating अलोकिक्तत्व of Vedas 113.

ढ
ढुढुढूळ 3.
ढानस्तत्तिः 119 f, 125 f.
ढुँढ त 52, 182.
प्रातिशास्त्राः, their origin 44; belonging to different Vedas 45; are attempts in interpreting Veda 83.

भावण 3.

मुक 93.

इष्टदेवता 83.

भावण 34.

भावणाः, literary estimate of, 36 f; explanatory passages in 83.

भावणप्रदत्ता on caste system 171; on the inferiority of the Vedas to भावण 113.

भट्टास्वरकर 29.

भट्टाजीवदेशित 2.

भाग son of हुष्यन्त 36.

भवभूति 3.

भारति 3.

मण्डलाः, internal arrangement of the several, 60 ff.

मृत 22.

मृतमृति 24.

मन्त्र and भावण, meaning of, according to साध्यण 20 ff; distinction between 33 ff.

मन्त्रās, discussion about the meaninglessness of, 84 ff; a passage referring to the antiquity of, 91.
INDEX

- महाभारत 36.
- महीदास 34 ff.
- माधव, brother of सायण, afterwards विद्वारण्य व्यासी author of स्रवेद्वीनसंग्रह 93.
- मारवाचार्य, वेदांतप्रवक्ता of, 113.
- मालवीयाचार्य 45.
- मालवीयाचार्य, quotation from, stating the number of Vedas as three only 25.
- मित्र 153.
- मीमांसक, contributions to the Vedic exegesis by, 92: rules laid down by, regarding interpretations of texts 92 ff.

व

ययु इम purpose and contents of, 28 ff; a story about twofold division of, 28 ff.
- ययुक्तवद्य 159.
- ययुक्तवद्यस्तुति 24.
- यज्ञिक 90.
- यास्क 23, 36, 182.

यास्क, निरुक्त of, quotation from, 25; treatment of the subject of निरुक्त by, 49 ff; prior to पाणिनि 51; whether two different persons named, 51 ff; the estimate of the service of, 87 ff; opinion of, about अश्विन, legend 148.

र

रसू its different senses 12 ff.

व

वहुण, legend of, 142 ff; associated with the spiritual domain 142; preserver of कः or moral order 143; epithets of, 143 ff; exploits of, 145; frequently associated with मित्र 145; connected with Ahura Mazda or Ormazd 145 ff; correspond to the greek Ouranos 146; a god of water, 147.

वासु is the origin of all things —(x. 125)—161.

वाजसेनेय संहिता, contents of, 29 ff.

वाद 19.

वाहसिह्य hymns 63.

वाधमाकके 6

विश्व, his position in the Rigveda pantheon 153 ff; his three strides and various interpretations of the same 154 ff; सायण's interpretation of, and his heroic acts 156:

इङ् exploit, several theories about, 137 ff; storm theory of नेर्क्स about, 137 ff; dawn theory about, 138; objections to the storm and dawn theories about, 138 ff; spring theory 139; Tilak's interpretation based upon the theory of Arctic home 140 ff.
INDEX

बेदाक्र, 43 ff.
बेदारथ्मकाश of सारण, important contributions to the Vedic exegesis by, 93 ff.
व्याकरण, the third बेदाक्र 46 f.
व्यास 6.

श
शंकराचार्य 4, 91 f, 159.
शास्त्र 13, 36.
शतपथभाषण 35; a passage from, regarding the Veda, 111 f.
समु, its different senses 13.
शास्त्र, the proper signification of, 44 f.
शिष्य, history of works on, 43 f.
शिपिन्ध, an epithet of विष्णु explained 155 f.
श्रृंग and कृष्ण वरुण्ड, 29.
शुरु, sacredness of, 23; meaning of 23; and स्तुति, distinction between 23 f.
श्रुतिबोध 82.

स
सर्वज्ञाकरण of काल्याण 83.
समथु, 152.
सामयाचारिकश्रव्य 54.

सामवेद, contents and importance of, 26 f; modes of recitation of, 27; बाह्यश्रव्य of, 35.
सारण 25, 37, 43.
सारण, definition of the Veda by, 19; denies the character of a fourth Veda to अथवेद 33; personal history of, 93; the invaluable services rendered by, 97 ff; authorities of, in interpretation of Veda 100.
शिवान्त कैथृरी 2.
स्वत period, 42 f; character and literary estimate of, 42 f.
स्वर 152.
शोभान 92.
संधि peculiarities of, 173 f.
संहिता period 24.
संहिता, four fold, corresponding to four priests 24.
संहितास and बाह्यश्रव्य inferior to उपनिवेद्य 112 f.
स्तुति, meaning of, 24.

ह
हरिहर 93.
हिरण्यगर्भ (Xv. 121)—166.
II. GENERAL INDEX
(By N. N. Kulkarni, B.A.)

Age of the Rigveda, 190 ff.;
linguistic or literary theories 190 ff.;
Max Müller's view 191 ff.;
options to the theory of Max Müller 194 ff.;
view of Weber 196;
views of Whitney 196; Kægi's opinion 196;
astonomic theories 196 ff.;
Haug's view 196 ff.;
Dikshit's view 197 ff.;
Tilak's view 198 ff.;
Jacobi's view 199.

Arnold 188 ff.
Arnold, Vedic. Metre of 81;
Historical Vedic grammar of—. 82.
Arrangement of the Rigveda, 58 ff.;
principles of, 59 ff.
Arrested personifications 128 ff.
Asiatic society of Bengal 73.
Aurora 3, 10.

B

Bardic period of the Rigveda 188.
Beginning and origin of all things, questions about, 160 ff.
Bencey 196.
Bergaigne 82.
Bhandarkar, Dr., R. G. 41, 199.

Bloomfield 75. 81, 124 128 ff.,
133, 135, 136, 139, 151,
156, 160, 169.
Bollensen 168.
Bohtlingk 74.

C

Caste System 169 ff.
Classical poetry and the Rigveda 3 ff.
Colebroke 92.
Colebrooke, paper on the Vedas by 73; part played by him in Vedic studies. 73 ff.
Comparative method of interpretation of Rigveda 103.
Comparative philology and the Rigveda 6 ff.
Conjugation in the Rigveda 177 ff.
Contents of Rigveda: 59 ff.
Creation hymn (X. 129.) 161.
Cretic period of the Rigveda 188.
Criteria for distinguishing older and later hymns 65 ff.
Criterion, of grammar, with examples 65 ff.; of Vocabulary, 67; of संि 67 ff.; of
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metre 68 f.; of the occurrence of Rigveda hymns in Atharvaveda 69; of subject matter 69; of ideas 69 ff.

D
Declension, peculiarities of 174 ff.
Delbrück, 82.
Deussen 161.
Didactic-gnomic hymns 120.
Dikshit, S. B. 197.

E
Education, chief thing in all, 101 f.

F
Formation of tribes 168.
Forts 163 f.
Fortune, derivation of 10.
Friedrich Rosen, work by, 74.
Funeral hymn 119.

G
Gambling 165.
Geldner 82, 105.
Gods, three-fold division according to the regions or worlds they occupy, 130 f.; form of, according to शास्त्र, 131; in the Rigveda and पुजन्यs, difference in the conceptions of 131 f.;
Goethe 13.
Golden mean in interpretation of the Rigveda 103.
Grammatical peculiarities of the Rigveda 172 ff.
Grassmann 105, 127.
Grassmann’s translation of the Rigveda 78 f.; dictionary of the Rigveda 79.

H
Haug 33, 170, 196 f.
Haug’s edition of ऐतरेय ज्ञान 78.
Henotheism, 130.
Herder 13.
Hillebrandt 82, 139.
Historical hymns 119.
Historical method of interpretation of Rigveda 103.
History of words, some interesting facts in 11 ff.
Humorous hymn, 120.

I
Ideas about death and other world hereafter 160.
Images of gods 168 f.
Immortality 127.
Incantation, formulæ of, 121.
Infinitive in the Rigveda 178 f.
Introduction 1 ff.
INDEX

J.
Jacobi 199.

K.
Keats 157.
Keith 163 ff.

L.
Lassen 82, 164.
Lectures, plan of, 15 ff.
Ludwig 105; his translation of Rigveda 78 ff.

M.
Macdonell 30 f, 94, 138, 149, 156, 172.
Macdonell & Keith, Vedic Index by—81.
Marriage, 165 f.
Max Müller, 6, 14, 49, 53 f, 63, 75 f, 138, 168, 191, 195.
Max Müller, sympathetic and liberalising spirit of, 76; on सारण्य’s work 97 ff.
Mere faith without reasoning not sufficient for interpretation 91 f.
Method is everything 101 f.
Method of studying Rigveda, 101 ff.
Metre, reasons for the preference for, 181 f.
Metres, of the, the seventh मण्डल, 183 ff.

J.

Metrical criteria, four periods of Composition based upon, 188 f.
Muir, 147, 169 f.
Muir’s Original Sanskrit texts 76 f.
Mythology of the Rigveda compared with Greek Mythology, 129 f.

N.
Nadirshah J. D. 140.
New gods in the पुराणs 132.
Normal period of the Rigveda 188.

O.
Occupations and trades 165.
Oldenberg, 82, 105 f, 145; his notes on Rigveda 80 f.
Orthodox view, regarding Rigveda 102 f; regarding the contents 111 ff.

P.
Pandit वेदशास्त्रिय 81 f.
Pathak, K. B. 47.
Personification, 128 f.
Pessimism, absence of, 161.
Petersen 19.
Philology, sketch of its growth 6 f.
Philosophical hymns 117.
Philosophy of the Rigveda, 158 ff; not cut and dry system 159.
Pischel 105.

Pischel and Geldner Vedishche Stundien by, 79 ff; on साप्तण's work 98.

Place of composition of Rigveda 162 ff.

Poetical riddles 121.

Popular period of the Rigveda 188.

Post-Vedic opinions regarding the contents 111 ff.

Priests (four), functions of, 24 ff.

Priests-poets as keen observers of nature 128 ff.

Progress from many gods to one god (RV. I. 164, 46), 159 ff.

R.

Rajvade V. K. 104, 146.

Religion, not fixed but a procession of ideas 122 ff.

Religious hymns 1ff.

Rigveda, why it should be studied, 5; study of, essential for right understanding of Indian mind, 5 ff; study of, essential for the elucidation of the history of the world 6; neglect of study of, least excusable 13 ff; the most ancient and important 25 ff; a compilation 58 ff; its unique character 59; made up of three portions 63; translations of, 78 ff; the object of including in the curriculum 101 ff; a concrete illustration of the method of studying, 103 ff; different views held regarding the contents of, 111 ff; origin of, determined from its contents, 114 ff; three divisions of (a) Religious (b) Philosophical (c) Secular. 117 ff; Religion and Mythology of, 122 ff.

Rigvedic philosophy 4.

Rivers in the seventh मण्डल, allusions to 163.

Roth 91, 127; his work and unique position in the history of Vedic studies, 74 ff; his remarks on Vedic interpretation by Indian commentators 88 ff; his method of interpreting the Rigveda 103.

S.

Sarup, L. 47, 51 ff. 84, 87.

Sayce 8.

Schroeder 82.

Secular hymns 117 ff.

Sentence structure, peculiarities of, 179 ff.

Shelley 157.

Sieg 82.
Social life in Rigveda age 162 ff.
Solar Gods 151 ff.
State 168.
Stein M. A 163.
Subjunctive Mood 179.
Sukthankar, V. S. 34, 52, f, 63, 65, 70, 82, 87, 89, 92, 94, 104, 121, 130, 140, 146 f, 150, 162 ff, 172, 188, 199.
Superhuman character ascribed to श्रवण 115 f.
Sustenance, principal means of, 164.

T.
Taraporewalla 34.
Textual restorations in case of metrical irregularity 186 ff.
Theological bias 93 f.
Tilak B. G. 140 f; 151, 158, 198; his two books Orion and Arctic home in the Vedas 82.

V.
Vaishnavism and Saivism 41
Veda, General neglect of the study of, 1 f; meaning of, 18.
Vedas, alleged primitive character of, 117.
Vedic, study, importance of, 9; Sanskrit and classical Sanskrit contracted 9 f; literature 18 ff; and post Vedic literature 22; study, beginning of, in Europe 72 ff; study, history of, modern period 72 ff; study, history of, Ancient period, 83 ff; exegesis, no living tradition relating to at the time of श्रवण, 94 f; spirit, occasional misunderstanding of, 95 f; Religion not primitive but civilized 123; Religion practical and utilitarian 123 f; religion, a hieratic religion of upper classes 126; religion, enjoyment of the present life is bestowed by 126 f; pantheon transparency of conceptions of the 128, gods not included in the श्रवण 132, inflexional forms 172 f; Metre 181 ff; Metres, the most prominent of the 183 critics, two schools of, explaining metrical irregularities 185 f.

Villages and cities 163.
Voltaire 72.

W.
Water as the origin of all things—X 82—161.
Weber 196; his work in this direction 75.
Wedding hymn 118 f.
Western scholars, the effect of introduction of Sanskrit to, 7 f.

Whitney 7, 32, 196: his Sanskrit grammar 80.

Widow burning 166 f.

Widow remarriage 167.

Wilkins, translation of बगवद्गीता by, 73.

Wilson, translation of the Rigveda by, 78; school of, in interpreting the Rigveda 103.

Women, some views regarding 120.

Z

Zimmer 82, 164.

Zimmermann 130, 134, 172.
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Rgveda - Lectures
Lectures - Rgveda
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